

Contextual Complexities and Nelson Mandela's Braided Rhetoric

by

Patricia Ofili

A thesis

presented to the University of Waterloo

in fulfilment of the

thesis requirement for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

English

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2019

@ Patricia Ofili 2019

Examining Committee Membership

The following served on the Examining Committee for this thesis. The decision of the Examining Committee is by majority vote.

External Examiner

Dr. Geneva Smitherman

Professor Emerita

Supervisor

Dr. Frankie Condon

Associate Professor

Internal-external Member

Dr. James Walker

Professor

Internal Members

Dr. Michael Macdonald

Associate Professor

Dr. Heather Smyth

Associate Professor

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

Dissertation Abstract

This dissertation revolves around the complex political circumstances in apartheid South Africa that produced Nelson Mandela the rhetorician, human rights activist, and the longest political prisoner in human history. The manner in which Nelson Mandela deploys a braided rhetoric that is a combination of the African and Western rhetorical traditions for spearheading the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa is investigated. Mandela draws upon the African rhetorical tradition through which his identity, selfhood, and ethos were forged, while appropriating the Western rhetorical tradition through which he attained his education and training as a lawyer. Also examined is the complexity of inter-ethnic strife among Black South Africans; a situation that was exploited by the apartheid regime and which made the western rhetorical tradition inadequate for addressing apartheid domination. The dissertation also studies Mandela's dynamism as he navigates the murky waters of apartheid policies, which were not only smoke screens for veiling their racist intent but were enactments that kept morphing for the purpose of crushing any form of dissent. The complex situation produced an audience that was very diverse; and to appeal to these local and international audiences, Mandela required a rhetoric that was nuanced and effective enough to dismantle the apartheid racist order. Mandela employs narratives, which are performed in keeping with the African oral tradition - to unify, organize, and inspire his people; to call on the world beyond the borders of South Africa to account for their support of Apartheid; and to call out whites South Africans for their implicit and explicit consent to the evils of a racist social, political, and economic order. Mandela's rhetoric is strengthened particularly because, even as he speaks and writes in service of a struggle against systemic racism, he rises above the reification of essentialism and thus resists complicity.

Acknowledgments

I owe a huge debt of gratitude to a lot of people without whom this dissertation could not have become a reality. I would like to thank my thesis supervisor, Frankie Condon, for her relentless support, encouragement, and availability. Her guidance and enthusiasm throughout the various stages of writing this project is invaluable. My sincere gratitude goes also to members of my committee, Michael Macdonald, Heather Smyth, and Shelley Hulan, (for the period she had to step in for my supervisor when she was unavoidable absent). I appreciate all your advice, deep and probing questions, and the countless hours that were devoted to reading my work and providing the much-needed feedback. My appreciation goes to Prof Austin Nwagbara, who was instrumental to my journey to UWaterloo. I would also like to thank the departmental staff, Tina Davidson, Maha Eid, Jenny Conroy, and Margaret Ulbrick for cheering me on and always being on hand to help. My gratitude goes to John and Roberta North for all their help and support. I am most grateful to my immediate family (you suffered the most from my long absence), my friends (especially my best Tina Egbuiwe and Rasha – my cheerleader) as well as my siblings, who have been my inspiration/pillar and for whom this program is as much an achievement as it is mine.

Dedication

This program is dedicated to the Almighty God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit

To my Mother Mary

And to my mother Lucy

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Mandela and Global Human Rights Ideologies.....	51
Chapter 3: Mandela’s Performative Ethos and Kairotic Ontology.....	106
Chapter 4: Apartheid’s Legal Screens and Mandela’s Luminescence.....	160
Chapter 5: Peace on a More Solid Ground.....	208
Bibliography and Works Cited.....	255

Chapter One

Introduction

My dissertation examines the manner in which Nelson Mandela employs a braided rhetoric within a complex socio-political context, as a strategy for dismantling apartheid. I describe braided rhetoric as the weaving together of both the Western and African rhetorical traditions. African rhetorical tradition refers to the entire system of artistic forms – visual, oral, and written, which are employed to celebrate and inculcate the African culture. These forms are employed within Africa and in the diaspora in ways that are highly persuasive. The Western rhetorical tradition is employed to describe the Greco-Roman canon with its tropes, figures, and symbols that form a system for persuasively inculcating, celebrating, and disseminating Western culture. This Western system of communication, with its derogative depiction of other races, formed the foundation for justifying imperialism, which in turn helped to produce racist apartheid. Apartheid was predicated on systemic and institutional racism, which was deployed to fragment Blacks in South Africa. Therefore, as a resistance leader, Mandela required a unique and complex rhetorical system in order to bring unity to these Blacks. Mandela’s braided rhetoric provided him with the rhetorical tools needed to appeal to the cultural commonality of these Blacks, whose ethnic differences had been effectively exploited by the ruling racial order to divide and weaken them.

Not only were South Africans divided culturally and linguistically, competing anti-imperialist and anti-racist ideologies that shaped their strategies for resistance movements also separated them. Further, other South African people of colour, whose vested interests differed from those of Blacks, were alienated from those resistance movements even as they, too, were exploited by the ruling racial order. Finally, any resistance by whites, who may have opposed the worst excesses of the Apartheid regime, was kept in check both by the political hegemony of Apartheid

and by the privileges bestowed on them by that regime. Thus, Mandela took on the onerous task of uniting Blacks, in order to produce a cohesive resistance to apartheid. He also attempted to bridge the gap between Blacks, other people of colour, and sympathetic whites within and beyond South Africa. To achieve all of these, he required a unique political rhetoric that could be strategic, adaptive, fierce, and reflexive.

Mandela's braided rhetoric is peculiar because he cultivates a style that has been criticized as not being as captivating as that of other human rights rhetors like Martin Luther King, Jr. However, the subtlety of Mandela's rhetoric enables his words to cut deep particularly because he employs a variety of rhetorical devices and by his recognition of the complex audience he needed to persuade. Previous scholars have examined Nelson Mandela's political rhetoric in the context of his human right activism and revolutionary leadership as evidence of his standing as a legal luminary. Jacques Derrida, for example, examines the manner by which Mandela deconstructs the apartheid legal framework to reveal how the Whites of South Africa violate their own legal heritage. Peace and conflict studies scholar, Tom Lodge, argues that Mandela's success as a leader was determined by the principles he absorbed from his cultural settings. These principles were strengthened by a literary culture that combined African oral traditions with Victorian concepts of honor, propriety, and virtue. Elleke Boehmer, a scholar of postcolonial literature, describes Mandela as a moral giant and an exemplar of a stand for social justice, non-racialism, and democracy.

Building upon and extending this prior scholarship, my dissertation examines the depth and nuance of Nelson Mandela's political rhetoric as he sought to articulate both dissent and social vision within a fractured and conflict-ridden rhetorical context. Through a close reading of Mandela's autobiography *Long Walk to Freedom* and his speeches, I undertake to examine the

deep historical knowledge Mandela had of the political, cultural, and social dynamics of apartheid in South Africa and how he used that knowledge in the resistance movement. In addition, Mandela's rhetoric is examined to show what role his African roots played for laying bare the imperialist underpinnings from the vantage point of apartheid's subjugated and resisting subjects.

Mandela deploys his braided rhetoric to craft a counter-history of colonialism and apartheid in South Africa. Mandela's account of the effects of colonialism and apartheid connects strongly to Frantz Fanon's psychological examination of colonization. Mandela crafts this counter-history by recovering the traditional ethos of the Xhosa tribe in the Transkei region of South African as a way of making an effective rhetorical appeal. The manner in which Mandela attempts to help Blacks in South African redefine their history exemplifies Homi Bhabha's concept of "scraps and rags of tradition" as a potent means of reclaiming the past of a dominated group. According to Bhabha, the signs and traditions of a nation are used by resisting subjects to tell a people's history (as opposed to an imperial history), with the intention of creating unity among a divided people. Mandela's braided rhetoric attempts to unify his fellow Black Africans and to also show that Black Africa has a rich rhetorical heritage. His deployment of African tropes and symbols as well as his intricate style enabled him to identify with his fellow Black South Africans in order to assuage and reclaim their bruised collective identity. The way Mandela crafts a counter-history, by combining Western and African tropes and symbols, reveals a revolutionary rhetorical strategy that is highly effective. The effectiveness derives from how he utilizes a surface lexical structure that is laden with deep meaning, which his people can easily recognize and identify with. By so doing, he attempts to heal the wounded cognitive fabric of the oppressed people of South Africa.

The historicizing of apartheid as a modern system of colonization is necessary for analyzing the rhetoric of Nelson Mandela. Colonization is largely responsible for the

psychodynamics that helped to shape apartheid policies. Apartheid was a racist order that was influenced by political, economic, and social events at the local and political levels that was played out on a global scale. Global events like WWII and emerging African nations (who were gaining independence from their former colonial masters) caused the apartheid government to be a constantly morphing phenomenon. These global events created awareness among Blacks and this awareness sparked debates surrounding freedom. These debates implied that leaders like Mandela needed to develop creative ways with which to engage with the people so as to find effective means for dismantling the hydra-headed apartheid system. Consequently, Mandela crafts a unique rhetoric that was braided from the Western and African rhetorical traditions, which served him quite well in the anti-apartheid struggle.

Historicizing of Apartheid

Understanding the history of South Africa is significant for bringing into perspective Mandela's complex context and his peculiar rhetoric. The current population of the Republic of South Africa stands at about 58, 065, 097, but for the sake of this project, I am using the 1980 census that has the population at about 28.6 million. The 1980 figure can be described as the first most credible census because most Blacks were not properly accounted for in previous ones, and it serves to show the South African population during the anti-apartheid struggle. South Africa has a racial classification that can be roughly divided into four groups that are as diverse and fragmented as can be imagined. According to Vincent Crapanzano, Anthropologist/Comparative literature expert, these groups have the Africans or Blacks making up the majority of about 20.7 million, Whites were about 4.5 million, the Coloureds or the people of mixed descent (also referred to as Browns) were about 2.6 million, and Asians were about 800.000 in number.

These different races were hardly homogenous in terms of language, religion, philosophies, or aspirations. The Asians were largely descendants of indentured labourers, and they were entirely Indians whose ancestors arrived in South Africa in the last decades of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth century. These Asians were made up of 70% Hindu, 20% Muslim, and 8% Christian (Crapanzano, xiv – xv). Their main languages are Urdu and Gujarati, and they live mostly in the province of Natal. The Coloured are descendants of whites and of slaves that were imported from Madagascar, tropical Africa, Southeast Asia, the local Khoikhoi-Hottentots, and San-Bushmen. These Coloureds mostly lived in the Cape Province. The whites, who are made up of Afrikaners (descendants of seventeenth-century Dutch, German, and Huguenot settlers), predominantly spoke Afrikaans, and as members of the Dutch Reformed church, they had no affiliations to traditional African cultures, while the rest of the whites are English-speaking. There were about 130,000 Jews in South Africa, who largely control the private economic sector. By the middle of the 19th century, the Afrikaners were in control of the bureaucracy and government.

The Black population can be described as mostly rural, and they can be safely divided into nine ethno linguistic groups. Among the Blacks groups, the Nguni is the largest tribe, and they consist of the Xhosa, the Zulu, the Ndebele, and the Swazi tribes. The Basotho (South Sotho, Bapedi – North Sotho) is the second largest group and, in addition to these other two groups are the Tsonga, the Venda, and the Tswana, with a sizable population. Blacks were definitely the poorest people in the country. This poverty was all encompassing basically because apartheid policies were designed to keep Blacks impoverished and powerless. For example, the “discriminatory laws, regulations, and agencies that serve to maintain baaskap (“bosssdom”), or white supremacy” (Crapanzano, xix) are a manifestation of the very term apartheid. This term means “separateness” in Afrikaans. Its operating laws enabled its romantic-nationalistic

philosophy of separate development. The laws, whereby a person's rights and privileges were determined based on their racial classification (Crapanzano, xix), ensured that Blacks were subjugated socially, politically, and economically.

Apartheid South African was greatly impacted politically, socially, and economically by diverse events locally and globally. The events that changed the South African political and cultural situations were very complex to say the least. For example, the Dutch were among the first group of white immigrants to arrive in South Africa with "a small party of Dutch tradesmen in 1652" (Stephen M. Davis, 1). Though their religion and culture were foreign to the indigenous Blacks, they had a relatively peaceful co-existence until the influx of Huguenot refugees swelled the numbers of foreigners; and that influx fuelled the conflict over farmland. This large number of white refugees also heightened inter-racial tension.

At about this same time, a new wave of British immigrants exacerbated the already fragile socio-economic milieu. That is because the British immigrants became as much a threat to the Dutch speaking Afrikaners as to the indigenous inhabitants of the land. The situation reached an alarming stage by the arrival of about five thousand imperial English speakers, who came to colonize Cape Town in 1820. Interestingly, these English-speakers "had followed in the wake of British rule, which had supplanted Dutch governance over the Cape colony. London's power provoked a major split in the young Afrikaner nation between those who wished to live and let live with the British and those who yearned for the freedom to farm their land out of the reach of "foreign" interference" (Davis, *Apartheid*, 2). These frictions caused strong internal disputes among Blacks that led to the famous war, which produced the victorious Zulu monarch, Shaka who crushed Black opposition in the local space. Shaka was in turn defeated by the combined power of the Europeans in the bloody battle of Ulundi. The suppression of Black independence

created a new form of power dynamics that pitted the British and Afrikaners against each other in a cycle of “fighting and negotiating with each other over the form of white governance in the region” (Davis, 3) within a period of about thirty years. The British victory in the Boer war altered the political landscape of South Africa in a way that excluded Blacks from enjoying any political franchise, despite being in the majority.

The Afrikaners regarded English settlers as representing British imperialism, and after failing to achieve secession, the Afrikaners settled for a coalition. Howard Brotz describes this coalition as having resulted “in a massive center party that seemed to put to rest in a decisive manner the bitter memories of the South African War” (9). This coalition also sealed the fate of the indigenous people and consigned them to the position of second-class citizens for over a century. WWII was one of the global events, which served to accentuate the divisions among the English and the Afrikaners. WWII was evidence that despite achieving a coalition, it did not totally erase ethnic cleavages at both local and global levels among whites. In South Africa, the war was regarded as a British or European affair, and some leaders of the Afrikaner sought to be neutral as a test of independence from the British Empire. The vote for neutrality was lost, and this loss reduced the power of the Afrikaners. This reduced power produced a new, more racist power order that would eventually change the social, economic, and political landscape to the detriment of the scapegoated Blacks.

The Cultural Logics of Imperialism

Blacks were deeply fractured culturally and linguistically because of the heterogeneous nature of their ethnic differences. Black South Africans were further fragmented because they had

differing ideological understanding as to what form their resistance to apartheid should take. These differences created conflicts among them, which were made more complicated by the divide and rule strategy of the Afrikaner government. The conflicts among Blacks provided justification for white hegemony, whose apartheid policies of segregation were crafted to maintain the economic and power dynamics in favour of whites.

It is important to understand the role that the historical construction of racial ideology played in imperialism and by extension, apartheid. The idea of viewing people of colour and their cultures as inferior prepared the grounds for imperialism. These ideas existed long before the economic conditions that expedited the exploitation of the lands and people of colour. Martin Bulmer and John Solomos describe racism as an ideology that produced discrimination on the basis of racial difference. And this ideology emanated from the belief that a designated racial group was biologically and culturally inferior. Such beliefs were used to rationalize and prescribe the treatment received by such racial groups in the society. These beliefs were also employed for explaining and justifying the groups' social position and accomplishments or lack of it.

Bulmer and Solomos argue that racism and racist ideologies existed long before the enlightenment period. The enlightenment period was the point when racism served as justification for pushing western culture upon the 'other' in order to exploit them. Thereafter, racism became further complicated and systematized by "the processes of economic expansion and capitalist development" (Bulmer and Solomos, "General Introduction," 10). Despite the fact that the construction of Blacks as uncivilized dates back to the 1st century BC, some scholars such as Philip Curtin, Michael Banton, and George Mosse, among others have argued that the description of Blacks has been in a flux over the centuries. The description of Blacks has been changing according to which historian or explorer was deploying the narrative and for what purpose. Some

descriptions have placed Blacks in sublime positions, while others have produced images that were bizarre and grotesque. In a bid to create sensational myths, reality became blurred between extremes that contributed toward shaping the ideology of race. This racial ideology became embedded within the cultures of Europe in a way that was made manifest socially, politically, and economically. As a result of this historical foundation of racial ideology, anything that did not emanate from Europe was regarded as inferior, dark, or evil. Therefore, imperialism was influenced by the racist ideology that aimed to devalue people of colour. This devaluation engendered the fear and loathing whites have toward people of color.

People of color were loathed because of the way they have been constructed over time. Apart from the zoological terms like dog and monkey that have been used to construct people of colour, the essentialist traits that have been imputed onto them have stuck. Victor Villanueva describes the traits, whereby people of colour were depicted as having minds that ran not higher than that of animal functions of eating, sleeping, and sexual debauchery (24). Villanueva argues that having such depictions appear on documents that determined immigration policies show how persuasive the rhetoric of racism can be. These racist ideas found a counterpart in European cultures, with their roots in a history that compartmentalized races within an ideological framework of hierarchy. Consequently, when it became important to explore other lands for economical advancement, the racial ideology that constructed people of colour as hierarchically inferior was used as justification for their colonization. Capitalism found a ready base in this racial ideology for the satisfaction of a market force that was driven by greed. Capitalism helped to reinforce the hierarchy, which reproduced the struggle for dominance politically, economically, and ideologically. Therefore, imperialism cannot be separated from racism, which in turn was fuelled by a Eurocentric view of culture.

Eurocentrism had a very powerful effect on the culture of Europe. That is because “there was an almost universal acceptance of the idea that Western, industrialized society had produced (or been produced by) men of higher intellectual power than their ‘primitive’ brethren” (Colby and Cole, 64). This idea of superiority, long held by the Western world, reached conclusions of cultural differences arising from “anecdotes supported by missionaries and travelers and, later, the observations of field anthropologists” (Colby and Cole, 64). Therefore, imperialism proceeded “from a single ideological climate” (Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, 3) that resulted in an imposition of the colonizing culture and language on the colonized. This imposition operates at a dual level of “simple utility (as propaganda for instance) and at the unconscious level, where it leads to the naturalizing of constructed values (e.g. civilization, humanity etc.), which conversely established ‘savagery’, ‘native’ as their antithesis and as the object of a reforming zeal” (Ashcroft et al, 3). Imperialism was established on “a privileging norm” and as a template for the denial of the ‘peripheral’, the ‘marginal’, and the so-called ‘uncanonized’ (Ashcroft et al, 3). Consequently, the Western literary canon and its rhetorical tradition were as central to the cultural enterprise of imperialism as the racial ideology that formed them.

It is important to discuss the connection between culture and ideology in order to grasp the role played by this connection in propelling imperialism. Culture and ideology cannot be divorced in the sense that ideology as a set of ideas exists in culture. While ideology is homogenous, culture is not, but the ideologies produced in various cultures help to promote cohesion within those cultures. By homogenous, I connect with Josue Antonio Nescolarde-Selva, Jose-Luis Uso-Domenech, and Hugo Gash who argue that ideologies derive their power from the logical coherence that forces totalitarian groups to reject alternative visions of reality (2). In terms of culture, Edward Said and Bhabha share the idea that “all cultures are involved in one another; none

is single and pure, all are hybrid, heterogeneous, extraordinarily differentiated, and unmonolithic” (Said, xxv). Therefore, what holds cultures together are those ideologies that produce a belief that what is practiced is the morally right thing to do.

Said deploys culture to explain how Western ideologies that are depicted in rhetoric, poetics, and philosophy are used to push certain agendas. These means of expression have connections to the economic, social, and political realms that often exist in aesthetic forms from which a group of people derive pleasure. Culture is fashioned among a group of people and in turn gives rise to a “popular stock of lore about distant parts of the world and specialized knowledge available in such learned discipline as ethnography, historiography, philology, sociology, and literary history” (Said, xii). The ideas constructed about the people of distant lands were firmly entrenched within the Western cultures, and these ideologies formed the moral grounds for imperialism.

In addition, the Eurocentric ideology whereby late nineteenth century Europeans saw Europe as the focus and standard by which other cultures must be judged has been strongly interrogated. That is because every culture is emblematic of a symbol system that is inseparable from the people of that culture. Therefore, individuals and groups imbibe values and employ symbol systems that are informed by what they have internalized culturally and epistemologically. To avoid the fallacy of essentialism, these values and symbol systems must be separated from the human essence. Bhabha also argues that Western literary canon and rhetorical tradition have been influenced by the cultures that produced them. Therefore, Western literary canon and rhetorical tradition have contributed toward how people from other cultures are perceived. The influence of the Western rhetorical tradition in producing racism and, consequently, imperialism can be seen

in the way Western cultures were celebrated and promoted as superior legacies. The superior status attributed to these cultures demanded that they be protected and propagated.

Since Europe was populated by whites only, anyone outside the shores of Europe was not only inferior but was commodified as something to be used and exploited. For example, Abdul R. Mohammed argues that imperialist and colonialist discourses commodified the people of other lands into stereotypical objects, which were used as resources for colonialist fiction. Consequently, characterization of Africans as the epitome of evil and barbarity provided justification for their economic exploitation. The literary canon gained currency and was employed to promote the so-called superiority of the Western culture. Thus, the rhetorical tradition provided the tools, in terms of tropes and figures, for promoting the superiority of Western cultures and the inferiorization of people of colour.

Said argues that the main concern in imperialism was the battle over land and when it came to “who owned the land, who had the right to settle and work on it, who kept it going, who won it back, and who now plans its future – these issues were reflected, contested, and even for a time decided in narrative” (xii-xiii). According to Said, imperialist ideas are embedded in history and art, and these disciplines helped to form the attitudes that gave impetus to imperialist practices. Therefore, the foundation of imperialism is art and science. Remove them or degrade them and the empire is no more because “empire follows art and not vice versa as English supposes” (Said 13). The cognitive activities ignited by imperial indoctrination can be highly compelling. According to Said, “defensive, reactive, and even paranoid nationalism is, alas, frequently woven into the very fabric of education, where children as well as older students are taught to venerate and celebrate the uniqueness of the tradition (usually and invidiously at the expense of others)” (xxvi). The result

is that the passion produced in turn feeds other passions, with the singular purpose of spreading the gospel of this superior culture.

The Consequence of an Internalized Racial Ideology

The racial ideologies of a superior culture were internalized by whites, and such ideologies were seized upon to help entrench their rule over Black South Africans. The idea of white supremacy was an attractive concept for the Afrikaners, and that concept gained popularity for them among their fellow whites who sought to suppress Blacks. Howard Brotz examines the dynamics of apartheid from a broad perspective through which he describes the factors that gave birth to the Afrikaner Nationalist Party as an ethnic fusion through the process of realignment (*The Politics of South Africa*, 3). The ‘segregation’ policy, which was a forerunner of the ‘apartheid’ policy, was fed by the fear harboured by whites that dreaded the superior numerical strength of the Black population. This fear gave rise to laws that disenfranchised Blacks from voting.

The laws removed them from the voting rolls in the Cape, the only place where they had previously enjoyed voting rights. This move was masked by the addition of more land to the Native reserves in order to give the impression that the locus of Black economic and political development was tied to the reserves. According to Brotz, the origin of the Bantustan idea was conceived at this point. The creation of the Bantustan, also known as Bantu homeland or Black homeland, meant that Blacks were restricted to existing within certain geographical regions. Sadly, the lands that were being added to the Native reserves were the least arable. Brotz observed that Blacks did not quite understand the loss of their franchise or the addition of land to their reserves. Their lack of

understanding stemmed from the fact that they still had confidence in the good faith of the government.

This confidence in General Jan Smuts's government quickly evaporated when the anticipated move of abolishing the pass laws as a first step towards equal rights (Davis, 5) was sacrificed on the altar of white supremacy. Smuts caved under the pressure from the pro-Nazi National Party because of the desire to retain power in the 1943 general elections. It was easy for Smuts to betray Blacks because they had no voting power anyway, and the whites-only electorate was a significant motivating factor in spurning the aspirations of the Black populace. To combat the evil that the loss of franchise represented, the ANC leadership was forced to "recognize the apparent futility of passive negotiation. Peaceful but forceful confrontation seemed the only path available" (Davis, 5). However, the membership of the ANC was rather insignificant and there was a need to re-organize and re-strategize.

To address the situation, consultations by the ANC would ultimately necessitate a "focus upon the delusions and also the iniquities of the segregation policy, the hardships of which fell entirely upon the shoulders of the Blacks" (Brotz, 12). These consultations helped to organize the divided Black groups, in a bid to free them from the yoke of oppression. The apartheid struggle would prove to be an uphill task because racial integration was such a formidable obstacle that any attempt to give any form of franchise to Blacks raised the level of fear among whites. This fear created a paranoia that caused whites to believe, particularly amongst the Purified Nationalists, that they were endangered. This paranoia contributed towards the evolution of apartheid policies, their interpretation, and implementation. Consequently, the whole world watched as "Afrikaner nationalism broke loose to become something like a wild politically irresponsible force" (Brotz,

13). A major global event that changed the socio-political landscape of South Africa was the industrial revolution as well as the discovery of natural resources in South Africa. As Brotz argues,

Industrialization sounded the death-knell of an easy-going rural economy among Whites and Blacks, in which domestic herds were valued for status rather than for a market. Such an economy depended for its perpetuation upon inexhaustible supplies of free land; and then this condition no longer obtained, the economy became decrepit and could no longer carry all its population. Industrialization was to draw both the poor whites and the tribal Blacks who were displaced from the land, between whom there were the rawest racial prejudices, into competition in the urban labour (4-5).

The demand for land and the resources from it created competition that worsened the racial tension. This competition, as with conflicts and issues pertaining to self-preservation, implied that alignments were produced using 'identification.' Such 'identification' exposed the power relations that saw the emergence of the white minority government, which was an "alliance between Afrikaner nationalism and the English-speaking Labour Party" (Brotz, 7). This coalition rode on the back of Black subordination in what was described as "The thesis of Creswell, the leader of the Labour Party" (Brotz, 7), which was founded on "the employment of cheap Black labour working on indentures or contracts to organized white labour" (Brotz, 7). Brotz, who is writing from a political perspective; and Vincent Crapanzo, who examines apartheid from the angle of anthropology, both recognize the impact of the industrial revolution in economically empowering whites over the other races, particularly Blacks. In essence, the industrial revolution, as an economic force, served very well the purpose of manoeuvring the state machinery to further deepen unequal race relations in South African. The cheap labour provided by Blacks constituted the entrenchment of their lower-class status.

The subordination of Black labourers was not only proof of the social-economic order; it exposed and heightened the fear that plagued organized white labour of "unrestricted competition for employment with racial groups who would work for lower wages" (Brotz, 7). This competition

resulted in the racist hubris that was informed by social Darwinism among whites, who viewed work in the mines as beneath them. Therefore, they would not perform jobs regarded as ‘Kaffir work’, which were earmarked for Blacks. Consequently, Blacks were restricted to specific low-level jobs that created employment ceilings and limited prospects for them. To reinforce the subordination of Black labourers, the same Creswell thesis was used to discourage Blacks from migrating to the towns. The implication of this spatial segregation was that what had been achieved economically was translated into a geographical curtailment. Blacks became confined to “Native reserves” thereby bringing together ‘imperialism’ and Afrikaner nationalism in a concept of new colonialism. This new colonialism goes as far back as 1922 when the Transvaal Local Government Commission came up with an act that argued that:

If the Native is to be regarded as a permanent element in municipal areas, and if he is to have equal opportunity of establishing himself there permanently, there can be no justification for basing his exclusion from the franchise on the simple ground of color. Some Coloured persons and Natives are possessed of property and brains, and have educational qualifications not inferior to some enfranchised Europeans; many carry on trades and are their own employers, and it cannot be denied that they have special and peculiar needs not at present being met. We consider that the history of the races, especially having regards to South African history, show that that the comingling of Black and White is undesirable. The Native should only be allowed to enter urban areas, which are essentially the White man’s creation, when he is willing to enter and to minister to the needs of the White man, and should depart therefrom when he ceases to minister (Brotz, 25-26).

This reasoning that forbids the comingling of races - using Fagan’s phrase – was the foundation for racist laws like the Pass Law. The Pass Law required Blacks to always carry on them a piece of identification. The identification specified their race on their person, and this practice solidified apartheid segregation. At this point, it might appear that the moral vacuum that Crapanzano described as the basis for apartheid had begun to deepen. Interestingly, the concluding part of the commission that refers to the ‘history of races’ and the desires of whites to avoid comingling of races is evidence of a repudiation of forensic logic. The point here is that the same

report that had provided glaring evidence of racial equality was making excuses for racial segregation. This report served to enable whites to persuade themselves on why they should hold on to an idea that was obviously morally wrong. By making excuses for racial segregation, the Afrikaners were resisting persuasion. The fact that racial segregation was being hinged on the so-called history of races reveals the psychology of racism. Despite the observation that any disenfranchisement on the basis of race was an aberration, a rejection of this truth is what Crapanzano regards as deep moral depravity.

This moral depravity is also evident in The Fagan Report or the Report of the Native Laws Commission of 1948. This commission was constituted to investigate the idea of segregation, and the report recognized that failure to address racial inequality would ultimately create problems in South Africa. Paradoxically, although Fagan admitted that “normal democratic franchise of one-man, one-vote, or as he termed it, majority rule by the counting of heads” (Brotz, 27) was the morally right thing to do, he rejected the integration of races that such a franchise would produce. The rejection of racial integration (which is a consequence of racism) contradicts the democratic franchise of one-man, one-vote. This rejection was concretized in apartheid policies as a measure to keep Black South Africans subjugated. Fagan’s report pandered to the fear that white South Africans had of Blacks.

The contradiction in Fagan’s report between an endorsement of democracy and segregation was informed more by fear than malice. Though not justifiable, this fear was understandable. The Afrikaners, who were occupiers and who were empowered by imperialism and colonialism, enjoyed political and economical power and privilege. The fear of losing such power and privilege owing to the fact that they were in the minority was real. The fear that whites had of Blacks was responsible for the resistance to persuasion that is portrayed by the contradiction in Fagan’s report.

Although Fagan acknowledged the intelligence and industry of Blacks, (which was no less than that of their white counterparts), his inconsistency through the endorsement of segregation was informed by racism. This endorsement helped to reproduce systemic racism in apartheid South Africa.

Blacks were regarded as uncivilized despite the evidence to the contrary in Fagan's report. The labelling of Blacks, as sub human and uncivilized, bought into the rhetoric of racism that the Afrikaners had internalized. This labelling produced the justification for the violence that the so-called uncivilized Blacks were subjected to. The rhetoric of racism produced a cycle of fear, whereby the risk of losing political and economic power to those who had been rhetorically constructed as inferior played a significant role in the Afrikaner's rejection of forensic logic. And the consequence was a resistance to persuasion.

Despite Fagan's acknowledgement of the cognitive equality of Blacks, both Fagan and the Afrikaners refused to be persuaded to share power. In refusing to share power, Afrikaners proved themselves impervious to the evidence provided by Fagan that (1) Some Coloured persons and Natives are possessed of property and brains and have educational qualifications not inferior to some enfranchised Europeans, (2) they have special and peculiar needs not at present being met, and (3) If the Native is to be regarded as a permanent element in municipal areas and if he is to have equal opportunity of establishing himself there permanently, there can be no justification for basing his exclusion from the franchise on the simple ground of colour. However, Fagan himself endorsed the systemic racism that segregated and denied Blacks their rights. The systemic racism that caused Afrikaners to resist such logical reasoning created the circumstances into which Mandela needed to speak.

The Complicity of Western Rhetorical Tradition in the Cultural Logic

Entrenched within the consciousness of Europe is the concept of a superior culture, which was instrumental in constructing racism and which, in turn, helped to justify imperialism. Within this culture are the literary canon and the rhetorical tradition, which constructed Blacks as animals. The construction of the Black race as subhuman was done with an ulterior motive as JanMohamed argues, and that motive was the exploitation of land. However, this construction was not achieved in abstraction. Said argues that the dehumanization of the Black race is deeply steeped in the Western canon. The imperial activities that are influenced by the Western canon and rhetorical traditions have severe ramifications. Jean-Paul Sartre describes the implication of the subhuman construction of the Blacks in his preface to Fanon's *Wretched of the Earth* in the following words:

Our soldiers overseas, rejecting the universalism of the mother country, apply the "numerous clauses" to the human race: since none may enslave, rob or kill his fellow man without committing a crime, they lay down the principle that the native is not one of our fellow men. Our striking power has been given the mission of changing this abstract certainty into reality: the order is given to reduce the inhabitants of the annexed country to the level of superior monkeys in order to justify the settler's treatment of them as beast of burden (13).

The implementation of the "numerous clauses" was made possible because Africans had already been constructed as sub-human. That construction enabled their enslavement and the annexation of their lands. The enslavement of Blacks was a deliberate act that occurred at the conscious and sub-conscious levels. The ideas about other people and their lands were planted in the minds of imperialist soldiers through their various symbol systems. The Western canon is replete with literatures that project this idea of the sub humanity of Africans. Henry Louis Gates argues that western literatures and philosophers like Hegel and Kant produced texts that drew conclusions that projected Blacks as 'stupid'. Gates captures the fact that Kant first claims that "so fundamental is the difference between [the black and white] races of man...it appears to be as great

in regards to mental capacities as in color” (Quoting Kant, 10). The very idea that the Blacks are mystified as being physically and mentally black, in order to portray them as evil, is a rhetorical trope that was internalized by the imperialists.

JanMohamed describes the imaginary starting point, where the depiction of the “other” was exploited, as a form of a Manichean allegory. The imaginary operates at the level of fictional text where the “European writer commodifies the native by negating his individuality, his subjectivity, so that he is now perceived as a generic being that can be exchanged for any other native (they all look alike, act alike, and so on)” (JanMohamed, 83). While the surface structure of the texts claims to present particular encounter with “specific varieties of the racial other, the subtext valorizes the superiority of European culture” (JanMohamed, 84). Colonial rhetoric commodifies the Black race into a stereotype in order to use them as a resource for colonialist fiction. In these texts, Blacks are fetishized as the epitome of evil and barbarity and badly in need of civilization. The seizing of land occurs as an execution on the spatial and physical level of what has been conceived at the level of textual fiction. JanMohamed argues that the overt aim of civilizing the savage has a covert aim that can be described as having been influenced by a psychology of superiority. That psychology has its

assumption in all colonialist literature [that] is accompanied in colonial texts by a more vociferous insistence, indeed by a fixation upon the savagery and evilness of the native [that] should alert us to the real function of these texts to justify imperial occupation and exploitation. If such literature can demonstrate that the barbarism of the native is irrevocable, or at least very deeply ingrained, then the European’s attempt to civilize him can continue indefinitely, the exploitation of resources can proceed without hindrance, and the European can persist in enjoying a position of moral superiority (JanMohamed, 81).

The negative depiction of the Black race is ubiquitous in the Western world as shown by Fanon, Crapanzano, Said, Bhabha, and a host of other scholars. The information concerning Blacks makes for interesting reading because their fetishization was constructed

in mythical tropes. Therefore, narrative fiction specifically plays an important role in “the history and world of empire” (Said, xii). Furthermore, it is the stories that explorers and novelists craft about strange regions of the world that imperialists employ for constructing the “other.”

Whether people choose to identify with Dante or Shakespeare, the ideas in their narratives serve to define the identity of a group of people, who vigorously strive to preserve particular codes of behaviour that set them apart from those considered as the “other.” The ideas in the texts of writers like Carlyle, Ruskin, Dickens, and Thackeray about colonial expansion, inferior races, or “nigger” cannot be ascribed to a different area from that of culture. Said argues that culture is “the elevated area of activity in which they “truly” belong and in which they did their “really” important work” (xiv). Furthermore, long before the imperialist encountered the people of the distant lands described in their narrative fictions, an image has already been formed in their minds of a beautiful and fertile land populated by an evil and barbaric people.

The Psychology of Imperialism

Western culture and western rhetorical tradition were responsible for producing a mindset, which in turn formed the ideas behind imperialism. The cultural enterprise of imperialism had a grand plan, which according to Fanon was hatched by systematically destroying the indigenous cultures without giving the colonized access to the culture of the colonizer. Any attempt to resuscitate the indigenous cultures was condemned as exaggerated passion, while disregarding the fact that the psyche of the colonizer, as well as their sense of self, was “conveniently sheltered behind a French or German [or English] culture, which has been given full proof of its [their]

existence and which is uncontested” (Fanon, *Wretched*, 169). Thus, the culture and language of the colonized people was subjugated, and the effect was psychologically damaging.

Said argues that the idea advanced for the justification of imperialism lies in the rhetorical construction of the “other,” which has psychological implications for the colonizer and the colonized. Therefore, “[t]he notions about bringing civilization to primitive or barbaric people, the disturbingly familiar ideas about flogging or death or extended punishment being required when “they” misbehave or become rebellious because “they” mainly understood force or violence, “they” were not like “us” and for that reason deserved to be ruled” (Said, xii) were irrevocably bound up in the psychology of imperialism. Consequently, imperialist culture thrived on a rhetorical pattern of us versus them.

Such internalized ideologies formed the principle behind white domination, white supremacy, and what Fanon describes as arrogant racism. This arrogance is firmly entrenched in the psyche of the imperialist. Fanon argues that racism was formed from a Manichaeism that “goes to its logical conclusion and dehumanizes the native, or to speak plainly, it turns him into an animal. In fact, the terms the settler uses when he mentions the native are zoological terms” (*Wretched*, 34). Bhabha describes this stereotyping of the Black race as “a tie-up between the metaphoric or masking function of the fetish and the narcissistic object-choice” (77) that is also “an opposing alliance between the metonymic figuring of lack and the aggressive phase of the imaginary” (77). Fanon argues that “The colonialist bourgeoisie, in its narcissistic dialogue expounded by the members of its universities, had in fact deeply implanted in the minds of the colonized intellectual that the essential qualities remain eternal in spite of all the blunders men may make” (*Wretched*, 37). Such Manichean depiction of the Black race starts in the imaginary and culminates in their physical and spatial domination.

The imperialist discourse was crafted as an overt desire to ‘civilize’ the ‘savage’ in order to introduce him to the benefits of Western cultures. But the covert purpose of such discourse was the exploitation of the colony’s natural resources. The portrayal of Africa as barbaric, which was pervasive in the Western world, was largely responsible for the stereotyping Africans have been subjected to. Sander Gilman describes the role of portrayals that take on the conventional significance of essential difference as a defining factor in imperialism. Gilman says that the twelfth-century Jewish traveler Benjamin of Tudela wrote that: “at Seba on the river Pishon is a people who live like animals and eat of the herbs that grow on the banks of the Nile and in the fields. They go about naked and have not the intelligence of ordinary men. They cohabit with their sisters and anyone they can find. And these are the Black slaves, the sons of Ham” (228). The information that is fed into the minds of the imperialists via the racist tropes embedded in texts gains currency and becomes elevated to the level of a religion when repeated over and over again.

Crapanzano reiterates the idea that whites have firmly entrenched in their beliefs that the essential qualities of the Black race are a part of their DNA. And these essential qualities reside in both their blood and psyche. For example, one of the white people Crapanzano interviewed in South Africa said “the Blacks are barbarians, uncivilized, raw...They can become professors and doctors, but there is always something lacking...It is in the blood...You can take a Black man from the bush, but you can’t take the bush from the Black man” (Crapanzano, 10). This idea that the Black man’s blackness is in his blood gives the impression that should a white man be infused with a Black man’s blood, the white man would become partly black. In fact, the idea is that any percentage of black blood when mixed with white blood makes the white person black.

Essentialism is often used to construct human flaws as the problems of particular races, and thus, it makes people of such races appear irredeemable. Essentialist constructs that strip

Blacks of their humanity set the tone and stage for their domination. Blacks are depicted as being either inhuman or infantile, who lack the ability to govern themselves. Crapanzano points out that “Apartheid is the product of an essentialist racism in which people of color are considered to be quintessentially different from whites and cannot, as such, enter in any meaningful way into the formation of white identity. They- the “Blacks,” “Coloureds,” “Asians,” “kaffirs,” “Brown,” – are a “lower race,” “Childlike,” “prolific,” “raw,” “primitive,” “savage,” “uncivilized,” “of the bush.” This difference is preserved through distance” (Crapanzano, 39). Such colonial discourse creates a psychological distance that aims not only at spatial separation, but aims at the exclusion of people of colour from enjoying human dignity at all levels of life. The colonized are forced to exist on a sub-human level socially, economically, and politically. Any leverage that they are given is perceived as a privilege no matter how inferior such leverages like lower standard of education or deplorable accommodations are. Such deliberate dehumanization represents a psychological dislocation on the part of the oppressors, who are emotionally distanced from the realities around them.

The psychological distance embodied in imperialism is problematized by the ambivalence that Bhabha refers to as “sly civility” (95). The point being made here is that imperialist discourse eulogizes the Eurocentric culture by normalizing its historical expansion and exploitation. Imperialism is, thus, depicted as a fixed hierarchy of civil progress (Bhabha 95). In essence, what is articulated in imperialist discourse is the doubleness that is enacted in the violence of one powerful nation deliberately effacing the history of another under the guise of benevolence. And this doubleness is enunciated as “the father and the oppressor...just and unjust” (Bhabha, 95) in apparent contradiction. The ambivalence referred to here “reveals an agonistic uncertainty contained in the incompatibility of empire and nation; it puts on trial the very discourse of civility

within which representative government claims its liberty and empire its ethics” (Bhabha, 95-96). The ambivalence strips the colonialist of the moral inclination to subscribe to any form of equality for the colonized.

Psychology of the Colonized

The psychology of imperialism produced a superiority complex that is reified by the colonizer to create a polarity. The polarity of superior versus inferior is systematically constructed, and the inferiority complex is projected onto the colonized. The actions emanating from the superiority complex are designed to crush the will of the colonized. Everything about the colonized is inferiorized – their skin colour, hair texture, physical features, culture, and language. According to Ngugi Wa Thiongo, the worst deathblow to the Africans was the ‘cultural bomb,’ and the colonialist’s goal was to annihilate the people’s belief in themselves.

Ngugi’s point connects to Fanon’s argument that the idea of imposing a language on the colonized represents a disempowerment. The disempowerment operates at a level deeper than the spatial colonization that appropriates the land of the natives. According to Fanon, language holds the power that controls the intellectual and cultural world expressed through that language. The power of language is captured by Paul Valery as “the god gone astray in the flesh” (Fanon, *Black Skin*, 18). What is emphasized here is that language has the power to build or destroy and to unite or divide. This idea corroborates Fanon’s argument that language is not just a means of communication, it holds the power for creation and is also a means of production. Therefore, human communication, which is the basis and process for evolving culture, is intricately tied to

human identity. In stripping the colonized of their language, they are equally stripped of their sense of identity.

From Fanon's arguments in *White Skin Black Mask*, racism and racial oppression have deep cognitive effects. The psychosis that he describes is produced over time and to combat such a problem, it would be necessary to employ strategies that are similar to those employed for creating the psychosis in the first place. In essence, the erosion of the historical past and by extension, the cultural identity of the colonized were achieved in rhetorical construction and violence. Therefore, the instruments for dehumanizing and inferiorizing the colonized cannot be eschewed when seeking redress. Fanon captures the psychological warfare waged against natives in the following words: "The colonial world is a Manichean world" (*The Wretched*, 33), where "the confrontation of 'civilized' and 'primitive' men created a special situation – the colonial – and brings about the emergence of a mass of illusions and misunderstandings that only a psychological analysis can place and define" (*Black Skin*, 85). The indigenous people who had become slaves in their own land were fed a version of history that claims that the Black man is "insensible to ethics; he represents not only the absence of values, but also the negation of values. He is, let us dare to admit, the enemy of value, and in this sense, he is absolutely evil" (Fanon, *Wretched*, 34). The construction of the Black race in such negative and degrading rhetoric has the potential of creating an identity crisis in the colonized.

Bhabha argues that the scraps and rags of tradition are employed for constructing anti-colonialist discourse, which serve to undo the damage of racist indoctrination in the colonized. This idea connects to Fanon's argument that stories from the past are given a new role in order to galvanize the oppressed into decisive acts meant to unseat the colonial powers. The colonialist discourse has the effect of making the African people see their past as "one wasteland of non-

achievement and it makes them want to distance themselves from that wasteland” (Ngugi, 3). According to Ngugi, to counter this effect, the colonized have to fight imperialism with a more creative culture of resolute struggle. Such tenacity enables them wield even more firmly the weapons contained in their cultures.

Fanon describes the imposition of a foreign language on the colonized people as creating in their soul an inferiority complex resulting from the “death and burial of its local cultural originality” (*White Skin*, 18) when face to face with the language of the civilizing nation. To buttress this point, Ngugi argues that language is culture itself because culture is “the collective memory bank of a people’s experience in history. Consequently, culture is almost indistinguishable from the language that makes possible its genesis, growth, banking, articulation and indeed its transmission from one generation to the next” (Ngugi, 15). The suppression of the indigenous languages was violently enforced in the colonized world without any consideration being given to the many effects on the colonized.

To combat the psychological effect of the distortion of the history and culture of the colonized, it is important to reclaim those histories and cultures in dynamic ways. However, it may be impossible to reclaim such histories without identifying the nature of that historical and cultural past in order to determine how these past histories, cultures, and languages have been distorted. Fanon, Ngugi, and Aime Cesaire argue that it is necessary to use the language of the oppressed for communication and artistic purposes in order to help them reclaim their identity. It is interesting to note that these scholars wrote in the language of the colonizer and have been criticized for not practicing what they preached. To truly practice what he preached, Ngugi switched to writing in Gikuyu. On the other hand, scholars like Edward Braithwaite and Chinua Achebe believe that the language of the colonizer can be used in a different way and can be bent to capture the culture,

flora, and fauna of the colonized. Mandela's peculiar rhetoric goes beyond the recommendations of Braithwaite and Achebe. Mandela employs the tropes and symbols of the western rhetorical tradition (the language of the colonizer) and the African rhetorical tradition (the language of the colonized) to attempt a reclamation of the African past. To appreciate the ways in which rhetors like Mandela attempted to reclaim the African past, it is necessary to undertake an objective examination of the African rhetorical tradition.

African Rhetorical Tradition

Comparative study of African rhetoric has shifted from the colonial/imperial binaries of superior versus inferior, with the Western rhetorical tradition placed at the apex of this hierarchy. Instead, emphasis is being placed on the form, function, and value of African indigenous rhetoric and cultures. Kermit Campbell states that "comprehensive studies of rhetoric in Africa or comparative rhetorical studies that take African cultures into account should be based on African historical records (early and modern) if the integrity of such studies is to be maintained" (257). Campbell makes an illuminating assertion that argues that the roots of Africa's rhetorical tradition are not only variegated and deep, but that they defy simple categorization and judgment.

The variegated nature of African rhetorical tradition is exemplified in the role of the West African griot or the South African *imbongi*, whose duty as a narrator has a rhetorical appeal. The griot is a repository of oral tradition and history. The griot or *imbongi* performs the important task of acquainting the people with their culture through storytelling, praise singing, poetry, or music by employing a rhetorical dexterity and wit that is compelling and persuasive. Campbell's example of the Guinean Mamadou Kouyate, "the griot narrator of a long-canonized version of Sundiata,

first published by the French in 1960” (269) depicts the wealthy legacy of the African rhetorical tradition. For example, “[t]he empires of Mali and Songhay each have an epic poem that memorializes, as epics customarily do, the nation’s history and its legendary heroes. *Sundiata* (Mali) and *The Epic of Askia Mohammed* (Songhay) are long narrative poems typically recited by oral poets called jeli...or griot” (Campbell, 268). Mandela drew heavily upon this griot/*imbongi* style narration in most of his speeches and courtroom appearances as a way of reaffirming the pride of his African heritage.

The griot, however, plays a dual role of calling the populace to action as well as exhorting the leaders to exemplary leadership. According to Campbell, “griot oratory clearly possesses what I would call a sermonic quality, one intended to stir the heart, to provoke and persuade an audience to take action on the battlefield as well as on the throne” (272). In essence, the oratory of the griot is significant in ensuring that both the leader and the led are made to remember their glorious past in order to secure a better future. The West African griot or the South African *imbongi* is defined as the traditional figure who “...was, and still is, observer, commentator or councillor on the past and passing scenes. He happily still survives in some part of Africa, not only rehandling traditional material...keeping the heroic feats of historical figures alive, but also commenting in historical style on contemporary matters” (Kaschula and Diop, quoting Jones, Palmer, and Jones, 13). Campbell argues that the griot functions as an orator as well as being a poet or storyteller.

The griot’s role of reminding the people of the kingdom’s glorious past in order to motivate them into a particular action makes them important orators within the African context. For the griot “appeals to his countrymen’s pride, their thirst of glory today and for posterity. His words are perhaps particularly persuasive given his calculated use of rhetorical questions and extended metaphor” (Campbell, 270). There is the need to examine the nature of the African rhetorical

tradition in order to answer the questions such as: what are the hallmarks of the African rhetorical tradition? In what ways does the western rhetorical tradition differ from its African counterpart?

Ruth Finnegan, Campbell, Roger Abrahams, and Bekunuru Kubayanda among others describe African rhetorical tradition as comprising of a system of expression and communication. The system is derived from the culture and values of the African people in forms of songs, dances, rituals, proverbs, riddles, folktales, and griots, which are artistic, performative, and persuasive in nature. These forms and functions exist in both the oral and written art forms that make up the African rhetorical tradition. But the oral form is often used as an excuse to subordinate African literary art. An examination of the verbal aspects of African rhetorical tradition will portray the complexity and creativity that make them effective as rhetorical tools.

The oral forms of African creativity exist as rhetorical modes that play significant roles in helping to form the values of the people. In addition, African rhetorical tradition harnesses the aesthetic value of verbal art as a tool of strengthening the cognitive retention of the lyrics and rhythm of songs that accompany performances in the mental modes that are easily retrievable for re-enactment. The cognitive activity activated by African verbal art is what Finnegan's perspective of a schema between language, mind, and memory (*Oral Tradition*, 169) depicts. This cognitive aspect of African rhetorical tradition makes manifest the notion that rhetoric owes its validity to a deeply cognitive engagement, which is evident in tropes and figuration as processes of the mind.

African rhetorical tradition should not be examined only from the perspective of African oral literature; rather, it should be viewed holistically as encompassing oral and written forms, which act as embodiments of the cultural, linguistic, and psychological expression of the African people. African oral literature possesses similar rhetorical depth and complexity as the written

forms. The emphasis on the oral does not indicate a preclusion of a body of written literatures; rather, the influence of the oral on the written is made more obvious.

Although oral literature in Africa has been viewed as similar to the “picture of the rhapsodist of the Homeric age” (Finnegan, *Oral*, 81), the different genres of African literature are dynamic and contextually realized. African oral literature is rich with narratives, which contain a wide variety of stories about animals and humans, “historical texts, proverbs, riddles, vernacular texts describing local customs, sometimes additional vernacular compositions by the collector, and, very occasionally, songs or poems” (Finnegan, *Oral*, 28). It is pertinent to point out that the oral aspects of African art depend greatly on the creative genius of the performer, whose effectiveness is stylistically realized. The ability of performers to capture the passions and persuasively communicate the essence of the art being performed is a question of style. The individual styles of different performers can make the difference between a persuasive or not so persuasive performance.

The performer and the audience enact roles that make the African verbal arts particularly engaging. For example, I enjoyed tales by moonlight as a growing child in my village in Nigeria. The performer of the folktales with which we were enamoured as growing children was dynamic in crafting various tales. Though very old, these tales were made to come alive and made to appear new by the style of the performer. The performer has various resources at his disposal, which are drawn upon for playing out a particular art form. The artist is typically face to face with his audience and can take advantage of this medium to enhance the impact of the tales. In many stories, for example, the characterization of both leading and secondary figures may appear slight; but these figures can be orally delivered in forms, which are conveyed by more visible means – through the performer’s gestures, expressions, and mimicry. The creative genius of the performer often

makes the characters larger than life; and consequently, the tales become more memorable and persuasive. This oral creativity is captured in the following words:

Much more could be said about the many other means which the oral performer can employ to project his literary product – his use, for instance, of vivid ideophones or dramatized dialogue, or his manipulation of the audience’s sense of humour or susceptibility (when played on by skilful performer) to be amazed, or shocked, or moved, or enthralled or appropriate moments. But it should be clear that oral literature has somewhat different potentialities from written literature, and the additional resources which the oral artist can develop for his own purposes; and that this aspect is of primary significance for its appreciation as a mode of aesthetic expression (Finnegan, *Oral*, 5).

The aesthetic value of these performances is tied to their orality. Therefore, rather than view the oral aspects of the African rhetorical tradition as a reason to subordinate it, their examination should be based on the creativity and artistry that make them persuasive expressions of the African culture. The performances of African verbal art are highly effective in the formation of selfhood. For example, I recall wanting to be like some of the characters – in virtues, wisdom, and beauty - in the tales I consumed and enjoyed as a young child.

Abrahams argues in his article “A Rhetorical Theory of Folklore” that “each item of lore can be discussed meaningfully in terms of linguistic and dramatic organization and relationship of performer to the rest of the group. In fact, understanding of an item (and by extension, the tradition in which it exists) begins with an interrelating of all of these stylistic matters” (146). To appreciate culture dependent artistry, it is pertinent to know that the items for expressing culture are instruments of argument as well as tools of persuasion. Therefore, the manner in which all the parts or style, performance, content, and usage are cohesive must first be understood within specific cultures.

The works of scholars involved with comparative studies and the parallelism between African and European folktales show that the content of folklore contains some level of

universality. Poetry is a genre that is very useful for describing the varied nature of African literature. Poetry is either composed or performed. In addition to being realized privately or publicly in the royal courts of traditional kingdoms in Africa, African poetry can be appreciated as being employed for multiple purposes that can be ceremonial, ritualistic, as well as entertaining. The panegyric is a poetic composition, and its performance is the most specialized genre, which traditionally occurs within the royal courts.

The panegyric is mostly enacted in the “elaborate praise poems of the Zulu or Sotho in Southern Africa, the poems of the official singers of the ruler of Bornu, the royal praises of the Hausa emirs, the eulogies addressed to rulers in the various kingdoms of the Congo, and many others” (Finnegan, *Oral*, 83). The poet has the role of remembering as well as expressing the eulogies being performed in a way that is similar to, yet significantly different from the role of the West African griot or the South African *imbongi*. What is unique about African poetry is the specialized skills of speaking drums as employed in the Yoruba, Hausa, and Ashanti tribes and the highly specialized bards of Rwanda.

Such bards are highly sophisticated and elaborate in their composition in addition to having specialized modes of expression. These types of poetic composition and performance are hardly restricted to the courts anymore, but they have spilled into other public spaces where these panegyric forms are used to sing the praises of political leaders and politicians. The panegyric was equally employed for religious and ritualistic purposes, which is particularly evident in Islamic and traditional rituals. The specialized cults dedicated to certain deities in West Africa, like the Fon of Dahomey and the Ifa priests of the Yoruba tribe in Nigeria, go through the kind of training that are highly professional. The use of panegyric in the public spaces often has materialistic motivations similar to the sophists of classical rhetoric. Despite the negative connotations that

accompany such rhetorical applications, the perversion of a particular art does not strip the art of its intrinsic beauty and power.

To support this argument, Benjamin Colby and Michael Cole argue against the long-held belief in the superiority of Western modes of thinking over those of other cultures. These scholars also claim that “the reasoning and thinking of different people in different cultures don’t differ ...just their values, beliefs, and ways of classifying things differ” (quoting J. Gay and M. Cole’s *The New Mathematics and an old Culture*, 63). The “ways of classifying things” referred to here echo what Burke refers to as ‘symbol systems’ of the ‘symbol using animal’. Nietzsche also describes such symbols as “a movable host of metaphors, metonymies, and anthromorphisms: in short, a sum of human relations which have been poetically and rhetorically intensified, transferred, and embellished, and which, after a long usage, seem to a people to be fixed, canonical, and binding” (“On Truth and Lies,” 891). In essence, differences in symbol systems can only be accounted for within the cultures from which they are derived.

The basis for making the dichotomy between western and non-western modes of thought (under a hierarchy of superiority and inferiority) is predicated on the contrast between “rationality (sometimes equated with scientific method) as opposed to non-rationality” (Finnegan & Horton, *Intro*, 17) and ‘civilization’ as opposed to ‘primitiveness.’ The notion of civilization and primitiveness used for making this distinction is highly subjective. Observations of these groups of people center around their belief system such as “beliefs in spirits, totemic ancestors” (Colby and Cole, 64), or beliefs in witchcraft, oracles, and magic. Consequently, the idea of “primitive thought” focus on the belief system of a group as a yardstick for judging their cognitive capacity, and this view tends to blur the line between “process” and “content.”

Like other literary genres of African rhetorical tradition, folklore is traditional and argues traditionally. As rhetorical tools, these literary genres use “arguments as persuasive techniques developed in the past to cope with recurrences of social problem situations” (Abrahams, 146). The performance sometimes employs songs and dance in combination with word narration that involve the individual performer, who is often joined by members of the audience (or chorus) for communal enjoyment. One of the most important aspects of the African rhetorical tradition is the communal role, which makes most oral arts communal properties.

Despite the communal nature of African art, the creative genius of the performer is indispensable because it is employed to enhance the aesthetic quality of the literary product being performed. The communal nature of African art implies that the audience plays a significant role in the form of “additions,” “queries,” or “even criticisms” in the performance, and this is what makes the distinction between oral and written literary art particularly noteworthy. The oral aspect of African rhetorical tradition, despite its obvious disadvantage of temporality, has several advantages, which are associated with their performances. What is lost in the orality of African oral tradition is gained in other potentialities such as immediate response and feedback from the audience. Such potentialities were quite evident in Mandela’s speeches, which were performances in themselves.

Oral performances have the persuasive power to produce psychological effects such as catharsis, which in turn create emotional wellbeing for the audience. The manner in which the performances are reproduced vary according to artists, genres, and cultures. And the role of promoting social cohesion is tied closely with the particular situations in which art and performer interact as evidence of social engagement. The occasions may be funerals, weddings, celebrations of victory, soothing a baby, and more, which when combined with the adequate literary genre can

be highly rhetorical. Beyond these occasions are other rituals, which perform the significant role of grounding people in their cultures and producing long lasting unity.

The dynamism of the African rhetorical tradition is best captured in the role of children's lullabies, rhymes, verses, and games that act as cognitive tools for enhancing the memory of the child and for forming strong social bonds. Rhymes, verses, and games are quite significant as they play out the communal nature of the African traditional society. Children's play as a broad spectrum of activities, which engage children physically, mentally, and emotionally help in the formation of societal value system. For example, riddles are deployed mainly for entertainment, but the process involved in riddling does not just require answers to the questions; they invite the participant to identify an allusive sentence with its analogous referent. And the point of reference "normally lies in some play of images – visual, acoustic or situational – rather than, as in many English riddles, in puns, or play on words" (Finnegan, *Child Play*, 297). Besides entertainment, riddles play a pedagogic role in training children for quick thinking, intellectual skills, and other taxonomies. Children's plays are characterized by games, usually accompanied by words and music, which sometimes connect to the traditional folklore.

African value formation relies heavily on literature, especially poetry, which is significantly influential. The influence of African poetry, particularly its ability to instil pride and a strong sense of identity in the minds of Africans, can be best glimpsed from the panegyric especially those composed in the praise of kings and warriors. In this regard, poetry can be ambitious and elaborate, for example:

The following extract from one of the many praises of the famous Zulu King, Shaka, illustrates the use of the allusion, metaphor, and praise name which are combined with some narrative to convey the bravery and fearsomeness of the king as he defeated his enemy Zwide:

His spear is terrible.

The Ever-ready-to-meet-any-challenge!

The first-born sons of their mothers who were called for many years!

He is like the cluster of stones of Nkandhla,

Which sheltered the elephants when it rained.

The hawk which I saw sweeping down from Mangcengeza;

When he came to Pungashe he disappeared.... (Finnegan, Oral, 124-125)

The above poem alludes to Shaka as both the defender of the people and one who fights on their behalf through the power of his spear. It is implied that the Zulu king did not possess the sophisticated weapons of the colonialist, yet he was able to fight bravely and hold back the colonialist. Mandela alluded to Shaka as a rhetorical strategy for encouraging Black South Africans to remain resolute in the struggle against apartheid. African Studies scholar, Bekunuru Kubayanda, describes African rhetoric as “inextricably bound up with the culture, history, and thought of the African peoples: it is impelled by a network of repossession and reidentification with self and source” (114). The rhetorical tradition of a particular group of people can be described as the body of epistemological texts, both written and oral, that are contributory factors towards the formation of their value system. Interestingly, African rhetorical tradition exhibits traits of hybridity as a result of the cultural contact with other traditions and civilizations such as the Christian, Islamic, and Roman influences, which left their marks on African rhetoric. Consequently, “one cannot presume to identify a single epigraphic style or ethos for all” (Kubayanda, 267) thus debunking the myth of homogeneity among Africans.

Heterogeneity among Africans implies that they often adhered to different ideologies despite having been formed within the same culture. The implication of this heterogeneity in South Africa is that Blacks were often divided along ideological lines as a result of class, gender, and ethnic differences. This division complicated an already complex context, which made Mandela’s

task of forging unity among Black South Africans very difficult. It is significant to examine the manner in which Mandela was formed and influenced by African and Western rhetorical modes in order to adequately capture his braided rhetoric.

Mandela: His Background and African Rhetorical Formation

Mandela's African rhetorical influences emanated from Xhosa traditional folktales, poetry, wisdom-lore, communal activities like his initiation ceremony, and childhood plays. These rhetorical influences are evident in his autobiographies and speeches. From his personal and African historical pasts, he crafts narratives that exemplify Bhabha's concept of rags and scraps of tradition. The narratives were deployed as rhetorical techniques for painting pictures of life in South Africa before colonial incursion. From these narratives, Mandela attempts to reclaim his African historical past in order to depict the rich rhetorical heritage that helped to form his value system and to portray the evil of racist apartheid. For example, he narrates the way his childhood activities played a significant role in his personal formation and to show how these activities fall within the scope of rhetorical persuasion. In essence, these activities acted persuasively upon him, and he deployed their narration in a rhetorical manner. Mandela shows how the activities of his childhood were directly responsible for his ideas concerning honour, fair play, and magnanimity – also regarded as the South African philosophy of "Ubuntu." Ubuntu means humanity or "I am because we are." It is a philosophy that guided Mandela even in the darkest period of the struggle.

Mandela's values were formed mainly through African oral traditional narratives that were rhetorical in nature. He often deployed such narratives as persuasive strategies for pushing his anti-apartheid cause. Mandela's employment of narratives can be compared to the role of a West

African griot or South African *imbongi*, who tells and retells the history of the people for rhetorical effect. He often used these narratives of the South African glorious past in the courtroom where logic appeared to have failed. Mandela wove narratives in a way that captures Fanon's description of how tales of African past are reinvented to act as tools of anti-colonial struggle. The way Mandela creatively spiced his speeches with African historical narratives, some performative styles employed in African folktale narration, and particular African community salutations is examined. Their examination is based on the fact that these African rhetorical devices enabled him perform the role of persuasive identification. This identification served the purpose of calling his fellow Africans to certain actions like the stoppage of intra-tribal violence so that the common enemy does not succeed in using Africans to distract and destroy each other. He also deployed some other tropes like repetition and metaphors culled from the flora and fauna that are distinctly African for the purpose of reinforcing the cohesion he aimed for among all South Africans.

According to Mandela, "To be an African in South Africa means that one...is born in an Africans Only hospital, taken home in an Africans Only bus, lives in an African Only area, and attends Africans Only schools, if he attends school at all" (*Long Walk*, 96). Based on these sentiments voiced by Mandela, the discrimination and violence suffered by Blacks indicates that the concept of community that he grew up with had become distorted by apartheid. Mandela captures the significance of the African community in the following words: "in the veld playing and fighting with the other boys of the village...I learned to stick-fight – essential knowledge to any rural African boy – and became adept at its various techniques, parrying blows, feinting in one direction and striking in another" (*Long Walk*, 9). The nature of the play Mandela describes portrays the freedom that formed his "love of the veld, of open spaces, the simple beauties of nature, the clean line of the horizon" (*Long Walk*, 9) that inscribed in his mind strong ideas of how

life should be. The cultural activities that made deep impressions on Mandela were expressions and embodiments of African rhetorical modes. Some of the effects help to form his African identity through activities such as self-praise.

The self-praises in African rhetorical modes, particularly during ceremonies, connect strongly with Mandela's account of his circumcision. Mandela's description of his circumcision, and the cry of "Ndiyindoda!" (I am a man!) (*Long Walk*, 27), immediately after the foreskin is cut off, may be likened to the self-praise that gives the individual pride and confidence in their achievement and culture. This ritual of passage from boyhood to manhood exists in many cultures, but the effect on Mandela's passage can be described as fundamental in helping to shape his African identity. This conclusion can be drawn from Mandela's own words thus: "...a great ceremony was held to welcome us as to society. Our families, friends, and local chiefs gathered for speeches, songs, and gift-giving...I remember walking differently on that day, straighter, taller, firmer. I was hopeful, and thinking that I might someday have wealth, property, and status" (*Long Walk*, 29). The rite of passage experienced and described by Mandela was unique, socially integrative, pedagogical, as well as persuasive.

Mandela's narratives of African political history, as told in his youth, formed his knowledge base as a young African boy. The way Mandela used these narratives rhetorically to attempt to persuade in the face of resistance to logos will be examined in other chapters. In addition, these narratives served to show that the joy and freedom he experienced as a young boy in the Transvaal, when compared to his suffering under apartheid, turns the Western concept of civilization on its head. In essence, the juxtaposition Mandela constructs with his narratives sets a new parameter for judging the Western precepts of civilization as a requisite harbinger of justice,

freedom, and equity. In essence, the absence of these elements that confers humanity on any group of people is a hallmark of the uncivilized.

Mandela's encounter with racism did not occur until he had imbibed the customs and traditions of his people, which are gleaned from the childhood stories in his autobiography. The significance of this age of encounter with racism rests on the fact he had grounding in cultural knowledge and pride before he encountered the racist ideology that would paint the apartheid heritage as uncivilized. Mandela's narratives give us an insight into the traits he inherited from his father such as gait, personality, and his father's leadership role in the society. For example, Mandela says: "My father was a tall, dark-skinned man with a straight and stately posture, which I like to think I inherited...He could be exceedingly stubborn, another trait that may unfortunately have been passed down from father to son" (*Long Walk*, 5). Without acknowledging what his father symbolized, Mandela carried on his father's role as a South African *imbongi* within their traditional community. Mandela tells of his father's duties in the following words:

My father has sometimes been referred to as the prime minister of Thembuland during the reign of Dalindyabo, the father of Sabata, who rule in the early 1900s, and that of his son, Jongintaba, who succeeded him. That is a misnomer in that no such title existed, but the role he played was not so different from what the designation implies. As a respected and valued counsellor to both kings, he accompanied them on their travels and was usually to be found by their sides during important meetings with government officials. He was an acknowledged custodian of Xhosa history, and it was partially for that reason that he was valued as an adviser. My own interest in history had early roots and was encouraged by my father. Although my father could neither read nor write, he was reputed to be an excellent orator who captivated his audiences by entertaining them as well as teaching them (*Long Walk*, 5).

Although it is not obvious if Mandela performs these exact roles, the manner in which he kept the anti-apartheid struggle alive, particularly through the power of his narratives, implied that he actively played the role of a griot or *imbongi* as a commentator, an observer, a legal interpreter, a mediator, and a leader. Kaschula sees the *imbongi* in terms of the role played as a "mediator and

as a political and social commentator in relation to the power base of the community within which he operates” (*Imbongi*, 66). Mandela’s national role connects to Kaschula’s description of the *imbongi*, who performed at Mandela’s first visit to his hometown upon his release from prison.

Sitole is the *imbongi* described by Kaschula. Sitole performed epideictic rhetoric; and on this occasion, Mandela was the object of praise. On this Mandela’s homecoming, the *imbongi* acted as a mediator among the citizens as well. In essence, in criticizing those whose actions called for it and praising those perceived as the enemy of the people, the *imbongi* was performing a rhetorical function similar to that of Mandela and Mandela’s father. Sitole deployed the call and response strategy of “Amandla-ngawethu” that Mandela used in his public speeches. Mandela can be described as playing the role of the South African *imbongi* by the way he deployed his narratives to sensitize the people about their past and the need to unite against apartheid. The role of mediating goes hand in hand with the historical narrative of the people.

The experiential and contextual impact of the African rhetorical tradition is deeply interconnected in the way they help to form the cultures of the African people. The significance of this impact is embodied in Mandela’s rhetoric, and he demonstrates that impact through the various rhetorical devices employed to make his appeal. Mandela describes the councils, where important political and cultural matters were resolved democratically, to demonstrate how the African rhetorical tradition was closely connected to his African sense of community. At the end of such councils, “a praise-singer or poet would deliver a panegyric to the ancient kings, and a mixture of compliments to and satire on the present chiefs” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 22). The cultural experiences themselves were rhetorical in the sense that they helped to connect the individuals to their traditional identity.

The point being made here is that the African rhetorical tradition, which encompasses many facets of the African culture, was highly instrumental in shaping Mandela's selfhood and rhetoric. His metamorphosis into the rhetorical figure that spearheaded the anti-apartheid movement is not inseparable from his African formation. The narratives Mandela employed in his various texts served to address the predicament of Black South Africans under the crushing apartheid government. In addressing the plight of Blacks, Mandela acts as the memory of the people and actively undertakes to reshape that memory. Thus, Mandela plays the role of the performer, and his narratives help to reshape the historical memory of South African Blacks for the political engagement of emancipation.

The African folklore Mandela describes captures the historical past that instilled pride in him as a young man. The folklore encompasses "historic battles and heroic Xhosa warriors" (*Long Walk*, 11) as well as "Xhosa legends and fables that had come from numberless generations" (*Long Walk*, 11) with which his mother enchanted him. The folklore stimulated Mandela's young imagination; and most importantly, they contained moral lessons that formed the baseline of African communal identity and unity. Such moral lessons embody Quintillian's notions that the education of the perfect orator is supposed to be geared towards capturing the minds of young children in order to identify the distinction between ethical and unethical orators. In essence, Mandela's education in African and Western rhetorical traditions accounts for his ethos and persuasiveness.

Mandela draws attention to the stories he heard during the councils he had the privilege to witness in his youth, which helped to form his sense of African identity. According to him: "I discovered the great African patriots who fought against Western domination. My imagination was fired by the glory of these African warriors" (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 23). Mandela recounts the

ancient tales of Chief Joyi, who played the role of the South African *imbongi* or the West African griot. According to Mandela, Chief Joyi was the “great authority on the history of the Thembu in large part because he had lived through so much of it” (*Long Walk*, 23). Mandela acts as a bridge between the present and the past. He makes this connection by always comparing the glorious African past with their present deplorable conditions in apartheid South Africa.

In addition to the poems and tales that were instrumental to Mandela’s formation, childhood plays were equally significant in the development of his ethos. African play is more than play, as with play in lot of other cultures. Mandela tells of how play formed in him the idea of how to uphold human dignity and honour. The concept of “face” would play a huge role in his rhetoric and praxis in the anti-apartheid struggle. The incident described and the lesson learned became some of the pillars of Mandela’s ethos. Thus, Mandela’s education through folklore and games started in his African rhetorical tradition long before he encountered the Western rhetorical tradition. Mandela’s rhetorical formation did not end with his upbringing or formal education. His experiences all through his career as a lawyer, his years in the struggle, as well as the physically, psychologically, and emotionally demanding years of incarceration were all learning experiences. These experiences helped to consolidate his appreciation of the Western and African rhetorical traditions.

Their complex content enriches African folklore, and one of the defining features of African oral literature is their verbal flexibility. “The verbal elaboration, the drama of the performance itself, everything in fact, which makes it a truly aesthetic product comes from the contemporary teller and his audience and not from the remote past” (Finnegan, *Oral*, 318). In essence, the idea that the stories date back to the past does not detract from their aesthetic value. The aesthetic value enables Mandela to attempt reclamation of the distorted identity of his people.

Mandela's appreciation and employment of the African rhetorical tradition is tied to style and performance, and this deployment makes it important to examine their stylistic significance. The impact of performance that is associated with the African oral tradition was a key factor in Mandela's legal profession; and ironically, his legal profession is a legacy of the Western rhetorical tradition.

Variety of Western Rhetorical Influences

The influence of the Western rhetorical tradition on Mandela was quite deep as it traversed several areas of his life. For example, while in prison, he and other ANC leaders acquired a lot of knowledge and also taught other prisoners who knew little about the ANC. According to Mandela, "[t]eaching conditions were not ideal. Study groups would work together on the quarry and station themselves in a circle around the leader of the seminar. The style of teaching was Socratic in nature; ideas and theories were elucidated through the leaders asking and answering questions" (*Long Walk*, 467). It can be argued that the reason that Mandela used the Socratic style of teaching is a deliberate invocation of the Western rhetorical tradition. Mandela embraced the Western rhetorical tradition despite it being a channel for inferiorizing Africans and the African rhetorical tradition. The influence of the Western rhetorical tradition on Mandela's rhetoric is well spread across his autobiography - *Long Walk to Freedom*. This autobiography serves the purpose of partly anthologizing some of Mandela's speeches and of depicting the context of his rhetorical strategies.

In combination with the distinct African rhetorical modes Mandela employed, he used lots of Western narratives, tropes, and symbols to draw attention to apartheid injustices. For example, he deploys symbols like Lady Justice, which is a Western symbol of equity, in a dynamic way to

show that the apartheid regime had betrayed their Western judicial legacy. He drew upon Shakespeare's characters like Shylock to interrogate racial injustice. He also enjoyed a lot of Greek plays and Western writers like George Bernard Shaw. He internalized the virtues of Sophocles' *Antigone* because according to Mandela, "it was Antigone who symbolized our struggle; she was, in her own way, a freedom fighter, for she defied the law on the grounds that it was unjust" (*Long Walk*, 456). Mandela, the rhetorician, refused to be limited in exercising his rhetorical agency either by the Western or the African rhetorical traditions in making his appeal in the anti-apartheid struggle. Instead, Mandela carefully draws from and combines both traditions in order to account for the extraordinary context and revolutionary political purposes for which he must speak and write. This context included the diverse and fractured audiences he had to persuade in order to build a movement and momentum sufficient to dismantle apartheid.

Mandela's appreciation of the Western rhetorical tradition is captured in the following words: "I only performed in a few dramas, but I had one memorable role: that of Creon, the king of Thebes, in Sophocles' *Antigone*. I had read some of the classic Greek plays in prison, and found them enormously elevating, what I took out of them was that character was measured by facing up to difficult situations and that a hero was a man who would not break even under the most trying circumstances" (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 456). Mandela's ability to learn from every possible source and situation is remarkable, and that openness may account for his rhetorical dexterity. Mandela's braided rhetoric has been described as subtle because he often used stories that employed tropes to expose the racist nature of apartheid policies. These policies created conditions, which the regime would rather were kept in the dark from the gaze of the global community. The conditions ranged from cultural suppression, racial segregation, educational deprivation, and physical

violence. These conditions were responsible for the decision to move from the non-violent stand of the ANC to the armed struggle Mandela ultimately advocated for.

The influence of both the African and Western rhetorical traditions had an impact on Mandela's inspiring leadership and tenacity. For example, Mandela captures one of the influences of the Western rhetorical tradition in the following words: "Antigone rebels, on the grounds that there is a higher law than that of the state. Creon will not listen to Antigone, nor does he listen to anyone but his own inner demons. His inflexibility and blindness ill become a leader, for a leader must temper justice with mercy" (*Long Walk*, 456). Mandela was impacted by Antigone's struggle, and he learned the danger of being an inflexible leader. This impact can be seen in Mandela's readiness to shift from a rigid stance on any issue to a more flexible position. For this reason, he was usually accused of having sold out by his fellow ANC leaders and his followers.

However, there is a duality to Mandela's identity and rhetorical formation that makes it impossible for him to deploy any single rhetorical tradition. Although the Church and the State both represented Western ideologies, the Church offered South Africans, according to Mandela, opportunities for self-realization. Mandela expressed this duality in his appreciation of the Western education and religion he acquired early in life. According to Mandela, "The two principles that governed my life at Mqhekezweni were the chieftaincy and the Church. These two doctrines existed in uneasy harmony, although I did not see them as antagonistic" (*Long Walk*, 19). Mandela recognized the way Africans benefited from the Western civilization that the Church provided access to and how those benefits were truncated by the apartheid regime. The Church and State in South African appeared to have been operating at cross-purposes from Mandela's observation.

The Church, which is supposed to be more interested in the spiritual welfare of the citizens, took on the role of extending the Western culture to Blacks. Thus, the Church is seen as a temporal

and spiritual entity, and this prompted Mandela to say that “the Church was as concerned with this world as the next: I saw that virtually all of the achievements of Africans seemed to have come about through the missionary work of the Church. The mission schools trained the clerks, the interpreters, and the policemen, who at the time represented the height of African aspirations” (*Long Walk*, 19). In helping to form Africans, the Church played the role of helping Africans gain access to Western civilization. The Church offered vocational and spiritual training to Mandela and his fellow Africans to help lift their socio-economical status. This training also offered Mandela rhetorical tools for interrogating the Christian legacy of the apartheid regime.

In essence, the Church in South Africa used scripture and rhetoric to put the Africans on the course to self-realization, while the State used the rhetoric of racism to dehumanize them. While acknowledging the exemplary role of the Church, Mandela got his animosity towards the State from the stories woven by Chief Joyi, who

railed against the white man, who he believed had deliberately sundered the Xhosa, dividing brother from brother. The white man had told the Thembus that their true chief was the great white queen across the ocean and that they were her subjects. But the white queen brought nothing but misery and perfidy to the black people, and if she is a chief, she was an evil chief. Chief Joyi’s war stories and his indictment of the British made me feel angry and cheated, as though I had already been robbed of my own birthright (*Long Walk*, 25).

Despite feeling cheated and angry about colonialism and apartheid racism, Mandela did not hold himself back from getting the benefits of European culture nor fail to appreciate the Churches that tried to mitigate the evils of apartheid. Although some church denominations played a good role in empowering Blacks, the fact that apartheid policies were given a religious coloring made the evil that the policies depict more difficult to uproot. The religious ideas were used to justify racism and allowed separate racial groups to develop “in its time and in accordance with its own predisposition” (Crapanzano, xix). This idea gave birth to the Population Registration Act of

1950. Afrikaners “sometimes support their argument by reference to the Tower of Babel, a sign, they say, of God’s desire to preserve a pluriracial, pluricultural, polyglot world” (Crapanzano, xxi). The Tower of Babel represents the ‘point’ or ‘place’ in “Genesis,” chapter 11, the first book of the Bible where human beings were linguistically separated, so that they will be unable to understand each other.

This belief fortified the idea of separation within the Biblical context of the Tower of Babel. Such manipulative use of scripture underscores Augustine’s admonition that interpretations of scripture should not eschew charity in its use of rhetorical tropes. It is ironical that the apartheid regime would manipulate scripture as an excuse to deprive Blacks of their rights, while the Church, on the other hand, acted as an instrument for empowering them. Therefore, we can understand Mandela’s respect for and employment of the Western rhetorical tradition. The fact that Mandela does not reject the Western rhetorical tradition but uses it in combination with the African rhetorical tradition to exercise his agency, makes his braided rhetoric more appealing.

Mandela’s appreciation of the Western rhetorical tradition is most evident in his great admiration for the Western canon and legal framework. That notwithstanding, Mandela recognizes that the apartheid regime has been unfaithful to their own Western legal framework and the civilization that is enunciated in the Western rhetorical tradition. The failure to adhere to the concept of equal right for all makes the apartheid regime in need of civilization, as J. M. Coetzee portrayed in *Waiting for the Barbarian*. Mandela’s agitation was not against the Western rhetorical tradition, but against those who exploited it for an unjust end.

Mandela’s anti-apartheid stance is best captured in the following words, “a thousand slights, a thousand indignities, a thousand unremembered moments, produced in me an anger, a rebelliousness, a desire to fight the system that imprisoned my people” (*Long Walk*, 95), capture

the build-up of emotions that accrued from the racial oppression of a group of people. Mandela's braided rhetoric is both a conscious and an unconscious enactment in the sense that he internalized aspects of both traditions unconsciously and drew upon them on the conscious level. For example, the symbols he culled and employed rhetorically come from both rhetorical traditions. The symbols are deliberate in their deployment and come from a deep cognitive place and are, thus, convincing. The complex nature of Mandela's multiple audiences makes his braided rhetoric strategically productive in his anti-apartheid struggle.

Chapter Two

Mandela and Global Human Rights Ideologies

Mandela's rhetoric was influenced not only by Western and African rhetorical traditions but also by political philosophies like anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, anti-capitalism, and anti-racism. These philosophies helped to shape his rhetorical appeal as he navigated the anti-apartheid struggle. Mandela's ability to move fluidly among and between rhetorical appeals associated with a variety of African and Western political philosophies was particularly significant. That is because the apartheid government kept changing both the policies and the rhetorical strategies deployed against Mandela in an attempt to frustrate and contain the ANC leadership. One of these rhetorical strategies employed by the apartheid regime against both the ANC and Mandela was the charge of communism. This charge was an interesting rhetorical move because the anti-apartheid struggle coincided with the cold-war era. The government recognized that a charge of communism was bound to produce the effect of tainting the image of the anti-apartheid leaders in the Western world.

This rhetorical move of suppressing political opposition by accusing dissenters of being or associated with communists was not peculiar to the apartheid government. The same scenario was playing out in the US where human rights activists like Martin Luther King and Malcolm X, who were contemporaries of Mandela, were also being accused of communism. Like Dr. King and Malcolm X, Mandela was undeterred by charges of communist association. The fact that human rights activists were being charged with communism across the globe at the time when the cold war was at its height indicated that human right activists were connected in some way. The charge of communism introduced a new phase of suppression, and this phase forced Mandela to fine-tune his strategy and shift from non-violence to armed struggle. This change in resistance strategy further exacerbated the already complicated context both within South Africa and abroad. The

change in strategy threatened Mandela's efforts to persuade multiple audiences – the most powerful of whom shared the fear of communism. Mandela employed a rhetorical sagacity in order to show why: (1) the charge of communism would not stick, and (2) the non-violence philosophy (of Mahatma Gandhi and favoured by Martin Luther King) he had initially adopted was inadequate to address the anti-apartheid struggle.

To keep the movement alive, a change of political strategies was necessary in order to keep up with the constantly morphing political terrain of apartheid. The shift from nonviolence to armed struggle resulted in the framing of Mandela as a communist and a terrorist. In addition, he was projected as being inconsistent and unreliable. All efforts to discredit the ANC leadership did not succeed in halting the freedom struggle. It is important to examine why the charge of having communist association failed to negatively impact the struggle as well as investigate why Mandela's rhetorical appeal for armed struggle was effective. To undertake this study, this chapter analyzes Mandela's autobiography, *Long Walk to Freedom* and some of the speeches delivered before his incarceration and after his release. The texts analyzed in this chapter include "A Black Man in a white Court," which was used in 1962 for defending himself against the charged of inciting workers' strike and leaving the country without permission and "An Ideal for which I am prepared to die," which was the three-hour appeal made from the dock at the Rivonon trial of April 20, 1964. The Rivonia trial for treason earned him 27 years in prison.

These texts prove quite productive for showing how Mandela's braided rhetoric was deployed to interrogate apartheid. They also help in making the argument that though recognizing Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King's nonviolence philosophy as a powerful political and rhetorical strategy, Mandela articulates the inadequacy of nonviolence as a political strategy within the constantly morphing apartheid governmental policies and violence ridden South African

context. Mandela's argument connects to Fanon's idea that colonialism (which apartheid represents) is a violent system that can only be dismantled through violence. The manner in which the complexity of the racist order of apartheid helped to shape Mandela's rhetorical and political strategies will be analyzed under the following sub-headings: (1) Cold War as Historical Context for Anti-Imperialist, Anti-Colonial, and Anti-Racist Struggles, (2) What Mandela says about the Charge of Communism, (3) Mandela's Ambivalence towards Communism, (4) Mandela's Rhetorical Connectedness with Global Anti-Racist Activism, (5) The Convergences and Divergences of Anti-Racist Activists, (6) Black Art as Tools of Resistance, (7) Mandela and Nonviolence as a Political Strategy, (8) Apartheid Government's Attacks on Mandela as A Terrorist

Cold War as Historical Context for Anti-Imperialist, Anti-Colonial, and Anti-Racist Struggles

Although there had been resistance to imperialist and colonialist incursions in previous centuries, twentieth century WWI and WWII produced an awareness of how catastrophic such incursions and oppressive regimes can be. This awareness, which was observed in trajectories of anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, anti-racist, and national self-determination of former colonies was discernible across the globe. Such trajectories involved the active engagement of leaders like King, Malcolm X, Fidel Castro, and Mandela, who confronted the realities of human rights abuses all over the world. On the one hand, this engagement was instrumental in bringing about the liberation of former colonial nations into independent states. On the other hand, the engagement caused concerned individuals and groups to push for the upholding of human rights, with the hope

of averting a catastrophe similar to the Nazi Holocaust. This Holocaust caused leaders like by Martin Luther King Jr. to argue that “[n]o person of goodwill can stand by as a silent auditor while there is a possibility of the complete spiritual and cultural destruction of a once flourishing Jewish community. The denial of human rights anywhere is a threat to the affirmation of human rights everywhere” (Snyder, 232). The carnage of the world wars created the awareness of human right abuses, which in turn produced a wave of activism in the 1950s and 60s in a manner that was unprecedented.

Globalization facilitated the activism, which in turn engendered relevant international policies. According to Jonathan Hyslop, World War II created an impact that served to shift the international political-legal framework of warfare in a way that had important consequences for Mandela and the ANC. It is interesting to note that both the Soviet Union, on the one hand, and Britain/the United States, on the other hand, had been strongly supportive of underground armed civilian resistance to Nazi occupation in Europe. This support for underground resistance acted as an impetus to the amendment of international laws like the 1949 revision of the Geneva Conventions, meant to protect civilian combatants. These amended laws were a direct consequence of WWII and a recognition of the need for oppressed groups to resist oppression in order to protect themselves. It is not surprising to see anti-colonial movements developing in Africa and Asia in these post-war years, and these movements indicate that the world wars acted as catalyst for more formidable push for self-determination compared to the failed efforts of the resistance to colonialism in the past centuries. That is because a new ideological space had opened up for national liberation organizations to demand legal protection for their fighters. But even more, by according to guerrillas the status of troops of national armies, the new legal regime helped the movements from which guerrilla fighters could claim the status of state authority for themselves

(Hyslop, 171). WWII exposed colonial incursion and imperialism more starkly as crimes against self-determination. Consequently, previous colonial subjects were more emboldened to fight for independence.

This post-WWII period happened to be the cold war era, and the mutual distrust it engendered on the part of Western democracies and Communist nations impacted the world in a significant way. The impact is identifiable in the manner in which any form of opposition against most Western powers was coloured as having communist influences. When Marx's Communist Manifesto, which states that "[t]here are, besides, eternal truths, such as Freedom, Justice, etc., that are common to all states of society" (Van Herpen, "Marx and Human Rights...", 13) is examined, it appears to interrogate the very foundation of those Western powers. That is because the Western powers put freedom and justice out of the reach of certain groups of people like Blacks.

Marx's manifesto connects to Martin Luther King, Jr. (MLK)'s argument that "[t]here seems to be a throbbing desire, there seems to be an internal desire for freedom within the soul of every man. And it's there: it might not break forth in the beginning, but eventually it breaks out. Men realize that, that freedom is something basic. To rob a man of his freedom is to take from him the essential basis of his manhood" (MLK, "The Birth of a Nation", 20). Human rights activists, who agitated for freedom from oppressive orders, often had to endure the accusation of having being sponsored by Communists. Therefore, it can be argued that Communism threatens the status quo whereby human rights abuses are perpetrated under the guise of capitalism. Communist agitations were a threat to apartheid in a way that both complemented and differed from that of ANC.

According to Mandela, “[a]s far as the Communist Party is concerned, and if I understand its policy correctly, it stands for the establishment of a State based on the principles of Marxism. Although it is prepared to work for the Freedom Charter, as a short-term solution to the problems created by white supremacy, it regards the Freedom Charter as the beginning, and not the end, of its programme” (“An Ideal...”). The Freedom Charter was adopted in Kliptown, on June 25, 1955 by the ANC and its allies as a proclamation of the central principles upon which the people of South Africa should be governed. The ANC did not have a problem with capitalism, but communism was totally opposed to capitalism. The Western countries abhorred Communism; consequently, any person or group that opposed racial and class oppression in South Africa and the US was accused of communism or of having communist association as a means of discrediting all forms of dissent.

What Mandela says about the Charge of Communism

Because Mandela was accused of being a communist, it is important to examine the basis for this accusation. Therefore, it is necessary to study what attracted Mandela to Marxist communism and the effective way he explained his pull towards and resistance to the communist ideology. Mandela opened his defense in his trial on April 20, 1964 by clarifying the different philosophies that influenced him. According to Mandela: “At the outset, I want to say that the suggestion made by the state in its opening that the struggle in South Africa is under the influence of foreigners or communists is wholly incorrect. I have done whatever I did, both as an individual and as a leader of my people, because of my experience in South Africa and my own proudly felt African background, and not because of what any outsider might have said” (An Ideal...”).

Mandela points out that he is first and foremost an African; and thus, his rhetoric reflects his African roots and identity. This assertion is valid because Mandela made this speech in his last trial called the Rivonia trial of 1964. Before this Rivonia trial, he was charged of inciting a workers' strike and leaving the country without permission on August of 1962. In this Rivonia trial, he employs the rhetorical modes of the griot or *imbongi* to narrate the legends of his African heritage as a way of evoking pride in himself and his fellow Africans. Mandela captures this pride in the following words:

Many years ago, when I was a boy brought up in my village in the Transkei, I listened to the elders of the tribe telling stories about the good old days, before the arrival of the white man. Then our people lived peacefully, under the democratic rule of their kings and their amapakati, and moved freely and confidently up and down the country without let or hindrance. Then the country was ours, in our own name and right. We occupied the land, the forests, the rivers; we extracted the mineral wealth beneath the soil and all the riches of this beautiful country. We set up and operated our own government, we controlled our own armies and we organised our own trade and commerce. The elders would tell tales of the wars fought by our ancestors in defence of the fatherland, as well as the acts of valour performed by generals and soldiers during those epic days. The names of Dingane and Bambata, among the Zulus, of Hintsa, Makana, Ndlambe of the AmaXhosa, of Sekhukhuni and others in the north, were mentioned as the pride and glory of the entire African nation ("A Black Man in a white Court").

It is important to indicate that Mandela was a performer, who had multiple audiences to persuade. The local audience was made up of his fellow South Africans: both white and Black, the oppressed and the oppressor. While the international community was made up of supporters of apartheid and white supremacy (they were also beneficiaries of the apartheid government) and others, who desired to see the end of colonialism and racism. It is interesting to see how Mandela braided his rhetoric such that it was easy to identify which rhetorical mode was being deployed and which audience, whether African or Western target audience, that mode was meant for. For example, the court scene provides Mandela, who deploys the rhetorical mode of the *imbongi*, the

opportunity to use the legends he narrates to make the point that it is the whites who should be on trial for depriving him and his people of their land. The *imbongi* rhetorical mode is employed to bolster the pride of his African audience, and the irony embedded within the narratives can be identified as targeting the Afrikaner audience. Through such narratives, Mandela exemplifies Finnegan's, Kaschula's, Abraham's, and Campbell's arguments that African folklore and historical legends are effective rhetorical tools that are often used to bring about change.

Mandela also validates Fanon's theory that old tales are retrieved and made new for the purpose of instilling pride in the people so as to resist colonization. Mandela's braided rhetoric can be appreciated by the way he projects the pride in his African culture and heritage through the deployment of African rhetorical modes in a court scene, which is a symbol of the Western legal framework. As a result, it can be argued that he was firmly grounded in his African identity and no other social or cultural influence was powerful enough to erase that imprint. Mandela's African root informed his appreciation of the African and Western cultures that helped to shape his belief system. Therefore, every other philosophy he imbibed was transformed by his African belief system that is predicated on the principle of "Ubuntu;" a principle that embraces every person's humanity. It is important to examine why Mandela was accused of having been influenced by foreigners or by communists in the first place.

Although Mandela was attracted to Marxist communism, he had an uncomfortable relationship with Marxism. The divergences between his African cultural and political philosophies and Marxist communism accounts for this uncomfortable relationship. The reason that the ANC and Communist political philosophies were at variance is laid out in a way that discredits the charge of communism. Unlike communism, the ANC had no problem with the class

structure of capitalism. The ANC was informed and guided by African traditional/political philosophies of freedom for all regardless of class. The African society had layers of classes that Robin Cohen describes as internal social pyramids. These social pyramids were similar to that of the Western societies without the complications of racism. Mandela describes African pre-colonial class structure as one where everyone had freedom. In addition, there existed a homegrown democracy where everyone regardless of economic class or age, except women, had a say. Therefore, it can be argued that Mandela was strategically privileging race over class for the sake of forming a consensus that was needed to overturn apartheid racist order. In essence, class distinction within the traditional African society was different from the racial classification that existed under apartheid. The freedom enjoyed by the various classes in traditional Africa opened up spaces for individual development and self-actualization, and this space can only exist in capitalism and not in communism.

As a result, the ANC was not as preoccupied with class as was the Communist Party whose main aim was to remove the capitalist system in order to replace them with a working-class government. The Communist Party sought to emphasize class distinctions whilst the ANC aimed to harmonize them (Mandela, “An Ideal...”). Mandela argues further that “It is true that there has often been close co-operation between the ANC and the Communist Party. But co-operation is merely proof of a common goal - in this case the removal of white supremacy - and is not proof of a complete community of interests” (“An Ideal...”). The effective way that Mandela employs forensic logic in his defense was a strategic rhetorical move. The move was to expose the diabolism behind the charge of communist association and embarrass the apartheid government before the international community. What Mandela achieves with this strategy is (1) to inform the Western audience about the differences between the ANC’s political philosophy and that of communism

and (2) show why the charge of communism was a deliberate ploy to destroy the reputation of the ANC leaders as well as discredit the freedom movement.

Despite the divergence described by Mandela, it can be deduced that the ANC and the Communist Party in South Africa had one thing in common and that was the desire for “the removal of white supremacy” (Mandela, “An Ideal...”). Mandela strategically employs analogy to turn the logic of the apartheid regime, in their accusation of communist association, on its head. An example of this analogy is captured in the following words: “My Lord, the history of the world is full of similar examples. Perhaps the most striking illustration is to be found in the co-operation between Great Britain, the United States of America, and the Soviet Union in the fight against Hitler. Nobody but Hitler would have dared to suggest that such co-operation turned Churchill or Roosevelt into communists or communist tools, or that Britain and America were working to bring about a communist world” (Mandela, “An Ideal...”). What Mandela does with this analogy is employ irony to cause his accusers to examine their consciences and motives.

It is interesting to note that the irony and analogy employed by Mandela in the above quote serve to draw attention to past occurrences and reveal the faulty logic of the regime’s charge of communism. It is also ironical that the Afrikaner Party, which campaigned on a racist ideology that fell in line with Hitler’s racist agenda, would use an excuse like communism to mask the racist agenda of the oppression of the ANC leaders and Mandela. To Mandela, it was hypocritical for Great Britain and the United States to be allying with apartheid South Africa right on the heels of Hitler’s failed racist project that these same nations had helped to foil. Such alliances were probably not surprising because the apartheid regime was emulating the US in conceptualizing

every form of dissent as pushing a communist agenda. That is because white supremacist oppression was as rife in the US as Hitler's Nazi Germany and apartheid South Africa.

In denying the charge of communist influence, Mandela shows how his ideas enacted a divergence from communism. This divergence is made clear in the following words: "From my reading of Marxist literature and from conversations with Marxists, I have gained the impression that communists regard the parliamentary system of the West as undemocratic and reactionary. But, on the contrary, I am an admirer of such a system" (Mandela, "An Ideal..."). Despite the divergence between ANC and communist ideologies, Mandela is appreciative of the communist solidarity that Blacks had enjoyed. Mandela captures this appreciation in the following words: "[i]t is perhaps difficult for white South Africans, with an ingrained prejudice against communism, to understand why experienced African politicians so readily accept communists as their friends. But to us the reason is obvious. Theoretical differences amongst those fighting against oppression is a luxury we cannot afford at this stage" (Mandela, "An Ideal..."). Mandela's employment of analogy to expose the "ingrained prejudice against communism" in this defense is emblematic of a stage performance. It is a form of epideictic rhetoric and a strategy similar to the performance of an *imbongi*. The performance is aimed at the Western international audience, who also shared this prejudice. In addressing the prejudice of the apartheid government, there was an indirect jab aimed at those at the larger stage (the international community).

The jab can be described as rhetorically effective because the charge of communism (which was a rhetorical strategy on the part of the apartheid regime) was also being deployed against human rights activists like King in the US. The idea of branding "all exponents of democratic government and African freedom as communists and bans many of them (who are not communists)

under the Suppression of Communism Act” (Mandela, “An Ideal...”) is tantamount to giving a dog a bad name just to hang it. According to Mandela, “although I have never been a member of the Communist Party, I myself have been named under that pernicious Act because of the role I played in the Defiance Campaign. I have also been banned and imprisoned under that Act” (“An Ideal...”). The acceptance of communists into the ANC was a reciprocal gesture because “for many decades communists were the only political group in South Africa who were prepared to treat Africans as human beings and their equals; who were prepared to eat with us; talk with us, live with us, and work with us. They were the only political group that was prepared to work with the Africans for the attainment of political rights and a stake in society. Because of this, there are many Africans who, today, tend to equate freedom with communism” (Mandela. “An Ideal...”). As Mandela strategically shows in his argument, the concept of freedom modelled by the communists was more in line with ANC’s view of freedom as was embodied in the African society than what obtained in apartheid South Africa.

It is interesting to note how Mandela appears to be speaking in plain English, but strategically braids African rhetorical modes into his language. Mandela’s evocation of the African rhetorical mode is made manifest in the argument that the communists were the only Whites “who were prepared to eat with us; talk with us, live with us, and work with us.” He draws upon the African idea of humanity and brotherhood in a way that is prevalent in the African tradition. The point being made here is that Mandela employs these words to mean more than just communist support as might be interpreted on the surface. The meaning extends to the way Africans view humanity, brotherhood, generosity, concern for others, and hospitality.

According to Dugald Campbell, “hospitality is one of the most sacred and ancient custom in Bantuland” (45). To Mandela’s African audience, the concept of brotherhood is depicted in the concept of eating, living, and working together. That is because in traditional African societies, members of a community are invited to share food and homes without counting the cost. In fact, it will be offensive for a guest to refuse to eat together with their host/s because it was a sign of distrust. There is a practice of always having extra food just in case someone comes by. In my village in Nigeria, there is a saying that it is more important to pile human beings upon oneself than to pile on clothes. This saying is also captured in the Akan maxim that the human being is more beautiful than gold. In essence, Mandela’s inclusion of Communists in the struggle is because white Communists had acted like brothers towards Blacks in South Africa.

Mandela’s Ambivalence towards Communism

From Mandela’s argument, we get the impression that he is both attracted to and repelled by communism. That is because white communists had shown a more humane side than their capitalist counterparts. At the same time, he is repelled by communist ideologies that serve to demonize capitalism. It is of importance to note that Mandela had initially resisted the inclusion of Communists into the ANC because the ideals of Black Nationalism were at variance with communist ideals. Mandela would eventually accept the brotherhood exemplified by communists’ support. That is because “[a]lthough there is a universal condemnation of apartheid, the communist bloc speaks out against it with a louder voice than most of the Western world. In these circumstances, it would take a brash young politician, such as I was in 1949, to proclaim that the Communists are our enemies” (Mandela, “An Ideal...”). Therefore, it can be argued that the class

homogeneity in the society aimed at by communism was problematic for Mandela. Mandela did not see capitalism as the problem but blamed those who used it as an excuse to enslave others. Mandela points out that freedom and equality are universal concepts, which are innate in human beings regardless of whatever philosophy people uphold. Capitalism had become a tool employed by the apartheid regime to strip Black South Africans of freedom as well as keep them in perpetual poverty and deprivation. In essence, racial capitalism needs to be deconstructed; but the homogeneity of communism is not a better alternative.

Racial capitalism, as tool of enslavement, was captured by Robert Davies, Dan O'meara, and Sipho Dlamini, who argue that "the various changing historical forms of national oppression and racism in South Africa are organically linked with, and have provided the fundamental basis for, the development of a capitalist economy in the country" (100). In essence, racism helps to feed the capitalist greed of the apartheid regime, which in turn keeps the capitalist machinery of the developed countries running. Therefore, "the various complex and intersecting class struggles through which capitalist forms of production and relations of production were developed and consolidated under colonialism in South Africa, themselves generated racist ideologies and a racially structured hierarchy of economic and political power. The national oppression of Black people in South Africa is a product of, and was indeed the necessary historical condition for, the development of capitalism in that country" (Davies, O'meara, and Dlamini 100). Despite the role of capitalism in enabling racism, Mandela does not want to replace capitalism with a system that will not help Blacks accomplish self-actualization and development.

The connection between capitalism and racism is the power dynamic that produces oppression wherever it exists. Mark Stern and Khuram Hussain view racism as a product of

capitalism. They argue that “one cannot separate the emergence of capitalism from racism, slavery, colonialism, imperialism, and nationalism” (Stern and Hussain, 68). Although Stern and Hussain hold capitalism accountable for racism, Mandela argues that like any concept, capitalism can be easily abused and manipulated for gaining and maintaining economic/political power. Therefore, capitalism was exploited to enforce the oppression of Blacks in racist orders like apartheid. Mandela captures the legal and systemic means by which Blacks were kept poor in the following words: “The complaint of Africans, however, is not only that they are poor and the whites are rich, but that the laws which are made by the whites are designed to preserve this situation. There are two ways to break out of poverty. The first is by formal education, and the second is by the worker acquiring a greater skill at his work and thus higher wages. As far as Africans are concerned, both these avenues of advancement are deliberately curtailed by legislation” (Mandela, “An Ideal...”). The policy of denying education to Blacks was mainly responsible for their poverty. Blacks were denied education because they were accused of lacking the cognitive capacity for acquiring one. It is ironic that the systemic oppression of Blacks was a deliberate design, which was justified using metaphors of ineptitude, laziness, and cognitive incapacity.

Therefore, the apartheid regime controlled the system that was manipulated to deprive Blacks of economic and political power. The same regime crafts and controls the rhetoric and narratives used to justify such a system. According to Mandela “The other main obstacle to the economic advancement of the African is the industrial color-bar under which all the better jobs of industry are reserved for whites only. Moreover, Africans who do obtain employment in the unskilled and semi-skilled occupations which are open to them are not allowed to form trade unions which have recognition under the Industrial Conciliation Act” (“An Ideal...”). The connection between racism and capitalism emanates from the way racism was deployed to feed

capitalist greed. Thus, racial capitalism serves the purpose of fostering a hierarchy of class distinction with Blacks at the bottom of that hierarchy.

In essence, to maintain the political and economic hierarchy, Blacks have been depicted as being a threat to the culture and lives of whites if given any form of power. The metaphor of life and death (with Blacks representing death) was deployed to keep Blacks suppressed in order to preserve the lives and culture of whites. Consequently, legal, rhetorical, and physical force were utilized for accomplishing the suppression. Therefore, the charge of communism was a rhetorical force that gained for the apartheid regime the support of their Western counterparts. To counter this rhetorical force, Mandela employs repetition, irony, and analogy in order to expose the insidious nature of such a rhetorical strategy. According to Mandela: “Our fight is against real, and not imaginary hardships or, to use the language of the State Prosecutor, `so-called hardships`. Basically, we fight against two features which are the hallmarks of African life in South Africa and which are entrenched by legislation which we seek to have repealed. These features are poverty and lack of human dignity, and we do not need communists or so-called `agitators` to teach us about these things” (“An Ideal...”). What can be deduced from the accusation of communist association is that there is a real fear of communism by racial capitalists. That is because communism aims to deconstruct capitalist greed.

Therefore, communism signified a threat to the power and privilege of capitalist dominance. The fear of communism produced a cycle of violence, whereby every voice of dissent was labelled a communist. The desire to hold on to their privileged position blinded the Western powers to the fact that the privilege they sought to protect at all cost was itself a consequence of past revolutions. According to Martin Luther King (MLK), “it is a sad fact that because of comfort,

complacency, a morbid fear of communism, and our proneness to adjust to injustice, the Western nations that initiated so much of the revolutionary spirit of the modern world have now become the arch anti-revolutionaries” (*Conscience*, 18). King’s words also apply to South Africa because the ideology and philosophies that govern Western modern democracies and by extension apartheid South Africa were fostered by the various revolutions in the Western world.

In essence, the oppression that these past revolutions sought to end in the Western world has resurfaced in racial capitalism. “This had driven many to feel that only Marxism has the revolutionary spirit. Therefore, communism is a judgement against our failure to make democracy real and follow through on the revolutions that we initiated” (King, *Conscience*, 18). King’s words echo Mandela’s, who argues that white supremacists had made their democracies a sham. White Communists had shown more acceptance and charity towards Blacks than their capitalist counterpart.

However, Mandela had a problem with the communist project. Although capitalism had been deployed by the apartheid regime to impoverish Blacks, Mandela viewed capitalism - when devoid of greed and racism - as a system with the potential to create equal opportunities for all. The working-class idea of communism projects a form of social, economic, and psychological homogeneity. This homogeneity was as problematic as essentialism. The problematic nature of Marxist communism would undercut the ANC position of heterogeneity, which opens up the space for equal opportunity. According Van Herpen, “[n]ow that Marx has replaced the ethically loaded concept of ‘species being’ by the *ethically neutral* [emphasis in the original] concept of ‘ensemble of the social relations’, a moral critique on human rights seem no longer possible” (13). This

problematic nature of Marxist communism partly accounted for Mandela's ambivalence towards communism.

Mandela states quite clearly that the ANC philosophies are different from that of communism. However, he admitted to having been influenced by Marxist concept of classlessness in the following words: “[t]oday I am attracted by the idea of a classless society, an attraction, which springs in part from Marxist reading and, in part, from my admiration of the structure and organization of early African societies in this country. The land, then the main means of production, belonged to the tribe. There were no rich or poor and there was no exploitation. It is true, as I have already stated, that I have been influenced by Marxist thought” (Mandela, “An Ideal...”). The classlessness Mandela identified with, which is similar to that of communism, is depicted as a form of tribal community.

However, this communal belongingness did not mean that people were prevented from owning properties as is evident in his various narratives. In essence, Mandela evokes the political and economic philosophies of Marxist communism embodied in a classless society like the ancient African society of his dreams; however, these philosophies contradict the democratic ideals of the ANC. It can be argued that the support of Communists reinforced the African communal brotherhood that had been a part of his childhood, and this brotherhood is evoked for rhetorical effect among his followers. Mandela's ability to draw from various philosophies gave verve to his braided rhetoric.

Mandela's desire for freedom and equality for his people made him open to any means for achieving that purpose. As a result, he refused to be contained by the charge of communism because dynamism is a necessary part of good leadership. According to Mandela, this openness to

various philosophies “is also true of many of the leaders of the new independent States. Such widely different persons as Gandhi, Nehru, Nkrumah, and Nasser all acknowledge this fact. We all accept the need for some form of socialism to enable our people to catch up with the advanced countries of this world and to overcome their legacy of extreme poverty. But this does not mean we are Marxists” (Mandela, “An Ideal...”). In essence, the struggle is greater than any singular interest or philosophy. Therefore, leaders who fail to look beyond their self-interest or any form of myopia will ultimately produce catastrophes like the Nazi holocaust.

Mandela’s embrace of dynamic ideas is described by Hyslop as pragmatic. According to Hyslop, this dynamism developed from “a universalist set of values that derived both from the liberal Christianity of his missionary education in the Eastern Cape and from humanist elements in the Marxism to which he was exposed in Johannesburg” (Hyslop, 168). Mandela can be described as having soaked up different philosophies, some of which seemed incompatible. This ability to combine ideas that seem incompatible largely accounts for his rhetorical appeal. Mandela’s pragmatism helps connect his humanism to the classless society of Marxism, which is also evident in the African society. Therefore, the concept of a classless society emanated from the humane manner that people were treated within traditional African societies. Not necessarily because there were no class distinctions, or other forms of inequality – like gender inequality.

Mandela was himself a product of his class. His father was a chief, and after the deposition and death of his father, he was raised in the home of the regent. According to Mandela, “[b]ecause of the universal respect the regent enjoyed – from both black and white – and the seemingly untampered power that he wielded, I saw chieftaincy as being the very center around which life revolved. The power and influence of chieftaincy pervaded every aspect of our lives in

Mqhekezweni and was the preeminent means through which one could achieve influence and status” (*Long Walk*, 20). There were members of the African society who were more privileged than others. However, the democratic system that aimed to produce some form of equity and equality (which he witnessed in the home of the regent) held an attraction for Mandela. Mandela describes this democratic structure in the following words: “[m]y later notions of leadership were profoundly influenced by observing the regent in his court. I watched and learned from the tribal meetings that were regularly held at the Great Place. These were not scheduled, but were called as needed, and were held to discuss national matters such as a drought, the culling of cattle, policies ordered by the magistrate, or new laws decreed by the government” (*Long Walk*, 20-21). The African democratic system, whose leaders related with the people in a father-children manner, exerted a huge influence upon Mandela. Despite the hierarchy that was evident in this system, the sense of belonging enjoyed by everyone made it devoid of exploitation.

The inclusive nature of this African system of government made apartheid a particularly difficult pill to swallow. Mandela describes the democratic proceedings in the following manner: “[a]ll Thembus were free to come – and a great many did, on horseback or by foot. On those occasions, the regent was surrounded by his *amaphakathi*, a group of councillors of high rank who functioned as the regent’s parliament and judiciary. They were wise men who retained the knowledge of tribal history and custom in their heads and whose opinions carried great weight” (*Long Walk*, 20-21). The freedom captured in this system of government remained indelible in Mandela’s mind. And this captivation gave impetus to the passion and commitment he exhibited during the struggle. With the African democratic system in mind, communism did not intrinsically represent the freedom that allows for diversity, which can be harmonized with a potential for development along individual lines.

The African system recognized individualism, with freedom of expression, as a necessary ingredient for peace and development. Mandela's desire for such a system made the homogeneity prescribed by communism unattractive. The beauty of the African political system is captured in the following words:

Letters advising these chiefs and headmen of a meeting were dispatched from the regent, and soon the Great Place became alive with important visitors and travelers from all over Thembuland. The guests would gather in the courtyard in front of the regent's house and he would open the meeting by thanking everyone for coming and explaining why he had summoned them. From that point on, he would not utter another word until the meeting was nearing its end. Everyone who wanted to speak did so (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 20-21).

Mandela could not accept that such a system should be replaced by one like apartheid, where Black freedom of expression, speech, association, and self-actualization were proscribed. Neither could he accept the homogeneity of communism, which can be stifling.

The African system of government was captured as both romantic and factual. For example, Mandela says that "[i]t was democracy in its purest form. There may have been a hierarchy of importance among the speakers, but everyone was heard, chief and subject, warrior and medicine man, shopkeeper and farmer, landowner and labourer. People spoke without interruption and the meetings lasted for many hours. The foundation of self-government was that all men were free to voice their opinions and equal in their value as citizens. (Women, I am afraid, were deemed second-class citizens.)" (*Long Walk*, 20-21). In Mandela's own words, women were regarded as second-class citizens; and thus, women's position in the society indicated that African societies were not as classless as he indicated. Nevertheless, the democratic deliberations witnessed by Mandela left an indelible mark on him.

The Western parliamentary system (which he came to love) and his love for the African democratic system accounts for Mandela's resistance to communism. Mandela's actions and speech pushed for the enthronement of the values of African democratic and Western parliamentary systems of government. Despite acknowledging that there was indeed a hierarchy in both the African and Western parliamentary systems of government, the freedom that those systems allowed were absent in apartheid and communism. Therefore, such freedom was enough to temper the danger of hierarchical oppression. Mandela's love for African democratic and Western parliamentary systems of government is expressed in his braided rhetoric. Mandela's rhetoric evolved from the coalescing of African and Western – cultures, language, political systems, and rhetorical traditions. This evolution is captured quite aptly by Norman Fairclough, who argues that “[l]inguistic phenomena are social in the sense that whenever people speak or listen or write or read, they do so in ways which are determined socially and have social effects. Even when people are most conscious of their own individuality and think themselves to be most cut off from social influences ‘in the bosom of the family’, for example – they still use language in ways which people are subject to social convention” (23). The social conventions that formed Mandela account for his ability to use language in a way that his audience could easily understand.

Mandela's rhetorical appeal is enhanced by his African cultural connection and his ability to spice up his speech with tropes, which are made more effective by his dynamic leadership. Communal connectedness, brotherhood, and equality are a part of the ideal African social organization, and Mandela deploys such concepts as strategic tropes for making his followers feel valued. To support this point, Arthur L. Smith argues that “Delivery becomes for the traditional African speaker an opportunity to engage in a textual as well as a contextual search for harmony. The stability of the community is essential, and public speaking when used in connection with

conflict solution must be directed toward maintaining community harmony. As a microcosmic example of the traditional African society's base in the harmony of all parts, the meaningful public discourse manifests rhetorical agreeableness in all its parts" (16). Mandela's employment of the communal trope operates by setting up a contrast that is etched in the memory of members of the society.

This contrast has, on the one hand, an image of the ideal African society where freedom reigned, brotherhood was supreme, and class did not matter. On the other hand, there is the racist apartheid order that represents a negation of the humanist values held dear by Black South Africans. This contrast romanticized the traditional African society and demonized racist apartheid. The deployment of this trope is pragmatic and dynamic on the part of Mandela because it helped to maintain the hatred for apartheid, and such feelings were important for sustaining the momentum of the struggle. Mandela embodied a pragmatism and dynamic leadership that drew people to him. This leadership lit up a burning desire within him to deliver a system of government to his people that was to help them recover their lost freedom, identity, and humanity. Much as communism had some merits and Communists had extended a hand of fellowship to Blacks, communism was inadequate for the freedom struggle.

Such were the various phenomena responsible for Mandela's rhetorical evolution. The context that made Mandela into the rhetor that he became connects to Fairclough's argument "that the language activity which goes on in social contexts (as all language activity does) is merely a reflection or expression of social processes and practices" (Fairclough, 23). The social and political contexts that influenced Mandela's ambivalent relationship with communism were significantly diverse. Mandela's description of the African system of government versus communism gives us

a sense of how “[p]eople sometimes explicitly argue about the meanings of words like *democracy*, *nationalization*, *imperialism*, *socialism*, *liberation* or *terrorism* [emphasis in the original]” (Fairclough, 23) to indicate that the contexts that produced those arguments are as important as the argument themselves.

Mandela’s speech context indicates that his perceptions of class distinction in apartheid and his traditional society were at variance. The class distinction enacted by the apartheid regime was dependent upon race while the class differences of his African society were determined by birth and gender. The oppressive laws promulgated by apartheid, which constituted deliberate barriers to the upward movement of Blacks, made the class distinction of Mandela’s African society appear insignificant. As Fairclough argues, context is an indispensable aspect of language use. Therefore, the context of apartheid racial discrimination created a focal point, whereby the idea of a Marxist classless society was particularly attractive to Mandela. Class distinction takes on a fluidity for Mandela that is traceable to the perspectives that informed his understanding of political reality. Mandela identified the role of racism in creating a new form of class distinction that was different from what he was used to. That reality made the activism of Dr. King, Gandhi, and Malcolm X very similar, despite the divergences in their various strategies.

Mandela’s Rhetorical Connectedness with Global Anti-Racist Activism

The unique nature of anti-racist struggles dictates that the concerns of Mandela and other human rights activists like Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr. and Malcolm X remain comparable. That is because, though fighting similar causes, their *modus operandi* was determined by their

contextual and ideological peculiarities. Mandela shares the non-violence ideologies of Gandhi and MLK, while his move to armed struggle makes him seem to be at par with Malcolm X before X and MLK began to move towards each other's methodical positions. It is imperative to indicate that Mandela, King, and X made shifts in positions in a way that showed that as dynamic leaders, their experiences helped to transform them in significant ways. However, the divergences and converges examined here occurred within the timeline before Mandela's trials and long incarceration starting from 1962; and within six year from this time period, both X and king were assassinated.

The significance of comparing these human rights activists stem from the manner in which the apartheid government appeared to have taken their concepts of segregation and discrimination from that of the United States. Mandela alludes to "such events as the Little Rock outrage and the activities of the Un-American Witch-Hunting Committee" (*The Struggle*, 76) as a way of showing that the US has a history of racial segregation. The segregation that was practised in the US also appears to have taken their cue from the Canadian Indian Act. The Canadian Indian Act was an unjust bill that was crafted to keep the indigenous people suppressed in a way that "created a disincentive for Indian persons to get a higher education" (Vic Satzewich and Nikolaos Liodakis, 218). In essence, the apartheid regime had racist models that they were emulating.

The South African context was similar to and yet different from the anti-colonialist movement in Indian and the anti-racist/human rights movements in the US. The fact is that unlike Gandhi, Mandela was fighting a minority government that was firmly entrenched and powerful. While Mandela was up against a settler group, Gandhi was fighting a colonial power that was ruling India all the way from Britain. The close connection between Mandela's ideology and that

of MLK is located in the concept of non-violent resistance, which is akin to that of Gandhi. The point being made here is that contextual similarities tend to produce intertextuality because human rights activists inadvertently feed off each other's ideas as a result of their similar experiences.

Despite the fact that the South African situation was different from that of the United States, an examination of MLK and Mandela's rhetoric shows examples of strong intertextual connections. This connection validates the argument that American racial segregation must have produced a cross-pollination of ideas in apartheid South Africa. In essence, apartheid policies tended to mimic the Jim Crow laws in the United States, despite being situated on two different continents. The difference between the United States and South Africa lies in the fact that Blacks were in the majority in South Africa, while being in the minority in the United States. Blacks were taken from Africa in slave ships to the United States after having already been conquered, while the Blacks in South Africa were conquered on their own land.

The Jim Crow laws in the Southern parts of United States legalizing racial segregation were similar to the laws vigorously enforced in apartheid South Africa. MLK describes the anti-racist struggle as occurring in phases in the following words:

Today the question is not whether we shall be free but by what course we will win. In the recent past our struggle has had two phases. The first phase began in the early 'fifties when Negroes slammed the door shut on submission and subservience. Adapting non-violent resistance to conditions in the United States, we swept into southern states to demand our citizenship and manhood. For the south with its complex system of brutal segregation, we were inaugurating a rebellion (*Conscience*, 2).

The rebellion referred to by MLK is reminiscent of the protest against the Pass Laws in South Africa. The point being made here is that although MLK and Mandela had adopted the non-violence stance, the unjust nature of racist laws tended to produce violent rebellions among the

people. Such rebellions were reflections of the violence enacted against the people through government racist laws. Therefore, violence had become a means by which those oppressed in racist orders expressed their frustration. This frustration is captured by Mandela in the following words:

There had been violence in 1957 when the women of Zeerust were ordered to carry passes; there was violence in 1958 with the enforcement of Bantu Authorities and cattle culling in Sekhukhuneland; there was violence in 1959 when the people of Cato Manor protested against pass raids; there was violence in 1960 when the Government attempted to impose Bantu Authorities in Pondoland. Thirty-nine Africans died in these Pondoland disturbances. In 1961 there had been riots in Warmbaths, and all this time, My Lord, the Transkei had been a seething mass of unrest (“An Ideal...”).

Both MLK and Mandela accused the US and South African governments of being responsible for the prevalent violence in the society and not the people. The people were only reacting in kind to their oppression. The Pass laws were used to enforce the policy of segregation in South Africa. The police brutally occasioned by this law and similar oppressive laws would eventually bring the ANC policy of non-violent resistance to an end. The state-induced rebellion referred to by MLK is also resonant in Mandela’s word. Thus, the idea of rebellion reinforces MLK’s argument - that freedom “is a throbbing desire, [that] there seems to be an internal desire for freedom within the soul of every man” (“The Birth of a Nation”, 20). MLK and Mandela shared some common rhetorical strategies, especially the idea of turning the accusation of criminality upon their white accusers. This strategy served to show that rebellion is a deep human tendency, whereby “a Government which uses force to maintain its rule teaches the oppressed to use force to oppose it” (“An Ideal...”). As Fanon argued in *Wretched*, violence begets violence in a natural reaction to sustained violence. Some laws flagrantly flouted natural laws; therefore, such laws paved the way for rebellion. MLK pointed out that Blacks in the United States chose to defy such laws, albeit, in a non-violent manner. Similarly, Blacks in South African could not accept laws

that made them aliens in their own land. However, the manner of resistance adopted by Mandela would ultimately differ from the non-violent strategy of MLK.

The necessity for rebellion was depicted by Mandela in the following words: “all lawful modes of expressing opposition to this principle 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 Government. We first broke the law in a way which avoided any recourse to violence” (“An Ideal...”). Defiance of these unjust laws in South Africa and the United States were deployed to expose the laws for what they really were, that is – malignant policies - meant to truncate the rights of Blacks. MLK and Mandela recognized the power in such resistance as a means of drawing international attention to the home situation. According to Mandela, “if mass action were successfully organized, and mass reprisals taken, we felt that sympathy for our cause would be roused in other countries, and that greater pressure would be brought to bear on the South African Government” (“An Ideal...”). Mandela and MLK’s activisms can be described as a form of performance. And the strategies employed by both men make Fairclough’s concepts regarding language and power evident in praxis.

The power that language produces can be appreciated from the way Mandela drew upon the African rhetorical tradition to elicit different reactions in his African audience. For example, in addition to narratives, Mandela used other African rhetorical modes that were formulaic in nature. Such modes use salutations like “AMANDLA” - meaning “power” - to rouse the crowd Mandela addressed on many occasions. These greetings, which were used at the beginning and end of some of his speeches, were similar to the call and response of the performance of African folktales. The roused audience would respond “Ngawethu” [meaning - “it is ours”]. The next call

is often i-Africa, and the crowd would respond “Mayibuye!” [meaning – “let it come back] in his speech in Cape Town upon his release from prison (Mandela, “Now is the Time to Intensify the Struggle,” 19). This formulaic form of address is a strategy for identification, which places the audience on a higher power level than the speaker.

To buttress this point, Mandela says: “friends, comrades, and fellow Africans: I greet you all in the name of peace, democracy, and freedom for all. I stand here before you not as a prophet but as a humble servant of you, the people. Your tireless and heroic sacrifices have made it possible for me to be here today. I therefore place the remaining of my life in your hands” (Mandela, “Now is the Time to Intensify the Struggle,” 19). Knowing that he had become the symbol of the struggle, he deploys a rhetorical strategy of giving power back to the people by elevating the struggle and people above himself. This rhetorical strategy is similar to what he had witnessed in the democratic proceedings of his youth.

After the formulaic rousing of the crowd, he employs another African system of salutation. For example, Mandela salutes various individuals, clans, and communities by name. This practice is an African tradition whereby the speaker acknowledges the attachment individuals have to their ancestral homes, land, and lineage by paying respect to those communal heritages. For instance, he says: “I greet the traditional leaders of our country. Many among you continue to walk in the footsteps of great heroes like Hintsa and Sekhukhume” (Mandela, “Now is the Time to Intensify the Struggle,” 20). In so doing, he emulates the *imbongi* or griot and praise singers in African traditional societies, who deployed this rhetorical strategy for producing pride in the people. After saluting his African audience using the African rhetorical modes, he shifts attention to the international audience by saying: “On this occasion, we thank the world community for their contribution to the anti – apartheid struggle. Without your support our struggle would not have

reached this advanced stage” (Mandela, “Now is the Time to Intensify the Struggle,” 20). After saluting his African base and acknowledging his supporters on the international stage, he turns his attention to the enemy – the apartheid government and their supporters. He uses a strategy of speaking to the enemy indirectly. For example, he says that

Today the majority of South Africans, black and white, recognize that apartheid has no future...Negotiations on the dismantling of apartheid will have to address the overwhelming demand of our people for a democratic, non-racial, and unitary South Africa. There must be an end to white monopoly on political power and a fundamental restructuring of our political and economic systems to ensure that the inequalities of apartheid are addressed and our society thoroughly democratized. It must be added that Mr. de Klerk himself is a man of integrity who is acutely aware of the dangers of a public figure not honouring his undertakings (Mandela, “Now is the Time to Intensify the Struggle,” 19).

Mandela’s performance here exemplifies the kind of epideictic rhetoric practiced by the *imbongi*, who employs the praise and blame strategy for addressing a social problem. This strategy whereby he blames the apartheid government for their destructive oppression of Blacks after praising his African compatriots is quite effective. However, he tempers the blame game by praising de Klerk, the leader of the apartheid regime, with whom he was negotiating a peaceful resolution to the lingering conflict. It is interesting to note that Mandela switched from the African rhetorical mode to the Western rhetorical forms within one speech for the purpose of addressing his multiple audiences. This is a regular pattern for him. Mandela also deployed rhetorical modes like African clothing and war regalia that were emblematic of the historical wars fought and won by his progenitors like Shaka the Zulu. These clothes that Mandela wore for rhetorical effect symbolized African power and resilience. This rhetoric of clothing always had a rousing effect on his Black audience and caused panic among his white adversaries. Consequently, he was no longer allowed to wear such clothes in the courtroom.

The point being made here is that Mandela's performances incorporated various tropes like the rhetoric of clothing, communal identification, African brotherhood, and past legends. Such tropes served to show that African historical past and cultures, as Bhabha and Fanon argue, can be effective tools for dismantling white supremacy. Racial domination was established upon the rhetoric of essentialism; and to resist such domination, human rights activists like Mandela and MLK required creativity and doggedness. Fairclough argues that "[p]ower, 'in' discourse, is not a permanent and undisputed attribute of any one person or social grouping. On the contrary, those who hold power at a particular moment have to constantly reassert their power, and those who do not hold power are always liable to make a bid for power" (68). The tussle for power is captured by Fairclough as on-going process.

As a result, the power holder at any particular time is the one who has successfully outwitted or arm-twisted the other. "This is true whether one is talking at the level of the particular situation, or in terms of a social institution, or in terms of a whole society: power at all these levels is won, exercised, sustained, and lost in the course of social struggle" (Fairclough, 68). In essence, power is negotiated, gained, and lost in discourse, and discourse is instrumental for shaping how power is perceived and enacted. The point being made here is that racist discourse was the foundation upon which racist policies in apartheid were formulated, and Mandela needed to deconstruct such racist discourse effectively in order to persuade his various audiences, particularly his white audience.

The Convergences and Divergences of Anti-Racist Activists

Mandela, MLK, and Malcolm X had a lot in common, but there were a lot of divergences in their rhetorical strategies for fighting against Black oppression. They all lay the blame for Black violence at the doorstep of white supremacy. According to MLK: “[a] million words will be written and spoken to dissect the ghetto outbreaks, but for a perspective ad vivid expression of culpability I would submit two sentences written a century ago by Victor Hugo: *If the soul is left in darkness, sins will be committed. The guilty one is not he who commits the sin, but he who causes the darkness.* [emphasis in the original]” (Conscience, 4). MLK argues that the darkness caused by the policies resulting from white supremacy was criminal. Therefore, such darkness had the potential to envelop the entire nation if left unchecked. In essence, “[t]he policy makers of the white society have caused the darkness; they created discrimination; they created slums; they perpetuate unemployment, ignorance, and poverty. It is incontestable and deplorable that Negroes have committed crimes; but they were derivative crimes. They are born of the greater crimes of the white society” (MLK, *Conscience*, 4). The similar threads that run through Mandela and MLK’s rhetoric are significant; however, Mandela’s move to arm struggle, which was never an option for MLK, was a huge point of divergence.

The non-violence tactic connects Mandela, Gandhi, and MLK. For Gandhi and MLK, non-violence was a religious principle, while Mandela regarded the principle as a temporary political strategy. Gandhi believed in changing the opinion of others through praxis and education, while MLK believed in using love to win over hatred. However, Mandela saw non-violence as a strategy that was predicated on exigency. The armed struggle eventually adopted by Mandela puts him at par with Malcolm X. It can be argued that X’s speech “The Ballot or the Bullet” has a strong

connection to Mandela's defence of his move from non-violent resistance to armed struggle. It is very important to point out here that despite Mandela's move to armed struggle, his ideas and rhetoric were far more in tune with MLK's ideas and rhetoric than the extreme radicalism of X before various experiences started to temper X's radicalism.

Initially, X espoused the idea of Black Nationalism, which advocated for separatism. On the other hand, Mandela and MLK advocated for the integration of races. In that sense, Mandela's and MLK's concepts of Black empowerment were very different from X's. According to X, "[t]he political philosophy of Black nationalism only means that if you and I are going to live in a Black community – and that's where we're going to live, 'cause soon as you move out of the Black community into their community it's mixed for a period of time, but they're gone and you're right there by yourself again" ("The Ballot..." 73). X's ideas, which were in consonance with the extreme principles of Black Nationalism presumes the homogeneity of Blacks that does not exist. Mandela and MLK recognized that to assume homogeneity among any group of people is as fallacious as essentialism.

This difference between how these human activists viewed themselves versus others is partly responsible for X's opposition to MLK's non-violence principle. The vehemence of X's opposition is captured in the following words: "anytime you're living in the twentieth century, and you're walking around here singing "We Shall Overcome," the government has failed us. This is part of what's wrong with you. You do too much singing. Today, it's time to stop singing and start swinging. You can't sing up on freedom. You can swing up on some freedom" ("The Ballot...", 75). X's rhetoric can be described as having been born out of the frustration experienced by Blacks. The deplorable state of Black existence in the United State was systematically and politically

entrenched; hence, X was intolerant of MLK's peaceful protests. X considered such non-violent resistance to be too passive for dismantling systemic racism.

X's impatience is evident in the following words, "[i]t'll be the ballot or it'll be the bullet. It'll be liberty or it'll be death. And if you're not ready to pay that price, don't use the word freedom in your vocabulary" ("The Ballot..." 79). X's frustration is very similar to the account Mandela gave of the restless youths in South Africa. These restless youth were demanding for more action and this demand served as the tipping point for the move towards armed struggle. Malcolm X argues that non-violent resistance has not achieved anything for Blacks. To him, non-violence as a philosophy had become ineffective. Mandela also made that argument in justifying his adoption of the armed struggle. According to X,

Once you change your philosophy, you change your thought pattern. Once you change your thought pattern, you change your attitude. Once you change your attitude, it changes your behavior pattern. And then you go on into some action. As long as you got sit-down philosophy, you'll have a sit-down thought pattern. As long as you think that old sit-down thought, you'll be in some kind of sit-down action. They'll have you sitting everywhere. It's not so good to refer to what you're going to do as sit-in (The Ballot..." 76).

Malcolm X equates the position of sitting as a metaphorical state of defeat or weakness. The analogy of "sitting" is used in contrast to standing and fighting. Sitting represents inaction and cowardice, while standing and fighting are metaphors of action. Therefore, the idea of sitting "castrates you. Right there, it brings you down...Think of the image of someone sitting. An old woman can sit. An old man can sit. A chump can sit. A coward can sit. Anything can sit. For you and I have been *sitting* long enough and it's time today for you and I to be doing some *standing*. And some *fighting* to back that up [emphasis in the original]" (X, The Ballot..." 76). X employs the tropes that depict his perceived notion of non-violence as cowardice. Mandela straddles the

middle position in the divergence between MLK and X. In essence, Mandela believed that non-violence has some value, while X did not see any value in non-violence. The sarcasm in X's rhetoric depicts his beliefs. Malcolm X's analogy of "old woman", "old man", "coward", and "chump" "sitting" paints a picture of non-violence as a form of weakness. Neither Mandela nor MLK view non-violence in that manner. The wisdom of Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence was not lost on Mandela and MLK. The only difference is that Mandela viewed non-violence as a strategy that could change whenever it proved ineffective.

Mandela's armed struggle was not only a shift from his earlier stance; it enacted a divergence from MLK's philosophy. Despite this divergence, there were clear occasions of convergence in the rhetoric of these two human rights activists. For example, both MLK and Mandela employed complicit rhetoric, but explicitly exonerated themselves of the fallacy of racial essentialism. According to MLK, "[I]et us say boldly that if the total slum violations of law by white man over the years were calculated and were compared with the law-breaking of a few days of riots, the hardened criminal would be the white man" (*Conscience*, 4-5). The generality of the term "the white man" depict McPhail's ideas of complicit rhetoric. However, MLK is aware of the danger of such complicit rhetoric and as such, is quick to say "[i]n using the term white man, I am seeking to describe in general terms the Negro's adversary. It is not meant to encompass all white people. There are millions who have morally risen above prevailing prejudices. They are willing to share power and to accept structural alterations of society even at the cost of traditional privilege" (*Conscience*, 4-5). In essence, just as Blacks in South Africa and the US had support from some sincere whites, such support was not enough to change the minds of those in government.

MLK argued that to deny the existence of such support was to deny an evident truth. “More than that, it drives away allies who can strengthen our struggle. Their support serves not only to enhance our power, but in breaking from the attitudes of the larger society, it splits and weakens our opposition. To develop a sense of Black consciousness and peoplehood does not require that we scorn the white race as a whole. It is not the race per se that we fight, but the policies and ideology that leaders of that race have formulated to perpetuate oppression” (MLK, *Conscience*, 4-5). While alluding to race, MLK excused the use of the racial polarity of Black versus white as a dictate of the prevailing discourse context. The convergences between MLK and Mandela are manifold. One point of convergence was the need to always excuse the use of racial terms.

This exoneration indicates intolerance to racism. This intolerance is captured by Dyslop in the following words: “non-racialism implied both the inclusion of sympathetic whites and Indians in political struggles and the inclusion of people of all races in a future political dispensation. Non-racialism became a fixed part of Mandela’s personal beliefs” (169). Both Mandela and MLK acknowledged that the support of certain liberal whites proved to be very important in their struggle against racial oppression. Therefore, there was a need to reciprocate the support of these liberal whites, whose sense of justice outweighed whatever power and privilege they stood to lose by the emancipation of Blacks. Non-racialism is a concept that both Mandela and MLK shared, and this concept ties into their philosophy of racial integration. Racial integration counters the radical separatism of Black Nationalism held by other Black activists like Richard Wright and X.

Despite the obvious divergence on the part of Mandela, MLK, and X, the point of convergence can be found in the rhetoric of identification they all employed. Rhetoric of identification is inevitable, particularly in conflict situations. The pronouns employed in the

rhetoric of identification, such as “we” versus “them”, project the exclusion of others, who represent the enemy. The divergences and convergences identifiable in their rhetoric are largely dependent on the peculiar contexts they had to contend with. The peculiar contexts connect strongly to Stephen C. Levinson’s description of the scope of pragmatic captured in the following words: “interpretation of the words *I* and *you* [emphasis in the original] relies on the identification of particular participants (or ‘user’) and their role in the speech event, so the words *here* and *now* [emphasis in the original] rely for their interpretation on the place and time of the speech event” (5). In essence, particular participants and their roles in the speech event cannot be taken out of the context. Context can be “understood to cover the identities of participants, the temporal and spatial parameters of the speech event...the beliefs, knowledge and intentions of the participants in that speech event” (Levinson, 5). It can be argued that the difference in the South African and American situations, coupled with the personalities of the individuals, made room for the different ways they chose to negotiate their political terrains.

It is interesting to note that Levinson and Burke’s ideas of identification conflate in the rhetoric of Mandela, MLK, and X. Levinson is concerned with context of a speech event in combination with the identities of participants, while Burke is preoccupied with how context accounts for the psychodynamics that govern motives. The prevailing contexts surrounding Mandela, MLK, and X’s rhetoric are similar, yet different. For example, Blacks in the US are in the minority, but the Blacks in South Africa are in the majority. Blacks in the US were uprooted from their land and taken as slaves, while the Blacks in South Africa were subjected to conditions similar to their counterparts in the US in their own land. Despite these similarities, major differences accounts for the peculiarity of Mandela’s anti-racist rhetoric. The main source of difference is the African flavour, which is closely connected to his African roots.

That is not to say that MLK and X are totally divorced from their African roots; however, they are many times removed from the African soil. Therefore, it can be argued that the African culture is intricately woven into the fabric of the African tribes in South Africa by virtue of their connectedness to their land of origin. Blacks in the US have a collective memory that has been partially modified by displacement and enslavement. However, South African Blacks are still strongly embedded within the land and culture that have built up a different collective memory. This difference is made manifest in Mandela's rhetoric, which is often enriched with symbols and narratives of the African culture and language. These symbols and narratives are deployed to stir up the pride of Blacks in their African histories and cultures. The cultural experiences often drawn upon by Mandela are not of a distant memory. Blacks in South Africa had not experienced a cultural loss accruing from enforced language change, as is the case of African Americans. In essence, land, culture, and language help to form human identity as was argued by Fanon and Ngugi. African Americans have a rich cultural past, which has been captured and preserved in art. These cultural modes have evolved over time into distinct forms; however, the fact remains that a lot has been lost over centuries of displacement.

Black Art as Tools of Resistance

Black art in the US performs the role of resistance as well as the creation of a new identity meant to replace the identity that was distorted through slavery. Paul Gilroy captures the essence of Black art and cultural music as distinct forms, which are both modern and modernist. The duality of Black art has been marked by their hybrid, creole origins in the West (73). According to Gilroy, “[t]he expressive cultural forms are thus western and modern...their special power is derived from

their doubleness, their unsteady location, simultaneously inside and outside the conventions, assumptions, and aesthetic rules, which distinguish and periodize modernity” (73). Black music can and have been used to “challenge the privilege conceptions of both language and writing as preeminent expressions of human consciousness” (Gilroy, 74). The idea of using art as a form of resistance is also identifiable in South Africa, where Mandela drew upon African art as a way of showing that Africa was far from the wasteland it was rhetorically constructed to be by the colonialists. The idea of using art to challenge and resist dominant ideologies connects with Frankie Condon’s argument that

Spirituals composed and sung by slaves sustained the hope that fuelled resistance in multiple ways. Written in language and music intelligible to slaveholders as rehearsals of a Christianity that seemed to them to justify slavery, slave spirituals gave voice to a radical Christianity...Just as importantly – or perhaps more so – the words of spirituals offered instructions to resisting slaves, deeply coded to be sure, on how to escape, where to find support along the way, and how to keep hope alive until escape might be possible (4-5).

Songs also played a significant role in keeping the hope of dismantling apartheid alive. Mandela described the manner in which songs were used as a means of catharsis in the face of apartheid brutality. In a similar way, African Americans employed songs as a way of coping with oppression during slavery and the Jim Crow days.

Similarly, Black art in South Africa served to reinforce the identity that the apartheid regime sought to distort. Black art in South Africa took the form of songs, dances, and narratives that reinforce the collective memory of the people as a way of making their history come alive. African history comes alive in a communal sense because the main aim of African rhetoric is the maintenance of harmony in the community. In a similar manner, “Songs like *Join the Band* occupy a unique place in our collective history of racial oppression. They are not, in fact, *merely* [emphasis

in the original] hymns. Such songs are indeed expressions of faith, but they are also anthems of resistance” (Condon, 4-5). The faith in the emancipation of Blacks in the US kept their hope and spirit alive. Such songs did “not only evoke a historical moment during which the enslavement of African American men, women, and children was authorized by law and openly legitimated by racial ideologies of white supremacy, but also the hopeful struggle for racial justice by African Americans and, indeed, by all peoples of colour” (Condon, 4-5). Therefore, the idea of using Black art in resistance connects to Fanon’s argument for the deployment of national culture in the fighting phase of anti-colonialism.

This strategy involves deliberate conjuration whereby storytellers use inert episodes to “bring conflicts up to date and to modernize the kinds of struggle, which the stories evoke, together with the names of heroes and types of weapons” (Fanon, *Wretched*, 193). Fanon’s argument can be likened to Bhabha’s ideas of scraps, patches, and rags of daily life that are deployed for raising awareness in order to resist colonial oppression. The colonial subjects use such scraps as nationalist discourses for reproducing signs and traditions that repeatedly tell their history, perform the nation’s rituals, celebrate its great figures, and commemorate its anniversaries (Bhabha, 145). The collective memory of Blacks in South Africa can be likened to that of Native Americans or the Aborigines, who were suppressed and stripped of their land. These oppressed people of North America had their identity reconstructed in derogatory terms, just like the Africans.

Despite all odds, people of colour in South Africa and the US have struggled to hold on to their identity despite efforts to suppress them. The difference in circumstances between the Blacks in South Africa and the US is evident in the layers of symbols (like the regalia) Mandela used for resisting apartheid. Another difference between Mandela’s and MLK’s struggle is the successful

transition from the non-violent resistance to armed struggle. The numerical strength of Blacks in South African partly accounts for this transition. Mandela's pragmatism enabled him identify this advantage of number as well as the right moment for making the shift to armed struggle.

Mandela and Nonviolence as a Political Strategy

It is significant to note that the change of strategy from non-violence to arm struggle, rather than undermine Mandela's ethos, served to validate it. That is because the move was evidence of his resilience as well as his convictions regarding the anti-apartheid struggle. The pertinent question to ask at this point would be – why would Mandela in particular, and ANC in general, choose to move away from the policy of non-violence to that of an armed struggle? The ANC adopted a nonviolence policy of resistance in emulation of the Gandhian model of resistance. Gandhi's philosophical concept was meant to encompass every area of human existence. The philosophy even extended to animals in the sense that no animal should be harmed, not even for food. The principle of non-violence has a lot of merits because the unequal power relations between the Black majority and white minority were skewed in favour of whites. Therefore, Blacks would be most vulnerable in the outbreak of violence.

Though the Black population was more than triple that of whites, political and economic power was firmly in the hands of the whites. Consequently, violence implied a higher fatality rate for Blacks. However, the reasons behind the adoption of the nonviolence policy proved to be the catalyst for the policy change. Mandela argued that “[t]he new laws and tactics of the government had made the old forms of mass protest – public meetings, press statements, stay-aways – extremely dangerous and self-destructive” (*Long Walk*, 162). The decision to change policy from

non-violence to violent armed struggle was an uneasy one, which threatened to break the ranks of important figures in the ANC. Mandela observed that there were passionate debates on whether this change of policy would not negatively impact the position of the ANC. According to Mandela, “[s]ome argue for nonviolence on purely ethical grounds, saying it was morally superior to any other method. This idea was strongly affirmed by Manilal Gandhi, the Mahatma’s son and the editor of the newspaper Indian Opinion, who was a prominent member of SAIC. With his gentle demeanor, Gandhi seemed the very personification of nonviolence, and he insisted that the campaign be run along identical lines to that of his father’s in India” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 127). Despite having a great respect for the Gandhian model of nonviolent resistance, the South African reality differed much from that of Gandhi’s India.

Gandhi’s movement sought to end British rule in India through nonviolent resistance, and he was successful. Despite this success, the policy proved inadequate in South Africa because the situation was different in several ways. The ambition of the ANC was to wage a mass struggle that served to engage the workers and peasants of South Africa in a campaign large and powerful enough to overcome the status quo of white oppression. The status quo that Mandela sought to overcome was different from Gandhi’s opposition in India. For example, in India, power was not in the hands of settlers like the Afrikaners who had vested interest in the South African land. This occupation of the land made the apartheid government bar any legal expression of dissent. Any form of legitimate protest was ruthlessly suppressed in South Africa. The reality was that South Africa had become a police state, which ensured that dissent was criminalized. According to Mandela, “[i]n India, Gandhi had been dealing with a foreign power that ultimately was more realistic and farsighted. That was not the case with the Afrikaners in South Africa. Nonviolent passive resistance is effective as long as your opposition adheres to the same rules as you do. But

if peaceful protest is met with violence, its efficacy is at an end. For me, nonviolence was not a moral principle but a strategy; there is no moral goodness in using an ineffective weapon” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 158). Therefore, it was necessary for Mandela to make a distinction between a “moral principle” and a “strategy.”

Mandela differentiates nonviolence as a strategy that could change when necessary from Gandhi’s religious principle. Gandhi’s principle of nonviolence called *Ahimsa* was a religious one that was context bound. Despite the religious bent to Gandhi’s non-violent philosophy, Mandela had identified some wiggle room. For example, despite Gandhi’s strong belief in nonviolence, he says that “[i]n life, it is impossible to eschew violence completely” (Murti, *Gandhi: Essential Writings*, 135). Mandela appears to have studied Gandhi intensely, and when he proposed a transition from nonviolent to armed struggle, he had himself done some internal dialectics. For example; when he says that “I had begun to analyze the struggle in different terms” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 157), the internal debate is evident. This process of analyzing the struggle got him to a point where he had become persuaded about the necessity of a change in strategy.

It is obvious that the decision to move from nonviolent to armed struggle was a hotly debated and highly controversial one within the ANC. The move to armed struggle was a necessary step because the nonviolent struggle had failed to yield the expected results. In justifying the change of strategy, Mandela argues that “[t]he position of the ANC on the question of violence is very simple. The organization has no vested interest in violence. It abhors any action, which may cause loss of life, destruction of property, and misery to the people. It has worked long and patiently for a South Africa of common values and for an undivided and peaceful non-racial state. But we consider the armed struggle a legitimate form of self-defence against a morally repugnant system of government, which will not allow even peaceful forms of protest” (Mandela, “The ANC

and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement,” 11). In this letter to P. W. Botha, Mandela proved that violence is often a last recourse when every other means of articulating dissent has failed. According to Mandela, “[n]ot only did the government ignore our demands for a meeting; instead it took advantage of our commitment to a nonviolent struggle and unleashed the most violent form of racial oppression this country has ever seen” (“The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement,” 12). It is pertinent to note that Mandela’s explanations for the *modus operandi* of the armed struggle remained faithful to Gandhi’s principles to a very large extent. In essence, Mandela held fast to the preservation of life in accordance to the principle of *ahimsa*. The idea of preserving life is a dialectical one. For example, Gandhi argues that the idea of violence is relative, and the question is where to draw the line (Murti, 134). Gandhi’s principle of *ahimsa* extended to animals because, he did not believe in the consumption of meat. However, *ahimsa* places life in a hierarchy, and the preservation of life begs the question: whose life?

Despite Gandhi’s strong belief in *ahimsa*, he never sought to impose his own personal beliefs on other people. Rather, he argues “[w]hat is one man’s food can be another’s poison. Meat-eating is a sin for me. Yet, for another person, who has always lived on meat and never seen anything wrong in it, to give it up simply in order to copy me will be a sin” (Murti, 135). Gandhi could have been accused of inconsistency, considering that he did not believe that the killing of animals who ate up a farmer’s crop goes against *ahimsa*. That is because it was more important to preserve human life. According to Gandhi

If I wish to be an agriculturalist and stay in the jungle, I will have to use the minimum unavoidable violence in order to protect my fields. I will have to kill monkeys, birds, and insects which eat up my crops. If I do not wish to do so myself, I will have to engage someone to do it for me. There is not much difference between the two. To allow crops to be eaten up by animals in the name of *ahimsa* while there is a famine in

the land is certainly a sin. Evil and good are relative terms. What is good under certain conditions can become an evil or a sin under a different set of conditions (Murti, 135).

Gandhi's argument goes to prove that self-preservation is far more important than any other principle because failure to preserve the self would be regarded as folly. And that is the point Mandela argues to prove in advocating for the armed struggle.

The apartheid government can thus be compared to Gandhi's "monkeys, birds, and insects" that eat up the crops needed to keep the people alive. In essence, apartheid policies were killing the South African people of color through violence, segregation, and deprivation. As Gandhi further explains, failure to use violence where necessary can be described as cowardice. This argument resonates with X's view of non-violence as cowardice. Gandhi warns against conflating nonviolence with cowardice in the following words: "nonviolence and cowardice are contradictory terms. Nonviolence is the greatest virtue, cowardice the greatest vice. Nonviolence springs from love, cowardice from hate. Nonviolence always suffers, cowardice would always inflict suffering. Perfect nonviolence is the highest bravery. Nonviolent conduct is never demoralizing, cowardice always is" (Murti, 173). Gandhi's words here particularly connect with Mandela's paradigm shift.

To fail to move beyond nonviolent struggle would have been interpreted as an act of cowardice by the people, particularly the youths. Mandela's and Gandhi's ideas of cowardice are similar in the sense that it is the failure to take needed action. During one of his speeches, Mandela says that "[t]here were a great many young people present, and they were angry and eager for action" (Long Walk, 156). Mandela had intellectually arrived at the realization that the apartheid government was exploiting the nonviolent stance of ANC to unleash terror on the people and their leaders. The apartheid government was using violence to intimidate and discourage the leaders of the struggle. To be cowed by such intimidation would have been to risk being called cowards. It can be argued that despite the radicalism of X, his cynicism regarding the non-violent resistance

was valid. For example, when X says that “A coward can sit” (The Ballot...” 76), he implies that sitting is inaction, and inaction in the face of unwarranted hostility is cowardice. The desire to maintain moral and political integrity and yet keep the fight alive produced an important debate among the ANC leaders. The change to armed struggle was vital in order to sustain the confidence of the masses. In essence, the leaders had to prove that they were prepared to go to any length, even if it meant laying down their lives.

Freedom fighters everywhere have had to lay down their lives, at least figuratively, because they practically have no lives during the struggle. The ultimate sacrifice was demanded of human rights activists like Gandhi, MLK, and X, all of whom were assassinated in the cause of their various struggles. Mandela was lucky to have survived the struggle compared to others activists in South Africa who lost their lives. The change from nonviolence to armed struggle was a very risky move. The threat of carnage was real. This threat made the move a very complex and difficult one, both at the transitional and implemental stages.

Apartheid Government’s Attacks on Mandela as A Terrorist

The complexities created by the apartheid regime were booby traps for the implementation of the armed struggle. For example, the ANC leaders were very much aware that they needed both internal and external support for the struggle to succeed. Adopting an armed struggle would significantly jeopardize such support. The challenge to produce a formula to balance the risks and benefits of armed struggle almost tore the ANC apart. The major risk came with being labelled terrorists by the apartheid regime and the international community. Mandela deployed his

rhetorical skill to convince the leaders that to be labelled as terrorists seemed like a smaller price to pay compared to the risk of being labelled as cowards by their followers.

To be regarded as cowards would have greatly undermined the struggle particularly among Blacks, who suffered much from the constantly morphing apartheid policies. Despite the fact that the change of tactics called the ethos of leaders like Mandela into question, opportunity cost demanded that the choice of a lesser evil be made. Deciding when to make that choice was a testament of Mandela's appreciation of *kairos* as a rhetorical device. The recognition of the opportune moment sprung from Mandela's deep knowledge of human nature as well as an acute understanding of the mindset of the apartheid government. Such knowledge was captured in Mandela's speech during the Defiance Campaign in the following words: "I began speaking about the increasing repressiveness of the government in the wake of the Defiance Campaign. I said the government was now scared of the might of the African people. As I spoke, I grew more and more indignant. In those days, I was something of a rabble-rousing speaker. I liked to incite an audience, and I was doing so that evening" (*Long Walk*, 157). Playing the role of a rabble-rouser was a political strategy that tied into the concept of identification. In essence, Mandela used the performance he described to show the impatient youths that he was as impatient for more decisive action as they were. That strategy became more obvious as Mandela condemned the government for its ruthlessness and lawlessness. According to him:

I stepped across the line: I said that the time for passive resistance had ended, that nonviolence was a strategy and could never overrun a white minority regime bent on retaining its power at any cost. At the end of the day, I said, violence was the only weapon that would destroy apartheid and we must be prepared, in the near future, to use that weapon. The crowd was excited; the youth in particular were clapping and cheering. They were ready to act on what I said right then and there (*Long Walk*, 157).

At this point, the die was cast, and the days of non-violence as a strategy were over. Mandela's shift from non-violent resistance to armed struggle did not occur in a vacuum. Neither

did it occur as a result of a mere desire to identify with the discontented youths. The shift to armed struggle was necessitated by exigency. Mandela's speech depicts a conscious effort to avoid Fanon's "Pitfalls of National Consciousness," which can have significant implications for any freedom struggle. According to Fanon: "[i]t so happens that the unpreparedness of the educated classes, the lack of practical links between them and the mass of the people, their laziness, and, let it be said, their cowardice at the decisive moment of the struggle will give rise to tragic mishaps" (*Wretched*, 121). In essence, making the right decision at the right moment is a very important element in the anti-colonial struggle. Mandela argues that violence has always played a major part in the fight for freedom depending on who is crafting the narrative. For example, the violence that was employed by the Afrikaners against the British for the sake of freedom was deemed right at the time. Therefore, Mandela argues that:

"[d]own the years oppressed people have fought for their birthright by peaceful means, where that was possible, and through force where peaceful channels were closed. The history of this country also confirms this vital lesson. Africans as well as Afrikaners were, at one time or other, compelled to take up arms in defence of their freedom against British imperialism. The fact that both were finally defeated by superior arms, and by the vast resources of that empire, does not negate this lesson" ("The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement," 12).

In essence, whoever holds the power at any point in time controls the narrative in a conflict. Fanon corroborates Mandela's argument in the following words: "Colonization and decolonization are simply a question of relative strength" (Fanon, *Wretched*, 48). Fanon describes the manner in which colonialists go into a strange land and with audacity, conquer them and take over their land as a calculated endeavour with a determined end in mind. According to Fanon, "[c]olonialism is not a thinking machine, nor a body endowed with reasoning faculties. It is violence in its natural state, and it will only yield when confronted with greater violence" (*Wretched*, 48). This argument may appear to support the concept of survival of the fittest, but that is far from the truth. Instead,

Fanon is advocating for a more pragmatic solution to a problem that has defied other means of resolution.

Fanon's argument validates the fact that violence, as a means of settling scores, is as old as mankind. Violence has always had devastating consequences. Violence in the anti-apartheid struggle was used as a means of demonstrating the frustration of the oppressed people when every other means of showing dissent had been blocked. Updesh, Kumar, and Manas K. Mandal's edited book, *Countering Terrorism: Psychosocial Strategies* theorizes that violence and terrorism have evolved as tools for displaying dissent and opposition in every area of life. They argue that several factors like "religion, poverty, the lack of democracy, or history as prominent factors, and the state as perpetrator" (Kumar & Mandal, Preface, xvi) have been catalysts in the employment of violence and terrorism in conflict.

Violence is often used by the state because they have access to immense resources that make it easy for them to use force against dissent. Mandela captures the use of violence in the struggle as a cause and effect phenomenon because the ANC adopted armed struggle as a reaction to the violence that the apartheid government had mounted against Black South Africans. In the address to South African Youth Congress on April 30, 1990 Mandela describes the way that apartheid violence had been unleashed against Blacks in the following words: "President de Klerk please take note: If people are becoming angry and intolerant, whatever you say, it must be measured against the activities of your police and your troops. As far as we are concerned, the government is doing very little to rein in its wild police force, which has been trained to look at every grievance by Blacks as a declaration of war" ("We Must Organize the Masses of Our People into the Struggle," 45-46). Violence and terrorism have different definitions and connotations depending on who is using force. State use of violence is viewed as governance regardless of what

devastation is left in its wake. For example, “[t]he word ‘terrorism’ entered into European languages in the wake of the French revolution of 1789. In the early revolutionary years, it was largely by violence that governments in Paris tried to impose their radical new order on a reluctant citizenry, which serves as a healthy reminder that terror is often at its bloodiest when used by dictatorial governments against their own citizens” (Adam Roberts, “The Changing Faces of Terrorism”). The framing of violence is dependent on who employs it and how it is deployed.

When the government uses violence, it is explained away through massive propaganda; but the table is turned when other groups resort to violence. According to Mandela, “[t]errorism inevitably reflected poorly on those who used it, undermining any public support it might otherwise garner” (*Long Walk*, 282). The apartheid government massacred sixty-nine unarmed demonstrators on March 21st in Sharpeville, a state of emergency was declared, and ANC and PAC were banned. The killing of innocent protestors is hardly regarded as terrorism on the part of the government, but acts of violence against government structures by the anti-apartheid movement are described as terrorist acts. The reluctance on the part of ANC to use violence made the choice of what violent activities to consider very difficult. Consequently, between “sabotage, guerrilla warfare, terrorism, and open revolution”, choosing which of these represented the best option was agonizing for the ANC. Mandela described the difficulty of making this choice in the following words: “[g]uerrilla warfare was a possibility, but since the ANC had been reluctant to embrace violence at all, it made sense to start with the form of violence that inflicted the least harm against individuals: sabotage” (*Long Walk*, 282). The apartheid government was therefore responsible for forcing the ANC into an armed struggle. Therefore, government policies made violence by the African people inevitable.

According to Mandela, responsible leadership was necessary to canalize and control the feelings of our people; otherwise, 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” (*The Struggle*, 157). In addition, without violence there would be no way open for the African people to succeed in their struggle against the principle of white supremacy. If all lawful modes of expressing opposition to this principle had been closed by legislation, then the ANC leaders had no choice but to resort to violence. According to Mandela, “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. We first broke the law in a way which avoided any recourse to violence; when this form was legislated against, and then the government resorted to a show of force to crush opposition to its policies, only then did we decide to answer violence with violence” (*The Struggle*, 157). The government launched a violent campaign against the people, the ANC, and all other affiliates of the party on all fronts.

Apart from herding the people into reserves, their leaders were arrested under various pretexts and jailed. The war against the people was waged on the physical, psychological, and material levels with the intention of crushing their spirits. Mandela describes the policy of banning, as one of the ways that psychological warfare was waged against him and other leaders of the movement in the following words: “[m]y bans extended to meetings of all kinds, not just political ones. I could not, for example, attend my son’s birthday party. I was prohibited from talking to more than one person at a time. This was part of a systematic effort by the government to silence, persecute, and immobilize the leaders of those fighting apartheid and was the first of a series of bans on me that continued, with brief intervals of freedom, until the time I was deprived of all freedom some years hence” (*Long Walk*, 144). The psychology of banning was such a strategic

weapon deployed by the apartheid government that it did not only confine the person physically, “it imprisons one’s spirit. It induces a kind of psychological claustrophobia that makes one yearn not only for freedom of movement but spiritual escape. Banning was a dangerous game, for one was not shackled or chained behind bars; the bars were laws and regulations that could easily be violated and often were. One could slip away unseen for short periods of time and have the temporary illusion of freedom. The insidious effect of bans was that at a certain point one began to think that the oppressor was not without but within” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 144). The intimidation of the opposition was orchestrated in a sinister manner such that the oppressed were stripped of their humanity.

The dehumanization of the oppressed people was planned and executed with a determined goal. And that goal, according to Fanon was to produce a neurosis as well as an inferiority complex. Mandela corroborates Fanon’s argument in the following words: “The lack of human dignity experienced by Africans is the direct result of the policy of white supremacy. White supremacy implies Black inferiority” (*Long Walk*, 367). Jean-Paul Sartre’s preface to Fanon’s *Wretched of the Earth* describes the systematic war against the natives in the following words: “Violence in the colonies does not only have for its aim the keeping of these enslaved men at arm’s length; it seeks to dehumanize them...Sheer physical fatigue will stupefy them” (*Wretched*, 13). Sartre’s conceptualization of the ulterior motive of an oppressive government connects to why the leaders of an opposition movement would want to ensure that such an aim is not achieved. According to Sartre, every aspect of the humanity of the colonized was attacked with violence – physically, socially, and psychology. The colonized were dehumanized that:

starved and ill, if they have any spirit left, fear will finish the job; guns are levelled at the peasant; civilians come to take over his land and force him, by dint of flogging, to till the land for them. If he shows fight, the soldiers fire and he’s a dead man; if he gives in, he degrades himself and he is no longer a man at all; shame and fear will split

up his character and make his inmost self fall to pieces. The business is conducted with flying colors and by experts; the “psychological services” weren’t established yesterday; nor was brain-washing (Sartre, *Wretched*, 13).

The ANC leaders were already witnessing the devastation described by Sartre. Every fabric of the lives of Black South Africans was being attacked. Having failed to achieve liberation by peaceful means, the onus was on the leaders to find alternative methods. As Mandela argued, “[a] freedom fighter learns the hard way that it is the oppressor who defines the nature of the struggle, and the oppressed is often left no recourse but to use methods that mirror those of the oppressor” (*Long Walk*, 166). The fact that violence had been employed as a tool of the oppressor indicates that a precedent had been set. And that was why, despite the consequences, Mandela and the ANC decided to shelve nonviolence for armed struggle.

The launching of media war against the people and their leaders by the apartheid government gave a strategic twist to the conflict. The media war was intended to help the regime further gain an upper hand. The media has always been a very powerful tool in conflict particularly because of the media’s potential for a wide reach. The government had a great influence over the media by virtue of the power and resources at their disposal. The media outfits as profit organizations need to be non-partisan and report news objectively. However, the media becomes victims along with the oppressed people; and to protect their business interests, they have to take positions that are contrary to non-partisanship. For example, Mandela says that:

At the beginning of the [defiance] campaign the press gave us a fairly objective coverage and, acting on information supplied by their own reporters in different parts of the country, they reported growing support for the demonstrations and correctly predicted unprecedented response to the call. Until a week or so before the stay-at-home, the South African press endeavored to live up to the standards and ethics of honest journalism and reported news items as they were without slants and distortions. But as soon as the government showed the mailed fist and threatened action against those newspapers that gave publicity to the campaign, the Opposition press, true to tradition, beat a hurried retreat and threw all principles and ethical standards overboard (*The Struggle*, 104-105).

The media plays an important role that serves to enlighten, educate, and sensitize the audience to events happening around the world. Such media aim ought to be achieved through the espousal of media ideologies that should be balanced with social responsibility. In essence, media reporting should be objective, accurate, and lucid in order to create a platform meant to produce a stable society rather than be an instrument of division and strife. The apartheid government forced the media to play a divisive role, and such a role deviated from the original objectives of the media. The divisive role forced upon the media by the government also negated the role of a legitimate government, which should serve to unite the people. Considering that the apartheid government had no legitimacy in the eyes of the black community, this divisive role was not surprising.

The media, particularly the international media, was used to destroy the reputation of the ANC leaders. For example, Mandela recounts a visit from two foreign media personnel in the following words: “I had one not-so-pleasant visit from two Americans, editors of the conservative newspaper the Washington Times. They seemed less intent on finding out my views than on proving that I was a Communist and a terrorist” (*Long Walk*, 520). The fact that these media practitioners were so biased and unprepared to operate according to the tenet of their profession, shows that the Western media was being fed damaging information about the ANC leaders. Despite the destructive role of the media, it failed to hamper the struggle; tough as the struggle proved to be.

Despite engaging in armed struggle, the importance of diplomacy was not lost on Mandela, who connected strongly with the Prussian general Karl von Clausewitz’s classic work, *On War*. According to Mandela, “Clausewitz’s central thesis, that war was a continuation of diplomacy by other means, dovetailed with my own instincts” (*Long Walk*, 277). Diplomacy as employed by Mandela cuts across race. His ability to draw upon various ideas and experiences

makes it necessary to draw the intertextual connections between his struggle and other human rights struggles. Despite the influences of the various ideologies that contributed towards the evolving of Mandela's rhetoric, the divergences and convergences also contributed towards creating problems for him.

For example, Mandela initially perceived the struggle as a Black-only affair, as lots of other Black South Africans did. This emotional space accounts for Mandela's initial resistance to the admittance of others like the Coloureds, Indians, and Communists. The reason for wanting to exclude the other non-white groups is a combination of factors. One of the factors was the Industrial Conciliation Act, which reinforced the lower status of Blacks. Despite this initial resistance, Mandela made a turnaround on a number of his previous stances. Another turnaround was certainly the change of strategy from nonviolence to the arm struggle. This change of strategy was a huge step, especially because of the risk it held for him and the ANC of losing support from the international community. These turnarounds caused people to accuse him of being inconsistent, and thus, brought his ethos into question.

Chapter Three

Mandela's Performative Ethos and Kairotic Ontology

This chapter examines the rhetorical moves employed by Mandela to address apartheid policy changes that made him change some of his own strategies as well. These policy changes aimed to suppress the struggle, and the need to subvert such an aim forced a change in strategy on the part of the ANC and Mandela. Mandela's change in strategy on the following issues: (1) the acceptance of other people of other races and people of differing philosophies (like the Marxists) into the anti-apartheid movement; (2) the move from non-violence to armed struggle; and (3) the unilateral act of initiating talks with the government, despite the government's failure to meet the demands of the ANC made his followers perceive him as inconsistent. Mandela's change of stance and some of his unilateral actions caused suspicion among his followers. This situation called his ethos into question.

Like Desmond Tutu, Mandela's character embodied values like honesty and integrity in a way that made an impact on their audiences. This impact is strongly connected to Mandela's rhetorical appeal. The following texts: *Speeches 1990: Intensify the Struggle to Abolish Apartheid*, which is an anthology of Mandela's speeches, *The Struggle is my life* and *Long Walk to Freedom* are instrumental for showing that Mandela's adaptive strategies reinforce rather than undermine his ontological and performative ethos. The autobiography *Long Walk to Freedom* can be described as a road map of Mandela's life and rhetorical formations before, during, and after the anti-apartheid struggle as well as an account of the narratives that make up his life. This autobiography comes in very useful in the next two chapters for depicting Mandela's evolving political career and rhetoric. The texts being examined in this chapter prove very fruitful for examining how Mandela's shifting stances in the anti-apartheid struggle created suspicion among

his fellow leaders and followers and how effectively the situations were handled. These texts help to make visible Mandela's performativity as his logos and ethos combine to form an important aspect of his rhetorical appeal.

Mandela deployed his entire life experiences to persuade his audience into accepting his fidelity to the anti-apartheid project. The strength of Mandela's rhetoric partly rested in his performative ethos, which encapsulated his ethical ontology as well as his experiential growth. By performativity, I draw upon Walter Beale's concept of the epideictic as a tool that performs a vital social role for "reinforcing traditional social values, by strengthening the "intensity of adherence to the values it lauds" (222). Beale's argument that "the audience of the epideictic assumes the role of "observer" and "critic;" whereas in the other rhetorical types, the audience is a judge, a decider" (222) connects to Mandela's audience, who observe and judge his performative role in the struggle. Mandela's audience observes and critiques his performance to ascertain whether he upholds the traditional values of honesty and integrity. The audience will need to judge, before deciding whether to perform the act of believing and following or not, after ascertaining what value system the speaker represents.

Mandela's performative ethos was a strategy that served to affirm his commitment to the anti-apartheid struggle and the South African project. That is because from the moment he and the ANC leaders embraced the idea of a multi-racial movement in 1950, which allowed communists to join in the anti-apartheid struggle till the end of his presidency, his ethos was constantly called into question. Whenever Mandela displayed flexibility on any issue, be it calls for armed struggle or the extension of an olive branch to the government, he was required to reaffirm his ethos. Mandela's performance acts upon his audience similarly to Searle's and Austin's ideas of illocutionary act. His persuasiveness was achieved through the political positions he advocated in

his writings and speeches as were made manifest in his political life. Consequently, his persuasiveness was rooted in the ethos he performed through his choices, both as a racialized African and as an activist. In addition, Mandela's wide acceptability stemmed from his identification with the disenfranchised (identification that was enacted in speech and actions – symbolized by his personal sacrifices), whose rights had been taken away from them either because of the color of their skin or because they belonged to a different belief system.

Mandela's peculiar position helps to make understandable the relationship between his political rhetoric – his appeals for solidarity – and the cohesion produced among ethnically and ideologically diverse groups. It is significant to analyze the varieties of strategies and tactics Mandela deployed as he organized and agitated for overturning the racist apartheid order. Of particular note were the ways and degrees to which Mandela drew upon the facts of his own repression – deployed rhetorically, as it were, by the apartheid regime to produce strong mental images. Mandela's rhetorical strategy served to undercut the apartheid regime's approach of sowing seeds of discord among disparate groups of South African people of colour in order to suppress their resistance.

Mandela's counter-rhetoric for destroying this divisive strategy proved effective particularly because he demonstrated his steadfast commitment to the cause of the struggle. The deployment of his rhetorical strategies was quite significant because the complex socio-political situation in South Africa had succeeded in fragmenting Blacks. Therefore, Mandela's stature, as a leader of high repute, became an important means of assuaging the frayed political and social nerves of Blacks. Mandela's changing rhetorical strategies demonstrated how he had grown over time without compromising his commitment to the struggle and his values of honesty and integrity. To investigate the role of Mandela's demonstrative ethos, this chapter examines: (1) Ethos as a

Human Symbol; (2) The Construction of Mandela's Ethos; (3) Mandela's Flexible and Performative Leadership; (4) Mandela's Diplomatic Strategies; (5) Mandela's Feminist Sensibilities; and (6) Identification as an Integral Part of Mandela's Ethos.

Ethos as a Human Symbol

Ethos has acquired the status of the bastard child of modern rhetoric because “[t]he impact of rhetoric’s dissolution and scientific philosophy’s consolidation of power eventually helped to contribute to the intellectual crises of the early twentieth century” (James Crosswhite, 84). Crosswhite argues that the domination of science in the society has produced a dismissal of the deliberative and inventive powers of the art of rhetoric. Consequently, ethical discourse has been redefined as producing prescriptive and emotive meaning without a truth value. The result is relativism. The catastrophic wars of the twentieth century are evidence of the crisis of philosophy after its divorce from rhetoric. Wayne Booth and Burke’s contemporary examination of these conflicts depict the need to produce the kind of assent generated in mutual engagement that is required for resolving lingering conflicts. Crosswhite argues that these holocaust wars were partly responsible for the re-creation and recovery of traditional rhetoric, which has given birth to what he describes as “deep rhetoric.”

Deep rhetoric accounts for the return of rhetoric as an enlargement of philosophy through which rhetorical frameworks are being developed for addressing contemporary problems. The recovery of traditional rhetoric plays a significant role in this chapter because of the role of ethos in traditional rhetoric. This chapter is preoccupied with role of ethos for producing persuasion; and hence, there is the need to address the question: Why is ethos such an important rhetorical

means of persuasion? To answer this question is to answer another question: Why are human beings so preoccupied with integrity and truth? Nietzsche gives an insight into the answers by describing how the physical vulnerability of the human race demands the use of the intellect more than other animals. He argues that humans are the least equipped in terms of physical strength, which is needed for survival in the wild and untamed nature. However, what humans lacked in physical strength, they made up for in their intellect. According to Nietzsche, “For without this addition, they would have every reason to flee this existence as quickly as Lessing’s son” (889). The intellect has enabled the human race not only to survive, but also to dominate their environment.

The human intellect is both a blessing and a burden because those referred to as the lower animals are not preoccupied with the same matters that produce divisions among people and groups. Thus, “as a means for the preservation of the individual, the intellect unfolds its principle powers in dissimulation, which is the means by which weaker, less robust individuals preserve themselves – since they have been denied the chance to wage the battle for existence with horns or with the sharp teeth of beasts of prey” (Nietzsche, 889). The human intellect predisposes people to seek to survive within the forces of nature in a way that makes them continuously grasp for control. This desire for control means that “insofar as the individual wants to maintain himself against other individuals; he will under natural circumstances employ the intellect mainly for dissimulation” (Nietzsche, 889). Dissimulation is not peculiar to the human races; but, as George Kennedy argues, we would also have noticed that lower animals equally have the power to enact some level of concealment and deception. Nietzsche argues that:

This art of dissimulation reaches its peak in man. Deception, flattering, lying, deluding, talking behind the back, putting up a false front, living in borrowed splendor, wearing a mask, hiding behind convention, playing a role for others and for oneself – in short,

a continuous fluttering around the solitary flame of vanity – is so much the rule and the law among men that there is almost nothing which is less comprehensible than how an honest and pure drive for truth could have arisen among them (889).

In essence, human dissimulation is of a higher sort than that of animals. Therefore, speech is that aspect of the intellect that differentiates humans from animals. Despite the power that comes from the intellect and speech, nature has made it impossible for human beings to know nature and themselves in totality. Nature has concealed “most things from him – even concerning his own body – in order to confine and lock him within a proud, deceptive consciousness, aloof from the coils of the bowels, the rapid flow of the blood stream, and the quivering of the fibers! She threw away the key” (Nietzsche, 889). This description of nature as some being or force with the power to deliberately keep human beings from knowing the unknown is interesting. This observation opens up the discussion on why human beings are uncomfortable with the unknown.

One of the reasons why we are uncomfortable with the unknown is because what is considered to be “lies” within social conventions cast shadows over the world as it is known, and “truth” illuminates this world by making it seemingly more accessible. Human speech plays a fundamental role in unraveling the world as we know it and upon which the human cognitive faculties are perpetually fixated. Therefore, the “legislation of language likewise establishes the first laws of truth” (Nietzsche, 889). Despite the relativism that Nietzsche subordinates truth and lies to, dissimulation eclipses truth and creates curiosity and suspicion among human beings. The complication that comes from conflict creates a psychological space where ethos (as an expression of traditional values of honesty and integrity) plays a key role. Bruce Barry and Robert Robinson argue that “[r]egardless of how much acrimony attends a particular discord, the challenge of reconciling competing interest without sacrificing self-interest inevitably tempts conflicting parties to be cunning, guarded, or furtive, if not plainly dishonest. The imaginary line between

clever furtiveness and naked deception marks that ethical frontier along which those who research and teach applied techniques in conflict resolution ply their trade” (137 -138). Barry and Robinson’s argument indicate that conflicts tend to shake ethical lines because conflict exacerbates self-interest and often brings out the worst in people. The role of rhetorical ethos in conflict makes Burke’s idea of the “dialectical pair” of “opinion and truth” conventionally compatible. That is because “many of the “opinions” upon which persuasion relies fall outside the test of truth in the strictly scientific, T-F, yes-or-no sense” (Burke, *A Rhetoric*, 54). Thus, what a society holds to be true is dependent upon what has been conventionally determined as truth (Nietzsche and Burke). The manner in which convention determines what is true or false and good or bad dates back to ancient times as can be seen in “Dissoi Logoi.” The ethical assumption upon which an orator seeks to persuade is connected to the configuration of the intended audience.

According to Burke, “if a given audience has a strong opinion that a certain kind of conduct is admirable, the orator can commend a person by using signs that identify him with such conduct” (*A Rhetoric*, 54) as a means of claiming credibility. What then are the motives behind such identification? To answer this question, there is the need to examine what Mandela had in common with South African people of color. What they had in common was the hardship that racial discrimination had inflicted on all minorities by apartheid. Mandela’s complex audience required that he projected an ethos that was consistent with the articulated position of the suffering masses in South Africa. It can be argued that Mandela employed identification in a way that demonstrated the transcendental nature of his motives, whereby putting the interest of his country above his personal interest was fundamental not superficial.

Conflict presents occasions for suspicion; and to persuade the opposing side, credibility is needed in the course of finding a resolution. Truth and lies occupy important places in conflict,

and the power to persuade rests largely in the speaker's ability to prove his trustworthiness. Conflict opens up the space for suspicion and fear, and these emotions place a high premium on ethos because trust becomes a prized commodity. Ethos is significant primarily because it projects a potent platform upon which persuasion, especially in a conflict situation, is heavily reliant. That is because ethos is that part of human nature, which can be both intrinsic and acquired. It is intrinsic considering that it is formed out of human conscience; and it is acquired through character formation. Mandela's ethos is irrevocably tied to his convictions because he had experienced freedom in his African village before he experienced the ordeal of curtailment in the city, and this curtailment was evidence of the evil of apartheid. The refusal to accept the tokenism offered by the apartheid government (such as preferential treatment in prison or a conditional release) validates his ethos, and therein partly lies his rhetorical appeal. Mandela's transcendental ethos enables him subject his interest to that of the general good, despite the cost. In counting the cost of the struggle, Mandela performative ethos is made manifest in the following words:

I have chosen this latter course (of going underground) which is more difficult and which entails more risks and hardship than sitting in goal. I have had to separate myself from my dear wife and children, from my mother and sisters to live as an outlaw in my own land. I have had to close my business, to abandon my profession, and live in poverty and misery, as many of my people are doing. I will continue to act as the spokesman of the National Action Council during the phase (armed struggle) that is unfolding and the tough struggles that lie ahead. I shall fight the government side by side with you, inch by inch, and mile by mile, until victory is won. What are you going to do? Will you come along with us, or are you going to co-operate with the Government in its efforts to suppress the claims and aspirations of your own people? Or are you going to remain silent and neutral in a matter of life and death to my people, to our people? For my part, I have made choice...The struggle is my life. I will continue fighting for freedom until the end of my days (*The Struggle is My Life*, 115).

Mandela does something very interesting in the speech from which the above quote was taken. First, he sets up the circumstances that led to his adoption of the armed struggle by praising the people for their support so far. He juxtaposes this praise with the condemnation of the

repressive strategies of the government. Then he praises the people again for their courage in the face of such repression. For example, he says that “[t]oday is 26 June, a day known throughout the length and breadth of our country as Freedom Day. On this memorable day, nine years ago, eight thousand five hundred of our dedicated freedom fighters struck a mighty blow against the repressive colour policies of the Government. Their matchless courage won them the praise and affection of millions of people here and abroad” (*The Struggle*, 113). The epideictic nature of this speech, that is characterized by the praise and blame elements, is apparent. But more importantly, Mandela is deploying the African rhetorical mode of the South African *imbongi* or West African griot by evoking their past victories as a means of interrogating their current challenges in order to call the people to action.

The manner in which Mandela exploits epideictic rhetoric, a rhetorical form that is present in the Western and African rhetorical tradition and the African mode of the *imbongi/griot*, exemplifies Campbell’s, Finnegan’s, and Kaschula and Diop’s concepts of African rhetorical tradition. These scholars argue that the African rhetorical modes function within the society as means of regulating the moral codes of the communities. Mandela’s strategy of deploying rhetorical questions in the speech echoes Campbell’s argument that griot oratory is sermonic, and it aims to stir the heart, to provoke, and to persuade. Mandela’s description of his own personal sacrifices is a performance of his ethos that was effective enough to gain him support for his change in strategy.

Mandela’s performative ethos is significant because the inter-racial and intra-racial conflict created suspicions that heightened the existent tension. The tension made Mandela’s braided rhetoric emblematic in the sense that it was used to build a bridge between the conflicting groups. Smith, Cambell, Finnegan, and Kaschula and Diop recognize that the most significant role

of African rhetorical modes is the way these modes function to create cohesion within the communities. Mandela always sought ways to perform this role of building bridges all through the struggle and beyond, even at the risk of appearing weak and compromising. His deep knowledge and appreciation of human nature combined with his diverse experiences helped him develop a knack for unifying various groups for a common cause. Mandela's experiences are drawn from practical law court proceedings, a shared African and Western cultures, various false political starts, successes, and failures.

The Construction of Mandela's Ethos

One of the factors that caused the intra-racial conflicts, which complicated things for Mandela and the ANC, was the paradigm shift on the part of the ANC. This paradigm shift was evidenced in the decision to include people of other races and ideologies in the anti-apartheid struggle. It is significant to discuss this paradigm shift because it served to both interrogate and validate Mandela's ethos. The policy to include other races and people of other ideologies like the Communists stemmed from the desire to accommodate all who were commonly oppressed by the apartheid government. Despite the nobility of this policy change, it created huge problems that threatened the anti-apartheid struggle. Mandela and other ANC leaders were accused of betrayal and inconsistency.

Mandela's paradigm shift was a volte-face on his part; however, his performative ethos was instrumental for persuading the people to embrace this change. Other Black leaders opposed the inclusion of non-Blacks and communists because they believed in African-only anti-apartheid movement. Mandela's Africanist fidelity had never been in question as his rhetorical strategies

proved. Despite having this fidelity challenged, the manner in which Mandela demonstrated his commitment to his African heritage can be seen in his braided rhetoric. This braided rhetoric, which served the dual role of calling his fellow Africans into a cohesive cooperation against apartheid, while appealing to his white audience to see the evil of apartheid, set him apart. According to Michael J. Hyde, “ethos has an ontological dimension because it emerges from the way one makes decisions, the way one lives on a day-to-day basis, the way one dwells. Those decisions are informed by one’s values, one’s practical wisdom, and one’s goodwill” (“The Ethos”, 2). Hyde’s ideas are exemplified in Mandela’s life and experiences. His ethos was tied to that of the ANC and yet separate in the sense that his individuality propelled him to make certain difficult decisions without the consent of his fellow leaders. Some of these decisions had the power to impact the ANC as well as call his credibility into question.

Another incident that both interrogated and validated Mandela’s ethos was his decision to write to the government from prison. Although this decision may have been taken on an individual level without first consulting with the leaders of the ANC, the motive behind it requires serious interrogation. The letter from prison served to initiate peace moves, and this move captured the manner in which his ethos transcended his party affiliations in order to encompass the general good of South Africans. This letter from prison gives us an insight into his individualism, and this individualism would cause his ethos to be called into question a number of times. According to Philip Bonner, “Mandela simply bucked collective discipline and took initiatives that were profoundly controversial in the upper ranks of the ANC and had never been collectively approved. These include Mandela’s initiative to ditch passive resistance and move to armed struggle in 1961 and his solitary decision in the late 1980s to enter into discussions with the white South African government over a negotiated settlement between the Nationalist Party and the ANC” (30). Bonner

considers such controversial tendencies on the part of Mandela to be an inherent contradiction in need of exploration.

Despite the fact that this point may have some merit, Mandela's actions, when examined from the complex political and racial situations in South Africa at that time, remain consistent with his commitment to the people of South Africa. The complex nature of apartheid caused him to continually strategize for the sake of exigency. Mandela's ability to always put the interest of the people above his own accounts for his rhetorical appeal. Putting the interest of the people above personal interest is the mark great leadership. And that is because, there were leaders who, when faced with important choices, failed to live up to expectations.

For example, at the height of the Defiance Campaign, Dr. Moroka, the president-general and the figurehead of the campaign, took a stance that undermined the credibility of the ANC. The Defiance Campaign was meant to push for the repeal of unjust laws such as, "the Suppression of Communism Act, the Group Areas Act, the Separate Representation of Voters Act, the Bantu Authorities Act, the pass laws, and stock limitation laws" (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 123). When the key ANC members were arrested and accused of communism, Dr. Moroka who "shared the government's animosity to communism" (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 137), despite the tradition of the ANC to work with anyone who was against racial oppression, turned his back against the struggle. He employed his own attorney, contrary to the plan to have all the arrested members tried together, and performed a role that almost destroyed the struggle.

Dr. Moroka took the stand and "tendered a humiliating plea in mitigation to Judge Rumpff and took the witness stand to renounce the very principles on which the ANC had been founded" (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 137). This was a practical betrayal of the ANC because "[w]hen his own lawyer asked him whether there were some among the defendants who were Communists, Dr.

Moroka actually began to point his finger at various people, including Dr. Dadoo and Walter. The judge informed him that that was not necessary” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 138). Mandela described Dr. Moroka’s betrayal in the following words: “[h]is performance was a severe blow to the organization and we all immediately realized that Dr. Moroka’s days as ANC president were numbered. He had committed the cardinal sin of putting his own interest ahead of the organization and the people. He was unwilling to jeopardize his medical career and fortune for his political beliefs, thereby, he had destroyed the image that he had built during three years of courageous work on behalf of the ANC and the Defiance Campaign” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 138). The description of the self-serving Dr. Moroka captures Mandela’s deep regard for self-sacrifice as a necessary ingredient of great leadership.

The depth of the betrayal is captured in the following words, “I regarded this as a tragedy, for Dr. Moroka’s faintheartedness in court took away some of the glow from the campaign. The man who had gone around the country preaching the importance of the campaign had now forsaken” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 138). Dr. Moroka’s eclipsed ethos is exemplary of a failed leadership. It is important to evaluate the terms Mandela employed to describe Moroka’s betrayal. In describing Moroka’s sell-out as the cardinal sin of putting his own interest ahead of the organization and the people, Mandela raises the freedom movement to the level of spirituality. The deployment of such religious language is not far-fetched because the oppression of a group of people based on the colour of their skin is a sin against the God who created them. In that regard, the apartheid regime as well as Moroka are relegated to the level of fallen beings. The language employed by Mandela connects to the Judeo-Christian concept of ethical prescription. Furthermore, there is also a close link between what such ethical prescription represents in the Western rhetorical tradition and the values imbibed by Mandela from his African heritage.

Mandela describes this African heritage as a whole way of living that is encapsulated in customs, rituals, and taboos that were passed down by their ancestors and which shaped their lives (*Long Walk*, 11). To dishonour this heritage was to debase their ancestors, and such actions had serious consequences like ill fortune and failure in life. The only way to atone for such lapses was “to consult with a traditional healer or tribal elder, who communicated with the ancestors and conveyed profound apologies” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 11). Such a belief system informed Mandela’s deployment of such religious language in describing Moroka’s betrayal.

Moroka’s failed leadership is stark in comparison to Mandela, whose promising law practice had been sacrificed on the altar of the struggle. Having being forced to abandon his family and go underground, it became impossible to care for or protect them. His beloved wife and children were physically harassed and displaced on numerous occasions. Winnie, his young wife was imprisoned and dehumanized many times. He was unable to care for his mother and sisters and was equally unable to attend family gatherings like birthdays and funerals. All of these personal sacrifices brought him great agony, yet he remained committed to the convictions of the struggle. Mandela brooded over his personal affairs as much as he agonized over the affairs of the country. Thus, he exemplifies Burke’s idea of being consubstantiated with the people; and this merger helps to validate his ethos, which in turn made him rhetorically persuasive.

The suffering people of South Africa are combined with Mandela’s immediate family to make up one big family. Mandela’s awareness of his consubstantiality with the people of South Africa is captured in the following words: “I had no epiphany, no singular revelation, no moment of truth, but a steady accumulation of a thousand slights, a thousand indignities, a thousand unremembered moments, produced in me an anger, a rebelliousness, a desire to fight the system that imprisoned *my people*” [italics is mine] (*Long Walk*, 95). Burke describes “consubstantially”

as “[a] doctrine..., either explicit or implicit, may be necessary to any way of life. For substance, in the old philosophies, was an act; and a way of life is an acting-together; and in acting together, men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, attitudes that make them consubstantial” (*A Rhetoric*, 21). The “common enemy” identified in this struggle was the apartheid regime.

The common enemy had inflicted immense suffering upon the oppressed South Africans, who had been dehumanized just for being human beings of a different color. Mandela identifies with the people through language at the surface level, and at a deeper level, acts together with them. All through the struggle, he used surface linguistic terms like the possessive pronoun “my” – “my people,” “my brothers and sisters,” “our mothers,” and “our sisters” to indicate that, at the metaphorical level, he belonged to the people and they belonged to him. In that belongingness, Mandela chooses to suffer for them and with them. Mandela’s language and actions, particularly his long incarceration, contributed towards his performative ethos.

Mandela’s ethos is demonstrative because his suffering is evidence that his rhetoric goes deeper than mere talk. Mandela even jeopardized his ethos through some of his actions, despite the fact that these actions were taken for the good of the cause and the people. To buttress this point, Mandela explains in his letter to the government the need to break the impasse that had truncated previous peace moves. This destructive impasse acted as a motivating factor for his intervention. Mandela’s concern for the plight of the citizens is captured in the following words: “My intervention is influenced by purely domestic issues, by the civil strife and ruin into which the country is now sliding (*Speeches*, 10). In essence, Mandela cared more about the country than about his reputation.

The extent to which the situation of the country affected him is captured in the following words, “I am disturbed, as many other South Africans no doubt are, by the specter of a South

Africa split into two hostile camps-Blacks (the term Blacks is used in a broad sense to include all those who are not whites) on one side and whites on the other-slaughtering one another; by acute tensions, which are building up dangerously in practically every sphere of our lives – a situation, which in turn, foreshadows more violent clashes in days ahead. This is the crisis that has forced me to act” (Mandela, “The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement,” 10). The terms used by Mandela to capture the South African situation can be described as a mission to rescue a haunted sphere. Thus, the metaphor of the “specter” that was created by the slaughtering on both sides by Blacks and whites produces a phantasmagoria that is more real than imagined. Mandela gives the impression that the images are real and heart-rending enough to occasion his intervention, regardless of how his action may have been misinterpreted. The dystopic descriptions of the South African milieu present a picture of a country on the brink of total collapse. In essence, the communal trope that has characterized Mandela’s braided rhetoric can be glimpsed yet again. Mandela’s reason for his action evinces the summation that every personal interest must be subordinated to the communal cohesion.

This communal cohesion necessitated Mandela to risk having his credibility questioned for initiating communication with the apartheid government. The communication channels had become closed as a result of the escalating violence on both sides on the divide; therefore, South Africa was fast becoming a wasteland. In saying “I am disturbed,” Mandela gives a glimpse of the emotional investment in the South African enterprise, which was being greatly threatened. At this point, Mandela gives the impression of making the shift from identifying with the Blacks and other oppressed people, to identifying with the entire South Africa – both Blacks and whites.

Mandela's Flexibility and Performative Leadership

Mandela's intervention exemplifies Wayne Booth's concept of assent, which argues that to resolve dissents and produce assent, people have to be ready to cross the lines of division. Mandela's flexibility, despite his consistency on matters that required him to be so, has been largely misconstrued. According to Booth, "[t]his flexibility – not to say venality - can be made to look like a very serious fault, but it can be turned into a serious resource especially in a time when "everyone believes" that "there are no shared values any more" (xiii). Booth argues that human engagement should go beyond just changing the minds of others, but it should extend to discovering good reasons to warrant assent.

It is assent that enables conflicting parties to break down the lines of division, which keep people apart particularly when maintaining the lines of division does more harm than good to the general populace. To avoid rigid positions in conflict, Booth describes rhetoric as a way of "discovering together, in discourse, new levels of truth (or at least agreement) that neither side suspected before" (11). Therefore, despite the fact that Mandela had supported ANC's resort to violent resistance, he recognized the role of incommensurability as the major cause for the cataclysmic situation plaguing South Africa. For example, Mandela argues for co-operative assent in the following words: "The most crucial task which will face the government and the ANC will be achieved only if both parties are willing to compromise...the move I have taken provided you with the opportunity to overcome the current deadlock and to normalize the country's political situation" ("Now is the Time to Intensify the Struggle," 18). Mandela's role as a peacemaker and mediator coalesces the Western and African rhetorical traditions on more than one level. In other words, he exemplifies Booth's idea of co-operative assent, Burke's concept of transcendence and consubstantiation, and the African concept of the griot or *imbongi* both as a peacemaker and

defender of communal cohesion. Thus, the need to rise above rigid standpoints was paramount in order to bring about lasting solutions to the pressing problems of violence and poverty.

Mandela's attitude towards incommensurability is in synch with Lawrence Prelli's argument that incommensurability is an insoluble problem when "linguistic, methodological, and valuational conflict or confusion" (296) are subjected to the concepts of mathematical meaning. As a result, "[i]ncommensurate communication is the failure of discussions to address the same situated ambiguities so that they, in effect, argue at cross purposes" (Prelli, 294). Mandela's awareness that violence in South Africa had the possibility of escalating, should the channels of communication remain closed in deadlock, is a testament to the role of the father of the nation that he had begun to assume. The role he undertakes to break the deadlock is significant particularly because he spearheaded the arm struggle, and he was also a victim of apartheid violence

The situation in South Africa can be likened to what Randy Harris described as "Brick-wall incommensurability [that] labels situations in which communication is hopelessly stymied, where each party can only hear gibberish when the other speaks" (Introduction, 22). The implications of allowing the carnage that was decimating the country are captured in Mandela's description of his suffering people. The violence had attendant economic and health ramifications for the poor, majority of whom were Blacks. Consequently, Mandela took upon himself the responsibility of addressing this incommensurability between the ANC and the apartheid government. According to Prelli, incommensurability can be resolved when the questioning of classical stasis doctrine is applied (299). Stasis questions such as – "Is it?" "What is it?" "Of what sort is it?" and "Is action required?" had to be taken into consideration in the South African context. Not only does Mandela address these questions, he even describes the actions that are required for a peaceful resolution.

Mandela's willingness to put his integrity at stake, in order to subordinate his interest to that of the general good, gives credence to his leadership role and ethos. Although Mandela chooses to go solo in initiating talks with the government, the ethos that constitutes his African ontology is visible at all times. This African ethos is made manifest in the African rhetorical tradition of subordinating the individual to the communal good. For example, Mandela says in his letter to the government that "I must further point out that the question of my release from prison is not an issue, at least not at this stage of the discussion, and I am certainly not asking to be freed. But I do hope that the government will, as soon as possible, give me the opportunity from my present quarters to sound the views of my colleagues inside and outside the country on the this move. Only if this initiative is formally endorsed by the ANC will it have any significance" ("The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement," 10). This quote is significant because while Mandela is being accused of having comprised his ethos as a result of his singular move, he is subordinating himself to the ANC as a collective body.

The seeming doubleness of individual action that is separate from the collective whole but in consonance with the collective ANC agenda depicts the African rhetorical mode of persuasion as an *imbongi*. Mandela's strategy is captured by Smith who argues that rhetoric for the African cannot be divorced from every day life. According to Smith, discourse cannot be removed from "the mutual compatibility of the entire traditional world view" (15). In this worldview, speech form and content must act harmoniously together in a logical link to the society. Therefore, the individual is not singular in a typical African society. According to Smith, this aspect of the African society will appear "rigid and constricting to most Western peoples, but, in reality, in customary African society, the possibilities are plentiful" (15). The possibilities are reflected in the confidence that gives a certain level of security to the individual to act within certain moral codes. This security

places pressure on the individual to be accountable on a communal scale because injury to one can be viewed as injury to all. The communal is a trope that is constantly deployed by Mandela, sometimes covertly.

Mandela's deployment of the African communal trope is visible in the following words: "far from responding to that call [of renouncing the South African Communist Party before there can be negotiation], my intervention is influenced by purely domestic issues, by the civil strife and ruin into which the country is now sliding. I am disturbed, as many other South African no doubt are" ("The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement," 10). Mandela's words validate Smith's argument that African rhetorical modes perform functions within the community. These functions are particularly significant in "instances of conflict or disagreement among members of the society [where] public discourse must function to restore the stability that conflict creates" (Smith, 16). It can be argued that in performing his ethos, Mandela aims to bring some harmony into the South African chaos. This argument holds sway if it is examined from the way Mandela reiterates his reason for initiating the peace move.

The risk of being accused of selling out his party, by acting alone, may have deterred someone more selfish or cowardly. The fact that he acted before seeking the approval of his party makes Mandela appear presumptuous. But he chose to risk his reputation for the greater good. Such a self-sacrificing mindset makes Mandela's ethos particularly exemplary. Scholars like Bonner describe Mandela as possessing characteristics that are "antithetical qualities of flexibility and intransigence" and question his "consistency and his impetuosity" (30). Such seeming contradictions give the impression that Mandela cannot be trusted. For example, "Mandela's initiative to ditch passive resistance and move to armed struggle" (Bonner, 30) represents one of the several occasions when a volte-face is portrayed. Rather than see Mandela as inconsistent or

inherently contradictory, the actions in question should be viewed as contingency of leadership. For example, his actions actually evince a solid determination to use every necessary means to bring about the liberation of his subjugated people.

His role as freedom fighter can be likened to the readiness of a father to do anything necessary in order to provide food for a dearly loved family. Mandela captures this exigency in the following words:

At the outset, I must point out that I make this move without consultation with the ANC. I am a loyal and disciplined member of the ANC. My political loyalty is owed primarily, if not exclusively, to this organization and particularly to our Lusaka headquarters, where the official leadership is stationed and from where our affairs are directed. In the normal course of events, I would put my views to the organization first, and if these views were accepted, the organization would then decide on who were the best qualified members to handle the matter on its behalf and on exactly when to make the move (“The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement,” 9).

The need to act now depicts Beale’s idea of a *kairotic* ontology, whereby rhetoric’s return as philosophy occurs in a linear progression of a deep rhetoric emanating from its humanism. Therefore, Mandela’s preoccupation with practical matters such as the near collapse of his country has produced a form of deep rhetoric that transcends the individual self.

Mandela’s *kairotic* being is captured in the following words: “[b]ut in the current circumstances, I cannot follow this course, and this is the only reason why I am acting on my own initiative, in the hope that the organization will, in due course, endorse my action. I must stress that no prisoner, irrespective of his status or influence, can conduct negotiations of this nature from prison. In our special situation, negotiation on political matters is literally a matter of life and death, which requires to be handled by the organization itself through its appointed representatives (Mandela, “The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement,” 9). The *Kairotic* ontology embodied by Mandela came at a high prize. His tactical

manoeuvrings were emblematic of a rhetorical *kairos*, whereby he recognized an opportune moment that must be seized upon to bring about a favourable outcome. By saying that “in the current circumstances, I cannot follow this course, and this is the only reason why I am acting on my own initiative, in the hope that the organization will, in due course, endorse my action,” (“The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement,” 9) Mandela articulated the risk he was taking, which implied that a rigid stance at such a point would have been more detrimental than a badly needed flexibility.

Bonner’s description of Mandela’s purported impetuosity requires interrogation. The contextual complexities in the South African polity must be considered when analyzing Mandela’s words and actions. According to Bonner, “[f]or long periods of his life, his political thinking and attitudes would remain unchanged, but he could also suddenly lurch forward or away from his established principles to adopt an entirely new political philosophy and persona” (30). Bonner’s depiction of Mandela’s unpredictability creates an impression of being a chameleon. However, Mandela’s purported chameleonic disposition evokes a self-preservation, which propels the chameleon to kairotically change its colour in order to merge with the surrounding flora. The constantly changing policies and tactics of the apartheid government made the political terrain an ever-shifting sand. Mandela took pains to explain that to remain rigid and unchanging in the face of such policy flux would have been tantamount to suicide.

There is a need to differentiate between consistency and rigidity and to interrogate flexibility apart from integrity in order to avoid conflating the deeper implications of these concepts. Rigidity can be a flaw in conflict because various actions are often in a flux, and a pragmatic leader knows to move according to the dictates of such complexities. For example, Chinua Achebe captured the manner in which rigidity can be a tragic flaw in his novel *Things Fall*

Apart. Achebe's major protagonist Okonkwo was a man of honour, but he was rigid in his opposition against the colonialists, who had infiltrated his community and were tearing his people apart. Okonkwo's failure to be flexible and pragmatic in his approaches led to his downfall. The very act of suicide on Okonkwo's part implied that he could not be buried properly; consequently, his body was thrown into the evil forest. In essence, in death, Okonkwo became the victim of the culture he tried to preserve with such rigidity while alive. Mandela's flexibility enabled him to straddle his African culture, through which he was nurtured, and the Western culture, to which he owed his training as a lawyer and which oppressed him as a Black man.

Mandela's flexibility is demonstrated on several accounts, yet his motivation remained consistent with the cause of the struggle. Mandela's motivations are made manifest on every rigid stance he had once taken and chosen to rescind. He goes to great lengths to explain the necessity of acting alone in his letter to the government, where he calls for negotiations. But at the same time, he reiterates the main crux of the anti-apartheid movement, which remained non-negotiable. Mandela made the non-negotiable issues clear and they remained so. Issues like "votes for all, decent wages for all, end pass laws, end minority white domination" (Mandela, *The Struggle*, 103) formed the basis for the exigent actions that made Mandela appear inconsistent.

Mandela's so-called inconsistency appears to be multilayered; and while this chapter examines the various levels on which he shifts ground or changes course, the manner in which these changes occur buttress Mandela's constancy and fidelity to the anti-apartheid cause. One of the issues on which Mandela changed his stance was the move to include people of other races and philosophies in the anti-apartheid movement. This move was kairotic, and it had a logical reason, which turned out to be beneficial to the cause of the struggle. The kairotic nature of the inclusion of others into the movement is captured by Mandela in the following words:

The democratic struggle in South Africa is conducted by an alliance of various classes and political groupings...all participate in the struggle against racial inequality and for full democratic rights. It was this alliance that launched the National Day of Protest on 26 June 1950. It was this alliance that unleashed the campaign for the Defiance of Unjust Laws on 26 June 1952. It is this same alliance that produced the Freedom Charter. In this alliance the democratic movement has the rudiments of a dynamic and militant mass movement and, provided the movement exploits the initial advantages on its side at the present moment, immense opportunities exist for the winning of the demands in the Charter within our lifetime (*The Struggle*, 55-56).

Mandela's deployment of repetition in the above quote is instrumental in showing the kairotic nature of his flexibility and the benefits accruing from it. He also employs repetition for playing the role of being the memory of the people like a typical *imbongi* whose persuasiveness is dependent on the ethos of their historical knowledge. In essence, the Freedom Charter that was produced in 1956 is drawn upon by Mandela to remind the people of the achievements of the alliance in the past and its potential for the future as a way of subverting those who called his ethos into question. Therefore, as with every shift that Mandela made, the reasons for such shifts were either directly related to or indirectly impacted by the indignities of racism or the injustices of apartheid policies.

It can then be argued that Mandela's supposed inconsistency reflects his flexibility on an inflexible matter of the anti-apartheid cause. Mandela's single-mindedness of purpose makes him rigid when necessary and flexible when presented with a superior argument. His initial exclusion of communists and other races was informed by the idea of homogeneity among Black South Africans and the belief that Blacks were peculiar in their oppression. Much as such facts were real, other facts existed as well. The point being made here is that there existed a racial pyramid, which had the white supremacists at the top. At the bottom of this pyramid were Blacks. However, there were others in the spectrum who did not belong at the top, whether Black or white, and who were needed to further swell the number of those at the bottom of the pyramid. That is because politics

is a game of numbers, and it was absolutely important to isolate the white supremacists at the top. The isolation of the whites was made manifest at Kliptown where the Freedom Charter was promulgated and adopted. The Freedom Charter was a collaborative enactment, which was captured in the following words: “[t]he Congress of the People took place at Kliptown, a multiracial village on a scrap of a veld a few miles southwest of Johannesburg on two clear, sunny days, June 25 and 26, 1955. More than three thousand delegates braved police intimidation to assemble and approve the final document. They came by car, bus, truck, and foot. Although the overwhelming number of delegates were Black, there were more than three hundred Indians, two hundred Coloureds, and one hundred whites” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 172-173). The decision to include ‘others’ in the anti-apartheid fight was pivotal in taking the fight to a new level, which gave a greater leverage to the ANC, even though the decision produced a fracture within the Black populace.

Despite the danger of rupturing the fabric of unity within the ANC, the struggle was greater than any individual or group. Therefore, rather than destroy the ANC, there was a reverse effect. According to Mandela, “[t]he view of the ANC was that every person above the age of seventeen years, irrespective of the political views he might have, was entitled to become a member of the ANC” (*The Struggle*, 91). This inclusion brought a new lease of life to the ANC, but also tore the Black community apart. The power to fragment Blacks and turn them against one another was a strategy that the apartheid regime employed quite often. Though Mandela had supported the exclusion of the Communists initially, he changed his mind for exigent reasons. Mandela’s attitude reflects Booth’s idea that: “[w]hen I assent to your thought (or symphony or novel or account of your divorce) the line between us grows dim; in the ideal case, it in a sense disappears, and it is not surprising that many theologians and rhetoricians have echoed Newman’s effort to build a

grammar of assent and Kenneth Burke's to build a grammar, rhetoric, and symbolic of identification" (xvi). It is significant to note that Mandela's identification with the sufferings of Black South Africans motivated his strong inclination to assent to the inclusion of communists for the greater good.

It can be argued that the inclusion of non-Blacks and Communists into the anti-apartheid movement served a political purpose, and it was a decision that worked to the advantage of the struggle. However, this decision rankled a lot of other Black South Africans and split up the Black community. This split gave birth to PAC (Pan Africanist Congress). The manifesto presented by PAC was called "government of the Africans, by the Africans, and for the Africans" (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 227). This division among Blacks can be described as a clog in the wheel of the struggle, and it became a powerful tool in the hands of the apartheid government. Such fragmentation was used to undermine the ANC as Mandela captured in the following words:

Because of the PAC's anticommunism, they became the darlings of the Western press and the American State Department, which hailed its birth as a dagger to the heart of the African left. Even the National Party saw a potential ally in the PAC: they viewed the PAC as mirroring their anticommunism and supporting their views on separate development. The Nationalists also rejected interracial cooperation, and both the National Party and the American State Department saw fit to exaggerate the size and importance of the new organization for their own end (*Long Walk*, 229).

This divisive strategy connects strongly with Fanon's argument that anti-colonial movements have many pitfalls, and Mandela and the ANC were determined to avoid such pitfalls. Such pitfalls arise because the colonialist "tries with success to revive tribal feuds, using agent provocateurs and practising what might be called counter-subversion. Colonialism will use two types of natives to gain its ends; and the first of these are the traditional collaborators – chiefs, caids, and witch-doctors" (Fanon, *Wretched*, 109). Though the apartheid government exploited the

cleavage among Blacks and complicated things for the ANC, attempts to deflect attention from the main agenda of the anti-apartheid movement remained unsuccessful.

Fanon describes the strategies that the colonizer employs to destabilize the opposition movement as unpredictable. According to Fanon, “[a]t opportune moments, he combines his policy of brutal repression with spectacular gestures of friendship, manoeuvres calculated to sow division” (108-109). Such ploys remained unsuccessful in the anti-apartheid struggle because the cleavages that the apartheid government sought to exploit were born out of emotions, which emanated from personal interests of opposing Black leaders. The main reason that the apartheid ploys could not derail the momentum was because the general interest has the potential to always triumph over personal interest in a struggle such as the anti-apartheid movement.

To support this point, Mandela argued that “[m]any of those who cast their lot with the PAC did so out of personal grudges or disappointments and were not thinking of the advancement of the struggle, but of their own feelings of jealousy or revenge. I have always believed that to be a freedom fighter, one must suppress many of the personal feelings that make one feel like a separate individual rather than part of a mass movement” (*Long Walk*, 228). How does this argument support Mandela’s decision to act unilaterally on several occasions? It can be argued that Mandela’s tendency to act alone contradicts his argument. At the same time, Mandela’s unilateral actions may have served to depict his consubstantiation with the country. To be consubstantial would imply that he was personifying the communal trope that aims for cohesiveness in a conflicted society.

On a transcendental level, it can be argued that Mandela starts to incubate the troubled country whose birth into a nation he helps to enact after his release from prison. To support this point, Mandela further argues that “[o]ne is fighting for the liberation of millions of people, not

the glory of one individual. I am not suggesting that a man become a robot and rid himself of all personal feelings and motivations. But in the same way that a freedom fighter subordinates his own family to the family of the people, he must subordinate his own individual feelings to the movement” (*Long Walk*, 228). In exploiting the communal trope once again, Mandela demonstrates the extent to which he was willing to subordinate his individuality to the collective aim. The evocation of the collective ideal is significant because it is a technique that serves to neutralize the divisive strategy of the regime. By sacrificing everything he held dear, Mandela’s performative ethos is made manifest amidst the many questions that trail his unilateral actions.

Mandela claims that the disgruntlement of PAC members stemmed from “their objection to the Freedom Charter and the presence of Whites and Indians in the Congress Alliance leadership. They were opposed to interracial cooperation, in large part because they believed that white Communists and Indians had come to dominate the ANC” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 228). Through his choice of words, Mandela sets up an antithesis between the ANC leaders and PAC members as a way of showing that the fear of the “other” was as prevalent among Blacks as their white oppressors. To reiterate this point, Mandela declares in a speech at a rally in Durban on February 25, 1990 that, “I personally believe that here in South Africa, with all of our diversities of colour and race, we will show the world a new pattern of democracy...To do this we must eliminate all forms of factionalism and regionalism” (“We are Committed to Building a Single Nation in Our Country,” 34). The antithesis is effective because it demonstrates that what the ANC has done in embracing everyone is an embodiment of what Bhabha describes as hybridity, which is a variation of diversity or multiplicity. Bhabha describes hybridity as “the name for the strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal (that is, the production of discriminatory identities that secure the ‘pure’ and original identity of authority)” (112). In essence, hybridity

deals the deathblow to complicit rhetoric, colonial segregation, and homogenous nationalism (a romantic and non-feasible idea), which aims to subdue diversity.

To Bhabha, the homogeneity of the colonial discourse can only be disavowed through hybridity (112). PAC inadvertently favoured a homogeneity that supported the apartheid ideas of racial segregation. Paul Gilroy questions PAC's concept of nationalism as he re-examines the concept of nationality and the desire for absolutism, exclusivity, and separateness that nationalism evokes in the discourse of race and ethnic identity. Gilroy interrogates such closed ideas of nationalism because the complexity of the various hierarchical formations within white and Black communities make homogeneity impossible. According to Gilroy, "[t]he essential trademark of cultural insiderism, which also supplies the key to its popularity, is an absolute sense of ethnic difference. This is maximized so that it distinguishes people from one another and at the same time acquires an incontestable priority over all other dimensions of their social and historical experience, cultures, and identities" (3). The way Mandela's rhetoric depicts PAC's discontentment with ANC's inclusive policy connects with Gilroy's description of "insiderism," which is resistant to the accommodation of those who are considered to be "outsiders." Mandela, on the other hand, redefines the concept of "insiderism" and African Nationalism through completely different modalities.

Mandela's Pragmatic and Diplomatic Strategies

Some of the modalities richly deployed by Mandela are diplomacy and pragmatism that permeate his discourse. Using these strategies, Mandela creates the space for accommodating people of differing views. For example, despite his mistrust of PAC, he courted their friendship

while in prison in order to attempt to forge a united front with them against apartheid. According to Mandela: “I was keen to talk with Sobukwe and the others, most of whom were PAC, because I thought that in prison we might forge a unity that we could not on the outside. Prison conditions have a way of tempering polemics, and making individuals see more what unites them than what divides them” (*Long Walk*, 335). In essence, Mandela’s “keenness to talk” with PAC members can be described as an embodiment of the communal trope he has often deployed, which is also a portrayal of a typical *imbongi* who acts as a bridge builder in conflict. Mandela’s role of always initiating talks with those who were opposed to him echoes Fanon’s argument that “[t]he individual stands aside in favour of the community” (*Wretched*, 90). Mandela’s braided rhetoric is most discernible in his communal trope, which is drawn from the African rhetorical tradition and the way he bends the Western rhetorical tradition to his purpose. The braided rhetoric is deployed at a deeper level than merely an identification with the people. Despite suffering greatly, he was able to master his emotions, remain pragmatic, and deploy diplomatic language in handling difficult matters. This rhetorical strategy that enabled him negotiate the murky waters of apartheid’s fluid legislations in order to expose their malignant nature will be explored further in the next chapter.

His pragmatism and diplomatic strategy are demonstrated through his ability to view issues from different perspectives, while maintaining his objectivity and commitment to the anti-apartheid cause is evidence of Mandela’s doggedness. Mandela displayed this pragmatism in dealing with the PAC. For example, he says that, “I found the views and behaviour of the PAC immature. A philosopher once said that something is odd if a person is not liberal when he is young and conservative when he is old. I am not a conservative, but one matures and regards some of the views of one’s youth as undeveloped and callow” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 228-229). Mandela’s antithesis of “young” versus “old,” “liberal” versus “conservative,” and “mature” versus “callow”

symbolizes the identification that enhances his flexibility and pragmatism. The ability to connect with human weaknesses on more than one level constitutes part of his rhetorical appeal. It is also another reason why he will appear weak to people of more rigid standpoints. The antithesis presents a panoramic view of human nature. Rather than dismiss PAC's belligerence as a dividing point, he uses their attitude as a yardstick for reflecting on and judging his views as a young man.

This identification is captured in the following words: “[w]hile I sympathized with the views of the Africanists and once shared many of them, I believed that the freedom struggle required one to make compromises and accept the kind of discipline that one resisted as a younger, more impulsive man” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 228-229). Mandela's discourse in this quote accounts for his diplomacy in extending the olive branch to the PAC officials. In addition, his articulation and appreciation of the fears of the white minorities, which made them reluctant to share power, demonstrates his objectivity. The rhetoric of diplomacy is embedded in etiquette; yet it has not succeeded in eliminating conflicts, and this makes diplomacy an evolving process. Diplomacy is closely related to what John Yule describes as linguistic politeness or the positive face, whereby a particular language use removes the assumption of social power. A face-saving act that emphasises a person's positive face captures a speaker's attempts to form solidarity with an interlocutor. By so doing, attention is drawn to a common problem and goal in a manner that implies, “let's do this together...; [y]ou and I have the same problem” (Yule, 134). Yule's ideas connect to Burke's concept of identification, which is significant for effective diplomacy.

Despite engaging in armed struggle, the importance of diplomacy is not lost on Mandela, who connects strongly with the Prussian general Karl von Clausewitz's classic work *On War*. According to Mandela, “Clausewitz's central thesis, that war was a continuation of diplomacy by other means, dovetailed with my own instincts” (*Long Walk*, 277). Mandela's deployment of

diplomacy is not restricted to any race or class. His diplomatic manoeuvrings and identification are rooted in his consubstantiality, which Burke describes as “either explicit or implicit” (*Language*, 21). According to Burke, “for substance, in the old philosophies, was an act; and a way of life is an acting-together; and in acting together, men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, attitudes that make them consubstantial” (Burke, *Language*, 21). Going by Burke’s ideas, Mandela is subsumed in the freedom movement and suffers for and with all the oppressed people of South Africa.

When Mandela says that the struggle is my life, the identification and consubstantiation he embodies is enacted in words and actions. His performative ethos implies that he subsumes himself in a cause that is bigger than himself. Mandela’s self-sacrificing life of deprivation, near-death experiences, and long incarceration exemplifies a Christ-like redemption. He demonstrates that self-sacrifice is required of anyone who is entrusted with the position of leadership. However, some leaders have exploited their positions for personal gain. Such leaders end up causing more harm to the oppressed people they claim to represent than good.

Mandela identified the different types of leaders at the rally in Durban after his release from prison in the following words: “Not only in Natal, but all through the country, there have been chiefs who have been good and honest leaders, who have piloted their people through the dark days of our oppression with skill. These are the chiefs who have looked after the interest of their people. We salute these traditional leaders. But there have been many bad chiefs who have profited from apartheid and who have increased the burden on their people. We denounce this misuse of office in the strongest terms” (“We are Committed to Building a Single Nation in Our Country,”³⁴). Mandela deploys epideictic rhetoric, yet again, in this quote by blaming some and praising others based on their roles in the “dark days”.

The antithesis of “good and honest leaders” versus “bad chiefs” evokes the Biblical image of the relationship between good and bad shepherds and their sheep who need guidance. On the one hand, the good leaders piloted their people through the dark days of [their] oppression with skill and on the other, many bad chiefs profited from apartheid and increased the burden of their people. The metaphors he deploys make the selfishness of such bad leaders particularly reprehensible because some other leaders (like Mandela, Thabo Mbeki, Walter Sisulu, etc.) were being hunted down and either killed or incarcerated. Despite the strong language employed to describe and denounce corrupt leaders, Mandela’s diplomatic rhetoric always left wriggle room within which to extend a hand of reconciliation to them.

He plays the fatherly role of reprimanding bad leaders on the one hand and calling them back to the fold on the other, in a truly African way. His performative ethos is captured in the following words: “There are also chiefs who collaborated with the system, but who have since seen the error of their ways. We commend their change of heart. Chiefly office is not something that history has given to certain individuals to use or abuse as they see fit. Like all forms of leadership, it places specific responsibilities on its holders. As Luthuli, himself a chief, put it, “a chief is primarily a servant of the people. He is the voice of his people” (Mandela, “We are Committed to Building a Single Nation in Our Country,” 34). Part of Mandela’s ethos is intricately tied to the boldness required to make such distinctions among the leaders of Black South Africans and call them out accordingly.

Although Mandela can be identified with the leaders who were basically more concerned with the interest of their people, leaders who used and abused their office for self-gratification do not represent anything new. Fanon describes such self-serving leaders in the following words: “Rich people are no longer respectable people; they are nothing more than flesh-eating animals,

jackals, and vultures, which wallow in the people's blood" (*Wretched*, 153). Such leaders successfully lead their people astray because they have mastered the act of identification in a way that is highly persuasive and misleading. Juan Vives gives an insight to the various deployments of rhetoric and to how easily rhetoric can be perverted. Therefore, the persuasive power of a leader cannot be separated from the ethos they embody; otherwise, there is a danger of creating monsters out of leaders.

Vives, like most humanist educators, reinforces the necessity for an orator to have good virtues, probity, and prudence. That is because an orator's speech has consequences that can be far reaching. Therefore, a leader must demonstrate that their ethos is integral to their rhetoric because "if we hand over the means of speaking eloquently to people who lack such virtues, we will not really make them orators, but will put arms in the hands of madmen" (Cicero, 86). It is dangerous when people with a high mental acuity acquire eloquence without seeking its moral depths and limits. Such people use it to attain positions of importance and exploit it to accumulate wealth and honours in order to become tyrannical. When such people have attained power, they put a bridle on eloquence because "this activity of ours, frightened by the threat of arms, suddenly [falls] silent and [ceases]" (Vives, 88). A tyrant who has obtained power by eloquence perceives eloquence as a threat to that power. Consequently, free speeches and opinions become prohibited, and only speeches composed to flatter the powerful are allowed.

The bad leaders among Black South Africans, who used opportunistic rhetoric to divide the people, were largely responsible for the implosion that occurred within the Black communities and further complicated an already bad situation. The implosion embodies the unleashing of violence by Blacks against other Blacks. Mandela decried this implosion in the following words: "[w]e are therefore disturbed that there are certain elements amongst those who claim to support

the liberation struggle who use violence against our people. The hijacking and setting alight of vehicles and the harassment of innocent people are criminal acts that have no place in our struggle. We condemn that” (“The Masses of Our People are Making History,” 24). Mandela’s pragmatism and diplomacy are reflected in the way he employs condemnatory language to condemn those he refers to as criminals and calls them to repentance at the same time.

This strategy is consistent with the fatherly role he had begun to play through his intervention, conciliation, and negotiation. But the “criminal acts” had produced an implosion within the African communities that posed a threat to the fatherly role of bringing cohesion within the community. Fanon theorizes this implosion as the internalization of the violence that the colonized have experienced because “[f]rom birth it is clear to him that this narrow world, strewn with prohibitions, can only be called into question by absolute violence” (*Wretched*, 31). In essence, where violence rules, might become right; consequently, law and order break down. In his paper “Contextual knowledge management in discourse production: A CDA perspective,” Teun van Dijk examines the relationship between social power and discourse in order to reveal the manner in which power is enacted, concealed, expressed, described, or legitimized in text and talk within a social context.

Political leaders deploy ideologies, which exploit social cognition to form a link between the social power of classes, groups, and institutions at a deeper level of discourse to dominate their trusting followers. Social power can be claimed to belong within the relationships that occur among groups or classes, whereby hegemony produces an unequal power relationship. In an attempt to explain why the economically disadvantaged subject themselves to exploitation in a hierarchy of social power, social theorists have used ideology, hegemony, and discourse as matrixes to account for the connection between societal construction of knowledge and the

maintenance of unjustifiable power relations. Marxist concept of ideology has proved fruitful for describing how the dominant ideas within a society reflect the interest of the economic ruling class. Dijk argues that Antonio Gramsci further elucidates Marxist's ideology theory by using hegemony to demonstrate how capitalist societies construct and perpetuate class hierarchies. These hierarchies are entrenched for dominance. Dijk argues that such hierarchies enact a form of power abuse that acts as a legally or morally illegitimate exercise of control over others, and this control often results in social inequality. He also posits that social power and dominance are often organized and institutionalized, thereby allowing for more effective control. However, such dominance is rarely absolute but is often gradual and may be met by resistance or a counter-power by dominated groups.

The power of dominant groups may be enacted in laws, rules, habits, norms or even a consensus and these constitute hegemony, and such hegemonies can be seen in class domination, sexism, or racism. The consequent implosion Mandela had to deal with was a psychological phenomenon with catastrophic consequences. Therefore, such a complex situation required pragmatism, *kairotic* flexibility, and diplomacy on Mandela's part because the trauma caused by the violence that accompanies colonial oppression leaves indelible scars. Consequently, the oppressed people are equally galvanized by violence in order to fight against that oppression. Fanon described the implosion engendered by such violence as a source of trauma, which in turn produces a sensitivity that indicates that violence is always bubbling beneath the surface. According to Fanon, "The settler-native relationship is a mass relationship. The settler pits brute force against the weight of numbers. He is an exhibitionist. His preoccupation with security makes him remind the native out loud that there, he alone is master. The settler keeps alive in the native an anger, which he deprives of an outlet; the native is trapped in the tight links of the chains of

colonialism. But we have seen that inwardly, the settler can only achieve a pseudo petrification” (*Wretched*, 43). The efforts to deprive the colonized an outlet for their frustration is a futile one. Unfortunately, when the dam breaks, those in direct reception of the violence may not be the settlers.

The internal wrangling caused by the pent-up frustration can be as catastrophic as the brutality caused by the colonialists, which was evident in the South African situation. Fanon describes the futility of trying to force the colonized to swallow their frustration in the following words:

The native’s muscular tension finds outlet regularly in bloodthirsty explosions – in tribal warfare, in feuds between sects, and in quarrels between individuals. Where individuals are concerned, a positive negation of common sense is evident. While the settler or the policeman has the right... to strike the native, to insult him and to make him crawl to them, you will see the native reaching for his knife at the slightest hostile or aggressive glance cast on him by another native; for the last resort of the native is to defend his personality vis-à-vis his brother. (*Wretched*, 43).

The oppressed express their fury in ways that are depicted as hostility, aggressiveness, or sensitivity by the colonizer. Fanon argues that these psychological states are indeed the creation of the colonizer. This sensitivity is a symptom of the colonial brutality, yet the sensitivity is rhetorically constructed as depicting the essence of the Black man. The implication of such rhetorical construction is a projected absence that aims to show that the Black man lacks morality and self-control. Mandela called attention to the damage, which such an implosion had done to the Black communities as cohesive unites as well as the negative image it gave to the Black race and the entire struggle. Mandela says that “[w]e condemn, in the strongest terms, the use of violence as a way of settling differences amongst our people. Great anger and violence can never build a nation. The apartheid regime uses this strife as a pretext for further oppression” (“We are Committed to Building a Single Nation in Our Country,” 36). Mandela captured the manner in

which the use of violence among Blacks was evidence of a crack in their unity, which was tantamount to loading the guns for the enemy, who used such strife as a pretext for further oppression. The implosion that Mandela and Fanon describe is fictionally captured by J. M. Coetzee in *Waiting*. According to Coetzee, the occupation army wreaked a lot of harm on the people, and the discontent among the people produced a similar implosion as was evident in apartheid South Africa.

The psychological damage caused by state sponsored brutality and injustice leaves a festering wound. And if such wounds are not healed, they will haunt the society for a long time. The cause and effect of a state sponsored violence produced a rupture within the moral fabric of the society, and that rupture propelled Mandela to call out the bad leaders in very harsh tones. Mandela's performative ethos is made manifest in the way that the violence within Black communities broke his heart, and he used every opportunity to call them to unite. Mandela describes apartheid as: "[A] deadly cancer in our midst, setting house against house and eating away at the precious ties that bind us together. This strife amongst ourselves wastes our energy and destroys our unity. My message to those of you involved in this battle of brother against brother is this: take your guns, your knives, and your *pangas* [machetes], and throw them into the sea. Close down the death factories. *End this war now!* [emphasis in the original]" (Mandela, ("We are Committed to Building a Single Nation in Our Country,"³¹). The language used to denounce the internal strife validated Mandela's role as the *imbongi* and showcased his braided rhetoric. The braided nature of his rhetoric is evident in his deployment of his usual communal trope as well as his listing of "your guns, your knives, and your *pangas*." The listing depicts how Mandela swings from one language and rhetorical tradition to another. The metaphor of the "death factories" is reminiscent of Nazi holocaust as a way of portraying the devastation of the implosion. Mandela's

description of the implosion caused by apartheid as “a deadly cancer in our midst” projected an image of morbidity that had the power to destroy the Black communities faster than the apartheid oppression.

In addition, Mandela recognized apartheid as the major force behind this inter-tribal violence. His communal trope that condemned how the communal rupture was “setting house against house and eating away at the precious ties that bind us together” is a significant aspect of the African rhetorical tradition. This description of “house against house” echoes Chinua Achebe’s *Things Fall Apart*. Mandela is, however, the antithesis of Achebe’s protagonist, Okonkwo. Okonkwo’s rigidity constituted his tragic flaw, while Mandela’s misunderstood flexibility was an important part of his rhetorical appeal.

Mandela’s Feminist Sensibilities

It is important to examine Mandela’s feminist sensibilities because the role of women in conflict cannot be underestimated as he evinces. Mandela’s recognition of that fact added punch to his political rhetoric and depicted another form of shift. The paradigm shift regarding the issue of gender inequality is further evidence of his flexibility, and it acts as a window into the pathos he has the ability to evoke. The manner in which the subordination of women was enacted in Black culture and within apartheid South Africa brought to the fore Mandela’s ingrained sense of justice and fairness. This flexibility on Mandela’s part can be described as something that occurs at a more conscious level, which also serves to deconstruct an idea he had internalized at an unconscious level. At an unconscious level, Mandela had accepted the subordination of women because that was the normal practice in his traditional society. For example, Mandela states that “[t]he

foundation of self-government was that all men were free to voice their opinions, and equal in their value as citizens. (Women, I am afraid, were deemed second-class citizens.)” (*Long Walk*, 21). Mandela’s reference to the subordination of women shows what Burke refers to as an attitudinal shift that is first articulated in speech before the performative enactment.

The attitudinal shift toward gender equality can be ascribed to Mandela’s connectedness to the subordination of Blacks in racialized South Africa. The point being made here is that at the bottom of the racial hierarchy, gender is redefined, and the female gender is doubly subjugated. Oyeronke Oyewumi argues that “African women suffered a “double colonization:” one form from European domination and the other from indigenous tradition imposed by African men” (340). Everyone, regardless of their gender, is subjugated, and every member of the populace is important in the fight against apartheid. According to Oyewumi, the colonial situation was a gendered one and the hierarchy fourfold, not two; with “beginning at the top, men (European), women (European), native (African men), and Other (African women). Native women occupied the residual and unspecified category of the Other” (340). Mandela’s paradigm shift proceeds from his recognition of this fourfold subjugation of women particularly in conflict. He empathizes with women because, having experienced oppression by the racist apartheid regime, a conscious awareness of female oppression is created.

Mandela’s keen awareness that any form of discrimination, be it racial or gender, will ultimately result in injustice and oppression contributes towards his performative ethos. Mandela’s accommodation of women within his expanded paradigm indicates the extent to which he had come to identify with them. His feminine sensibility was particularly significant because “African females were colonized by Europeans as African and as African women...They were dominated, exploited, and inferiorized as Africans together with African men and then separately inferiorized

and marginalized as African women” (Oyewumi, 340). Within the apartheid hierarchy, Black men and women are commonly inferiorized and subjugated, and this commonality creates a bond that proves useful for the anti-apartheid movement. Mandela recognized and seized the opportunity, which he deployed to an advantage. Mandela’s empathy for the suffering women had to endure by the national and inter-ethnic conflicts reflects his fatherly role. This empathy showed his humanity, humility, and appreciation of the significance of everyone in conflict management.

Mandela’s recognition of women’s contribution to the anti-apartheid movement is remarkable. This is because most nationalist leaders have been accused of using women to achieve their aims and thereafter, dumping them when it came time to reap the benefits of the nationalist movement. Anne McClintock claims that “[a]ll Nationalisms are gendered; all are invented; and all are dangerous” (89). McClintock argues that “[e]ven Fanon, who at other moments knew better, writes: ‘The look that the native turns on the settler town is a look of lust... to sit at the settler’s table, to sleep in the settler’s bed, with his wife if possible’” (89). McClintock takes exception to Fanon’s narrow view of the contested space. Thus, “[f]or Fanon, both colonizer and colonized are here unthinkingly male, and the Manichean agon of decolonization is waged over the territoriality of female, domestic space” (McClintock, 90). Fanon’s view notwithstanding, women have been implicated in nationalism as active participants in national struggles, but “[m]ilitarization and the centralization of authority in a country automatically entail a resurgence of the authority of the father” (McClintock, 93). McClintock further argues that “[w]omen are typically constructed as symbolic bearers of the nation but are denied any direct relation to national agency” (90). The fact is that women were often used to actively engage the colonialist in military combat; however, they did not get to enjoy the gains of victory.

The metaphor of the doors of tradition getting slammed in women's faces indicates that women were treated as tools to be used and afterwards dumped under the guise of tradition (McClintock, 110). In a pure nationalist revolution, both women and men should be empowered to decide which traditions are outmoded, which should be transformed, and which should be preserved. The argument of male nationalists, which claims that colonialism or capitalism has been women's ruin with patriarchy merely a nasty second cousin destined to wither away when the real villain expires, has been disproved in independent nations as McClintock, Ann Laura Stoter, and Oyeronke Oyewumi have argued. The question then is – was Mandela merely paying lip service to feminism as a maidservant to nationalism or did he truly make a radical shift with regards to his former masculinist beliefs?

The extent to which post-apartheid South Africa addressed issues of gender equality needs to be examined further, but within the scope of this project, gender roles are interrogated to reveal the extent to which they help to reinforce Mandela's performative ethos. However, when Mandela says that "I pay tribute to the mothers and wives and sisters of our nation. You are the rock-hard foundation of our struggle. Apartheid has inflicted more pain on you than on anyone else" ("Now is the Time" 29), he is expressing the way women have suffered double colonization under apartheid; and therefore, he connects his pain to theirs. Mandela personally suffered alongside his wife, mother, daughters, and sisters. His wife, Winnie was hounded far more than most other females by virtue of her position as his spouse as well as the active role she played in the struggle.

By applauding the women for their courageous role in the struggle, it can be argued that Mandela was connecting the women's role to his communal trope within a new platform of female empowerment for the future. To support this argument, on assumption of office in 1994, Mandela sets up Women's Day on August 9, 1994 to celebrate the women who fought to end apartheid. On

Women's Day on August 9, 1996, Mandela gave a speech where he outlined some of his measures to promote equality between men and women like the ratification of The Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women and the promulgation of The Commission on Gender Equality. He also declared that "as long as women are bound by poverty and as long as they are looked down upon, human rights will lack substance" ("Women's Day, Pretoria, 9 August, 1996"). It can also be argued that women were rewarded for their suffering in Mandela's government, based on the positions they occupied.

The fact is that even though the death toll is usually higher among the male gender in war situations than the female gender, women and children bear the brunt of the carnage caused by conflicts. Consequently, Mandela exhorts the women of Natal, the Black community worst hit by intra-Black violence, to rise up to the occasion in order to take control and stem the tide of violence. Mandela says: "[i]t is thus vital that we end the conflict in Natal, and end it now. Everyone must commit themselves to peace. Women of Natal, in the past and at crucial moments, you have shown greater wisdom than your menfolk. It was you who, in 1929 and again in 1959, identified and struck out at one of the roots of our oppression. You launched powerful campaigns around beer halls" ("We are Committed to Building a Single Nation in Our Country," 37). Is Mandela indicating that women had the potential to pull down the apartheid regime as they had succeeded in fighting against social vices like alcohol abuse? Applauding the wisdom women had displayed in dealing with social problems in the society sets up a new social order.

For example, Mandela says that "[w]omen such as Dorothy Nyembe, Gladys Manzi, and Ruth Shabane showed sharpness of mind by closing down the beer hall when the men were rendered useless by alcohol and families were being broken up. I hope that the women will again stand up and put their shoulders to the wheel together with the community to end the strife and

violence.” (“We are Committed to Building a Single Nation in Our Country,” 37). Feminists must have applauded Mandela’s speech because he appeared to be raising women above men and upturning the existing social and cultural gender order. What Mandela actually does is a rhetorical move where he amplifies a past event as a means of drawing attention to a present situation in need of redress. Is Mandela playing one gender against another? Mandela deconstructs patriarchy by boldly calling out those he views as acting unwisely, and in this case, it is the Black men who have forgotten who their common enemy is. It can then be argued that Mandela celebrates the “immense strength” alluded to by Helen Cixious, which in itself would be a boost to his performative ethos. According to Cixious, “[m]en have committed the greatest crime against women. Insidiously, violently, they have led them to hate women, to be their own enemies, to mobilize their immense strength against themselves, to be the executants of their virile needs” (“The Laugh of the Medusa” in *The Rhetorical Tradition*, 1234). Can Mandela be accused of mobilizing this “immense strength” of women against men in his speech?

If that is the case, it can be argued that Mandela employed *Kairos*, yet again, as the occasion demanded. If Mandela pits women against men by turning the patriarchal premise on its head; he does so in keeping with his consistent ability to do whatever is necessary to advance the cause of the struggle. The point being made here is that patriarchy has been entrenched on the premise that the female gender is cognitively inferior to the male gender. But Mandela is here claiming that women have disproved this premise, particularly in a crisis situation. Mandela does something unique in the following words:

I call on the women of Natal. Each and every one of you must play your part! I charge you with a special responsibility here today. It is you, in your wisdom now, who must begin the work of bringing peace to Natal. Tell your sons, your brothers, and your husbands, that you want peace and security. It is you who must show them the real enemy. All women know of mass poverty and homelessness, of children dying from

diseases caused by hunger, poverty, and repression. We must therefore end the strife and the fighting and the misunderstanding in the community so that we defeat our common enemy, the apartheid regime. Open the cooking pots and ask them why there is so little food inside. When the rains come into your homes, place the hands of your men in pools on the floor, and ask them: “Why?” When your child ails, and you have no money to take it to the doctor, ask them: “Why?” There is only one answer, and the answer is our common deprivation. Go out and meet the women of the other side. Their story is the same. Then take your men with you. I want to hear from you. From each and every community, I want a report. I want to hear the story of how you made the peace. We place our trust in you. Viva our mother! Viva our sisters! Viva the women of our land! (“We are Committed to Building a Single Nation in Our Country,”38).

In upholding the important roles that women have played in the past, Mandela places a significant responsibility upon the shoulders of the Black women who demonstrated the essential bravery needed at that moment. Mandela depicts a picture of women who have agency in a way that is contrary to previous patriarchal portrayals of female weakness and subservience. These depictions that construct women as being preoccupied with the safety of their children and homes are traditional and longstanding. Such preoccupations tend to give women the moral authority to call upon others to do good. Mandela remodels these active roles as a tool for leadership and freedom fighting. In connecting the women with the land, Mandela’s communal trope and braided rhetoric is deployed to indicate that the liberation of the land is dependent on the agency of the women in light of the failure on the part of men. Mandela may have clothed his revolutionary ideas about women in traditional-sounding invocations; however, the post-revolution roles of women need to exceed the conservative duties of moral and educational authority in the home, care of men/children, and the maintenance of anticolonial ethnic identities and traditions to embrace political roles that are independent of those gendered roles.

For these gendered roles to be reconstructed, female agency must be recognized and encouraged. Mandela says, “Tell your sons, your brothers, and your husbands, that you want peace and security. It is you who must show them the real enemy” (“We are Committed to Building a

Single Nation in Our Country,” 38). This exhortation was significant because he creates this binary picture of female wisdom versus the folly of their menfolk. The inability of the menfolk to appreciate the divisive tactics of the “real enemy” fostered a toxic environment of in-fighting, insecurity, and lack of peace. We get a sense that the women named in Mandela’s speech and the actions described that had the power to bring a business like the sale of liquor to its knees were quite significant. The fact that such actions were publicly applauded in his speech showed that Mandela’s motives in the struggle extended beyond the liberation of Black South Africans. Such a public stamp of approval upon the women’s actions indicated an interest in the survival and cohesiveness of the African communities at the physical, financial, and psychological levels. In essence, the general activities in the public space make a huge impact on the domestic front, and the domestic space constitutes the bedrock of a strong community.

The manner in which the domestic front can impact events in the public space is captured in Mandela’s speech as a ploy to make the men more accountable for the catastrophic conditions their families were forced to live in. Mandela evoked some new psychodynamics in calling upon women to make the domestic front impactful upon the public domain. This new order is far removed from the political configuration of his childhood whereby women neither had a say in nor had much of an impact on the male dominated political sphere. The power of women to change the political trajectory of the struggle was captured by one of the key leaders of the ANC in the following words: “[w]hen the women begin to take an active part in the struggle, no power on earth can stop us from achieving freedom in our lifetime” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 220). The image conjured here is reminiscent of women’s capacity to muster their immense strength to build or destroy as Cixious argued.

It is pertinent to ask the following question – was Mandela’s rhetoric and feminist sensibilities an exploitation of the knowledge of female strength akin to a Machiavellian manipulation? Unlike Machiavelli, Mandela’s performative ethos was wrapped up in empathy and conciliation. It can be argued that Mandela was not interested in weakening the strong. The anti-apartheid struggle was a movement that aimed to create equality for all. This equality would not suddenly make the poor rich or make the rich poor, but it would, instead, create equal opportunities for everyone regardless of race, gender, or creed. The terms under which to enthrone the equality sought in this struggle are clearly spelt out in the Freedom Charter such as equal pay for equal work for men and women as well as maternity leave on full pay for all working mothers. Therefore, Mandela’s flexibility in constructing a new rhetoric around gender roles can be described as a part of his kairotic ontology that stems from a strong desire to do whatever is exigent to minimize the suffering of the people, who have already suffered too much.

Identification as an Integral Part of Mandela’s Ethos

Although the apartheid regime made deliberate attempts to damage Mandela’s life and reputation, his empathetic side enabled him to identify with whites. For example, Mandela says that “[a] number of obstacles to the creation of a non-racial democratic South Africa remain and need to be tackled. The fears of whites about their rights and place in a South Africa they do not control exclusively are an obstacle we must understand and address” (“The Masses of Our People are Making History,” 28). Mandela’s appreciation of the fear that drove apartheid violence is a sign of both his flexibility and his performative ethos. Mandela’s empathy caused him to seek conciliation through the positive face. The idea of recognizing a person’s positive face informed Mandela’s show of sympathy towards the white minority, who were afraid of being dominated by

the numerical strength of the Black population. Mandela appreciated the fact that this fear was valid and could only be overcome through justice and equality. Considering the pain that the apartheid regime of racism had caused him, he was able to recognize that ‘fear’ was a strong enough emotion to complicate the idea of white supremacy. The manner in which a white superiority complex can be complicated by fear can best be appreciated in systemic racism. The brutality that emanates from fear-induced acts can be extreme.

This extreme enacts a disconnect that accounts for how the psychodynamics of racism produces a cycle. This cycle causes the oppressor and the oppressed to become solidly trapped within essentialism, to the extent that both groups live in mutual fear of each other. Consequently, apartheid laws that aimed to put Blacks in their place were inhuman. This inhumanity was decried by General Smuts, who was a white Nationalist himself, as “a crazy concept, born of prejudice and fear” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 112). Despite this warning by one of their own, the white minority failed to recognize how deeply entrenched this fear had become. Mandela empathizes with the whites who harbour this fear. He says that “[w]e would like to assure our white brothers and sisters in this country that they have nothing to fear” (“We Must Organize the Masses of Our People into the Struggle,” 44). Mandela was aware that this fear had caused whites to be unyielding and unwilling to share power. They were afraid of losing their privilege position, of being outnumbered and dominated, and of possible retaliatory policies.

Mandela argued that the demand of the ANC for every South African to determine their fate through a policy of “one person, one vote” would ensure racial peace and harmony in the country. He further reasoned that: “[b]ut we are conscious of the fact that Whites are honestly worried that this demand may result in the domination of whites by blacks. We want to assure them that we, the African National Congress, are prepared to examine this fear. Because, although

it is mistaken, we believe that it is genuine. And we will do everything in our power, together with the National Party, to ensure that the whites do not fear a future democratic South Africa” (Mandela, “We Must Organize the Masses of Our People into the Struggle,” 45). Mandela’s performative ethos was particularly appealing because his words in the above quote re-echoed his famous speech in 1964 before his final sentencing and long incarceration.

By addressing the concerns of white South Africans, Mandela’s rhetoric gains a different flavour. His identification and empathy depict a leadership style that begins to shift more decisively from that of a freedom fighter to that of a statesman. Mandela was not dismissive of the fears white South Africans had of being dominated; rather, he made it known that any form of domination of one race by another went against the principles he stood for. For example, in his famous speech from the dock, “An Ideal for which I am Prepared to Die,” Mandela argues that “we want equal political rights, because without them our disabilities will be permanent. I know this sounds revolutionary to the whites in this country, because the majority of voters will be Africans. This makes the white man fear democracy. But this fear cannot be allowed to stand in the way of the only solution which will guarantee racial harmony and freedom for all” (“An Ideal...”). The psychodynamics behind apartheid had always been used by Mandela to illuminate the root cause of a complex problem. His reference to this fear at every opportunity seemed like an effort to make excuses for the oppressors; however, this reference is deployed to force a self-examination that no one can escape from.

The fear of equality had long been wrapped in layers of falsehood and machinations, which were exemplified in racist policies. According to Mandela, “[i]t is not true that the enfranchisement of all will result in racial domination. Political division, based on colour, is entirely artificial and, when it disappears, so will the domination of one colour group by another. The ANC has spent

half a century fighting against racialism. When it triumphs as it certainly must, it will not change that policy...” (“An Ideal...”). Mandela’s appreciation of the problem that the Afrikaner’s fear of racial equality had created for South Africans did not mean he would embrace the position of a second-class citizen. That recognition enabled him see the struggle as a psychological war that must be won. His resilience in the face of danger is captured in the following words: “During my lifetime, I have dedicated my life to this struggle of the African people. I have fought against white domination, and I have fought against black domination. I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons will live together in harmony and with equal opportunities. It is an ideal for which I hope to live for and to see realised. But, My Lord, if it needs be, it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die” (Mandela, “An Ideal”). Mandela’s preparedness to die for the ideal is responsible for his refusal to accept a conditional release from jail.

This refusal of a conditional release was proof of his transcendental ethos, which was firmly rooted in his strong identification with his people. The employment of identification by Mandela is multilayered. At the surface level, his language reinforced his identification with the people by the way he referred to them, using the terms of ownership. On a deeper level, he suffered with them, in the sense that their pain was his pain. This phenomenon is quite common among leaders because, as Kenneth Burke argues, “[w]hen you are with Athenians, it’s easy to praise Athenians, but not when you are with Lacedaemonians” (*A Rhetoric*, 55). In as much as Mandela’s identification was articulated linguistically through his continual reference to his fellow Blacks as “my people”, “my brothers”, and “sisters”, he performed this identification through various actions. These actions were as persuasive as his actual words.

Mandela’s actions proved that he was prepared to suffer the same fate as his fellow Black South Africans. Burke argues that “[y]ou persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language

by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your ways with his” (*A Rhetoric*, 55). Mandela made himself consubstantial with his people in their suffering in several ways. For example, in prison, racism was enacted through various methods, and one of them was through the “rhetoric of clothing” whereby short pants were given to Black prisoners. Clothes were used to differentiate races. According to Mandela, “[a]partheid’s regulations extended even to clothing. All of us, except Kathy, received short trousers, an insubstantial jersey, and a canvas jacket. Kathy, the one Indian among us, was given long trousers. Normally, Africans would receive sandals made from car tires, but in this instance, we were given shoes. Kathy, alone, received socks. Short trousers for Africans were meant to remind us that we were “boys.” I put on the trousers that day, but I vowed that I would not put up with them for long” (*Long Walk*, 383). When Mandela protested against the different treatment of prisoners according to their races, whereby Black prisoners were subjected to poorer diet and clothes, he was put in solitary confinement. Solitary confinement served to erode the identification Mandela performed all through the struggle.

Mandela sought to foster communion and camaraderie with his fellow Blacks in prison in consonance with his communal trope. Though hating the humiliation of being poorly clothed and fed, “he readily reconciles himself to sharing the indignity of shorts and the deprivation of cold mealie pap” (Schalkwyk, 56) than to be separated from his fellow oppressed prisoners. Consequently, “[wh]en he is offered long trousers at the beginning of his second term on Robben Island, he refuses the offer unless everyone is offered a pair” (Schalkwyk, 56). Mandela’s performative ethos is demonstrated as a totality of being. In essence, his physical and psychological survival was important for the struggle. Mandela says that the condition in the “[p]rison is designed to break one’s spirit and destroy one’s resolve...the authorities attempt to

exploit every weakness, demolish every initiative, negate all signs of individuality – all with the idea of stamping out that spark that makes each of us human and each of us who we are” (*Long Walk*, 390). The desire to crush the spirit of the opposition was the motivation behind solitary confinement.

The psychological torture of solitary confinement was described to vividly capture the imagination. According to Mandela, “[a]fter a time in solitary, I relished the company even of the insects in my cell and found myself on the verge of initiating conversations with a cockroach” (*Long Walk*, 334). In essence, the leaders were targeted for physical and psychological dehumanization. This dehumanization was extended to anyone regardless of race who dared to oppose the apartheid regime. For example, Ruth First, who was a journalist, a communist, and a staunch supporter of the ANC, was a white woman. She was detained under the 90 days law, which had the power to detain anyone without charge or trial. First describes apartheid’s terrorist tactics of intimidation as operating through various trajectories. First’s attempt to “focus the world’s attention on the plight of the regime’s physical and mental torture machine” (First, 5) was avenged through several detentions and her ultimate assassination. First’s description of her detention echoes Mandela’s experience in the following words: “It was a technique based on a diabolically simple principle: assault the prisoner’s only companion in an isolation cell – the mind” (First, 5). What would make one group of people subject their fellow human beings to such cruel treatment?

To attempt an answer to this question, it is pertinent to understand the metaphor often employed in racism. Fanon argued that the Black race was referred to in zoological terms. In essence, Blacks were not regarded to be human. According to Sartre in Fanon’s *Wretched*, “since none may enslave, rob, or kill his fellow-man without committing a crime, they lay down the principle that the native is not one of our fellow-men” (13). Therefore, if Blacks were not regarded

as human, then whites have already created a psychological distance that made the dehumanization of Blacks a natural sequence. The metaphor that enables such a poor treatment of Blacks requires severe interrogation, considering that no one who is psychologically stable goes out of their way to inflict violence on innocent animals. The metaphor employed for describing Blacks is similar to Hitler's description of Jews. Hitler referred to Jews as vermin, pests, and parasite. Pests and parasites are naturally destroyed to preserve the life of the host.

Using such metaphors to describe the Jews gained for Hitler the people's support. Consequently, those Jews and other races, who had no service to render, were slaughtered in the holocaust. In the case of Blacks in South Africa, they still had some usefulness. They served as cheap labour, but they were not entitled to the same standard of life enjoyed by whites. Therefore, Blacks were viewed as beasts of burdens who could be used to till a white farmer's land without adequate compensation. Blacks were treated as some hybrid creature who is half-human, half-animal. When these so-called creatures began to agitate for human rights, there seemed to be a disconnect that the white minority could not handle. Mandela suffered the same inhuman treatment at the hands of the apartheid government as his fellow Blacks, and he joined his suffering with theirs, rather than enjoy any form of token privilege.

This chapter surmises that Mandela's rhetorical appeal was deeply rooted in his performative ethos, which was demonstrated over the course of the freedom struggle. His ethos was not the absence of human flaws; instead, it was evidence that despite his flaws, he remained committed to the anti-apartheid movement regardless of the personal cost. His ability to rise above primordial sentiments, despite his painful experiences, was evidence of his statesmanship. His contact with people of different races and ideologies partly informed his braided rhetoric. Mandela's ethos was transcendental particularly because he did not aim to mainly gain advantage

over his adversaries; rather, he exemplified dynamic leadership through moral superiority (Burke, *A Rhetoric*, 60). Mandela's leadership role placed him in a very difficult position because the great responsibility placed on his shoulders predisposed him to making difficult choices.

Critics have pointed out the contradictions that trailed Mandela's choices during the struggle. However, Mandela draws attention to the complexities he had to deal with; therefore, "[a]s a leader, one must sometimes take actions that are unpopular, or whose results will not be known for years to come" (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 390). The ethos upon which Mandela's rhetoric gained global appeal stemmed more from his ability to embody identification than from the gift of a rhetorical garb. As Burke argues, the various meanings associated with rhetoric have to be contextualized because "though these meanings are often not consistent with one another, or are even flatly at odds, we do believe that they can derived from "persuasion" as the "Edenic" term from which they have all "Babylonically" split, while "persuasion" in turn involves communication by the signs of consubstantiality, an appeal in *identification*" (*A Rhetoric*, 61-62). Mandela's identification was not constrained to any particular race or rhetorical tradition, but he displayed a unique rhetorical style that was eclectic as he appropriated different rhetorical and literary traditions. Mandela's consistent fidelity to his ideals in prison and outside the walls of prison made him appealing to some and repelling to others. The flexibility he sometimes depicted, while being rigid at other times, meant that his rhetoric would often defy easy classification without undermining his ethos.

Chapter 4:

Apartheid's Legal Screens and Mandela's Luminescence

This chapter examines the legal framework of apartheid South Africa and how this framework was practically a racial subterfuge that was crafted to appear benign. The manner in which legal rhetoric was exploited in order to mask the racist ideologies of apartheid policies requires serious interrogation. The legal rhetoric was particularly complex because the racist ideologies were strongly embedded within the belief system of the Afrikaners. Therefore, it becomes difficult to draw the line between where the Afrikaners' idea of self-preservation ends and the malignancy towards Blacks begins. In essence, the legal rhetoric with which the policies of apartheid were formulated amounted to screens for ideological baselines. According to Crapanzano, some laws were "blatantly discriminatory", while others were covertly so. For example, "although no legislation specifically forbids integrated sports, most sports are in fact segregated" (xx). It can be argued that the apartheid government deflected attention from the overt discrimination their laws embodied, while the full range of the powers the policies constituted were evident in their implementation.

To appreciate the implication of the unjust laws, it is instructive to see how such "policies are complemented by illegal pressures, threats, harassment, sabotage, and personal violence" (Crapanzano, xx) that were deployed for the enforcement of those policies. The manner in which the layers of moral disconnection enacted by white South Africans were justified using categories, images, and figures makes Mandela's braided rhetoric particularly significant. Mandela's overt rhetorical moves expose what Crapanzano describes as a classificatory system designed to legalize Blacks out of existence (20) and get the victims to take the blame. This system employed various methods for suppressing Africans in ways that were often insidious and deceptive.

Of significant importance is Mandela's nuanced rhetorical deployments of tropes similar to those used to justify apartheid policies in order to illuminate the implicit deceptions. The rhetorical strategies were effective because they brought into perspectives the moral bankruptcy behind the political and social structures of the apartheid regime. Mandela employed overt and covert methods for revealing what were deliberately concealed within apartheid policies that were instruments for oppressing Blacks. Mandela's braided rhetoric effectively illuminated the injustices and inconsistencies entrenched within apartheid legal frameworks at every given opportunity. The policies in question were crafted to hide the racial prejudices of the regime, which resulted in the violation of basic human rights like freedom of speech, movement, and association. Kenneth Burke's concept of "Terministic Screens" proves productive for theorizing the manner in which the apartheid government attempted to direct attention away from the unjust nature of their laws.

Mandela's speech "A Black Man in a white Court", which was used in his first court defense from 15 October to 7 November, 1962 (when he was accused of two counts of inciting persons to strike illegally in the 1961 stay-at-home and for unlawfully leaving the country), captures the racist laws and unjust legal system in South Africa. He extracted symbols from the Western rhetorical tradition, juxtaposed with the narrative texture and tropes of the African rhetorical tradition, to portray how these laws continued to exploit the Western legal lexicon to keep Blacks dominated. In addition, *A Long Walk to Freedom*, his other writings, and speeches help to examine apartheid concealments and Mandela's illuminating strategies in a way that symbolizes a rhetorical tug of war. To undertake this study, Mandela's strategies will be examined under the following sub-headings: (1) Terministic Screens in the Apartheid Legal Framework; (2) Mandela's Contextual Tropes; (3) Religious Rhetoric in Conflict Engagement; (4) Subverting

Apartheid Machiavellianism; (5) Mandela's Narratives as a Legal Rhetorical Strategy; and (6) Illuminating Legal Racism in Civilization.

Terministic Screens in the Apartheid Legal Framework

Mandela's braided rhetoric follows a trajectory, which intersects with his personal experiences for exposing apartheid equivocations. It is important to examine Mandela's methods for exposing apartheid screens, which were intended to conceal racist motives. Burke describes "Terministic Screens" as a "selection of reality," which function also as a deflection of reality (*Language as Symbolic Action*, 45). The idea of "selection of reality" or "deflection of reality" is compared to Pascal's idea of "directing the intention" in his satire (Burke, *Language*, 45). This idea of directing the intention satirizes an act among the Jesuits whereby their actual intentions are masked in a subterfuge that is deliberately deceptive. According to Burke, Pascal describes a scenario whereby "[d]uelling was forbidden by the Church" (*Language*, 45), but in order to take part in a duel, the duellist came up with a clever plot.

In this scenario, instead of intentionally going to take part in a duel, the duellist would merely go for a walk to the place where the duel was to be held. And they would carry guns merely as a precautionary means of self-protection in case they happened to meet an armed enemy. By so "directing the intention," "they could have their duel without having transgressed the Church's thou-shalt-not's against duelling. For it was perfectly proper to go for a walk; and in case one encountered an enemy bent on murder, it was perfectly proper to protect oneself in self-defense" (Burke, *Language*, 45). Burke argues that the idea of directing the attention deploys terministic screens for such subterfuges. Terms such as 'merely' going for a walk and carrying a gun "merely"

for self-protection are used as excuses to undertake a well-conceived intention. The use of such terms as “merely” doing this or that connects to the apartheid policy of separateness as “merely” an intention to protect the whites against the “Black danger.”

The idea of the so-called “Black danger” is deeply rooted in the racial consciousness of South African whites. At the unconscious level, the fear of the Black danger was to play a huge part in producing the moral disconnect behind apartheid laws and their implementation. For example, Dr. Malan, the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa in 1954, captured the psychodynamics behind the concept of the Black danger in the following words:

It must be appreciated from the outset that Apartheid, separation, segregation or differentiation - whatever the name given the traditional racial policy of South Africa – is part and parcel of the South African tradition as practiced since the first Dutch settlement at the Cape in 1652, and still supported by the large majority of white South Africans of the main political parties. The deep-rooted color consciousness of the White South Africans – a phenomenon quite beyond the comprehension of the uninformed – arises from the fundamental differences between the two groups, White and Black (Fiona Mclachlan quoting Dr. Malan, 95).

Mclachlan examines the manipulation of colour difference as a phenomenon that goes beyond merely the physical manifestation of skin color to the contrast between two irreconcilable ways of life; between barbarism and civilization, between heathenism and Christianity, and finally between overwhelming numerical odds on the one hand and insignificant numbers on the other. In essence, Mclachlan undercuts Dr. Malan’s projection of racial difference as a given by arguing that such a projection was a manifestation of fear and long held beliefs. Racial difference was exploited at the psychosocial, spiritual, cultural, linguistic, and financial levels to keep the minority trapped in a moral prison. For example, Dr. Malan argues that “from the outset the European colonists were far out-numbered; there is no doubt that if they had succumbed to the temptation of assimilation, they would have been submerged in the Black heathendom of Africa as effectively as if they had been completely annihilated. Of necessity they had to arm and protect themselves

against this ever-growing menace, and how could it better be done than by throwing an impenetrable armor around themselves – armor of racial purity and self-preservation?” (Mclachlan, 95). Malan’s words were addressed to a group of Christian Reformed Church ministers in Grand Rapids, Michigan, who wanted to understand the situation in South Africa. Because these people were fellow whites like Dr. Malan, there was no need to conceal the racist bent of Apartheid policies from them.

Basically, the apartheid regime presented a selection of reality to an audience they believed would be sympathetic to their sentiments, while deflecting attention from this racialized reality when addressing a different audience. Mandela depicted the “selection” and “deflection” of reality of apartheid policies by interrogating the motives behind those policies. His interrogation helped to expose the deeper semantic implications of the surface lexical structure of apartheid policies. The point being made here is that laws like the Groups Areas Act and the “Keystone of Apartheid: The Bantustan or “Homeland” Act of 1950 (Mclachlan, 76-77) were based on the idea of self-governing homelands that let Blacks develop along their own lines. According to Mandela, “[p]olitically, the talk about self-government for the Reserves is a swindle. Economically, it is an absurdity” (*The Struggle*...81). Most significantly, the policies were crafted in a language that masked the intentions of racial subjugation.

For example, the concept of development along their own lines in an independent homeland of the Bantustan Act appears beneficial, but the semantic implication of separate unequal development and deprivation is well concealed. That is because “once a homeland becomes “independent,” its “citizens” automatically lose their South African citizenship, whether they live in the homeland or not” (Mclachlan, 77). To buttress this point, Mandela declares that:

Dr. Verwoerd may deceive the simple-minded Nationalist voter with his talk of Bantustans, but he will not deceive anyone else, neither the African people, nor the great world beyond the borders of this country. We have heard such talks before, and we know what it means. Like everything else that has come from the Nationalist Government, it spells nothing but fresh hardships and suffering to the masses of the people. Behind the fine talk of 'self-government' is a sinister design (*The Struggle...81*).

The deceptive nature of Dr. Verwoerd's fine talk, apartheid oppressive policies, and the real meaning plus the implications of those policies formed the premise for Mandela's move for recusal in "A Black Man in a white Court." Apartheid deceptions depict how conflict makes terministic screens oscillate in very interesting ways. Burke's description of how photographs are produced captures apartheid legal practices. Burke says that, "I have particularly in mind some photographs I once saw. There were different photographs of the same objects, the difference being that they were made with different colour filters. Here something so "factual" as a photograph revealed notable distinctions in texture, and even in form, depending upon which colour filter was used for the documentary description of the event recorded" (Burke, *Language*, 45). Mandela identified the polarity of Black versus white as the nexus around which the "colour filter" and screens of all apartheid policies revolve. These colour filters are depicted in Mandela's move for recusal.

Mandela's premise for recusal was based on the need to illuminate the strategies devised for concealing apartheid racist intent. His rhetoric underscores the ideas depicted in terministic screens as a means of interrogating apartheid modus operandi in judicial matters. The rhetorical questions Mandela employed in court were a rhetorical strategy prevalent in the Western and African rhetorical traditions he drew upon, and he used them for exposing apartheid racism. To defend his call for recusal, Mandela asks: "What is this rigid colour-bar in the administration of justice? Why is it that in this courtroom, I face a white magistrate, I am confronted by a white

prosecutor, and escorted into the dock by a white orderly? Can anyone honestly and seriously suggest that in this type of atmosphere, the scales of justice are evenly balanced?” (“A Black man”). Mandela’s rhetorical questions set the tone for unravelling the courtroom setting, which was the most obvious sign of racial inequality.

Mandela’s questions deploy symbolism – as a rhetorical move to call attention to the “colour-bar” and the unbalanced “scales of justice” of the apartheid legal system. Lady Justice is the symbolic bedrock of the Western legal system, and Mandela’s evocation of this symbol is effective for throwing light upon apartheid injustice. Mandela’s employment of this symbol is theorized by Burke, who describes (the generic) man as “the symbol-using animal” (*Language*, 2) and Charles Morris, who describes human beings as “the dominant sign-using animals” (17). Burke’s and Morris’s concepts depict the manner in which symbols and signs transcend the syntagmatic and paradigmatic levels of communication. For example, the “colour bar” and “scale of justice” are lexical forms, which operate at the syntagmatic level that evoke phenomena that are easily recognizable in apartheid legal systems. However, these lexical forms that are identifiable in apartheid policies and legal system affect the lives of Blacks at every level of existence in very deep ways. Mandela’s use of symbols reinforces how these levels of communication contextualize the exploitation of apartheid power dynamics.

Morris claims that “[h]uman civilization is dependent upon signs and systems of sign, and the human mind is inseparable from the functioning of signs – if indeed mentality is not to be identified with such functioning” (17). Therefore, if Western civilization is directly dependent on the symbol of Lady Justice, Morris’s perspectives on the usage of signs and symbols prove quite fruitful for explaining why Mandela’s deployment of this sign is rhetorically appealing. Morris’s ideas are critical because they encompass the triadic relation of syntax, semantics, and pragmatics

as a way of engaging with Mandela's employment of various signs and symbols in his interrogation of apartheid injustice. According to Morris, "[t]hese three components in semiosis may be called, respectively, "the *sign vehicle*, the *designatum*, and the *interpretant*; the *interpreter* may be included as a fourth factor" (19). Burke and Morris's preoccupation with human motives and interpretation connect strongly with Deirdre Wilson's idea of intersecting the modular and inferential approaches to discourse interpretation. According to Wilson, this intersection whereby the Chomskyan and Gricean concepts of communication act together as cognitive systems, which help to explain how people use language in a certain manner under different circumstances. Based on Wilson's argument, the interpreter draws upon the contextual information to determine "what direct speech act the speaker intended to perform" (1131). Therefore, Mandela's audience can very easily capture the irony of Lady Justice. For Blacks, the irony is depicted in the metaphor of unbalanced scales, which represent injustice; and for his white audience, the irony represents an obvious double standard.

Mandela's symbolic reference to Lady Justice is significant because as Morris argued, the "sign of an object may, at one theoretical extreme, simply turn the interpreter of the sign upon the object, while at the other extreme it would allow the interpreter to take account of all the characteristics of the object in question in the absence of the object itself" (20). It can thus be argued that the absence of justice for Blacks in the apartheid legal system makes Mandela's juxtaposition of the symbolic Lady Justice with the colour-bar particularly potent. The attributes of Lady Justice are embodied in the balanced scales, the sword, and the blindfold. These symbols of justice, which only produce justice in favour of whites, are used by Mandela to draw attention to an absence in presence.

Mandela draws attention to the scales of justice in order to reveal how the apartheid legal system has betrayed their Western heritage. It is pertinent to connect Burke's preoccupation with motives to Morris's idea of taking "account of all the characteristics of the object" (20) to account for Mandela's strategy of drawing attention to the scales of justice. The designatum described by Morris is the symbol of Lady Justice; while the blindfold, the sword, and balanced scales represent the function of her office (which is supposed to produce colourblind justice). However, these symbols like the sword of justice have been perverted and wielded against Blacks. Mandela employed such symbols in the courtroom to effectively expose the apartheid judicial system as an aberration.

Mandela's symbol usage draws his audience into an overarching inferencing whereby a conjuration of Lady Justice exposes the paradox this image evokes for Blacks. Mandela's semiotic discourse operates in line with Saussure's ideas of semiology, which identifies three types of signs that are classified by the relations that occur between signifier and signified (Vincent Leitch, 9). According to Leitch's examination of Saussure: "With the *index*, the relationship is causal: dark clouds mean rain; smoke denotes fire; sobbing signifies sorrow. With the *icon*, the relation is one of resemblance: a portrait bust depicts a particular person. With the *symbol* (or *sign* proper), the relationship is arbitrary: nodding the head signifies "yes" [*ireser*] connotes "eraser." Saussure focuses mostly on the sign (symbol) – on the arbitrary signifier and signified" (9). Mandela's subtle evocation of Lady Justice uses the un/balanced scale to indicate that the index, which represents the relationship between the legal system and the process of producing justice, has failed as far as Blacks are concerned. Therefore, based on Saussure's semiotic signification comprising of the index, icon, and symbol as well as Morris's designatum, Mandela's deployment of Lady Justice implies that the signifier – the symbol of Lady Justice and the signified – justice based on fairness,

equity, and equality have lost their meaning and rhetorical appeal. That is because apartheid has created a system whereby the scale of justice is no longer a synecdoche of fairness based on the ironic reality of Black experience.

Mandela's rhetorical questions also force the audience into a provocative introspection regarding the distortions enacted by the apartheid legal system. For example, the blindfold implies that justice ought to be fair and (colour) blind, but the rigid color bar indicates that apartheid itself and its legal system have negated the symbolic blindfold. Therefore, the color blindness necessary for justice has been metaphorically ripped off the image. As Mandela further explains, the racist laws portend a system that is riddled with prejudice, and that prejudice is the root of the injustices suffered by Blacks. This injustice accounts for his call for recusal because the prejudices already depict a blindfold to truth and fairness. Mandela's evocation of the symbols of the Western legal system is highly rhetorical.

Therefore, as long as Blacks in South Africa are denied their basic rights; (as enunciated by Western law), the blindfold of Lady Justice takes on an ironic symbolism. Thus, the South African Lady Justice is neither blind, nor are her scales balanced because the executors of the justice system that was operating under apartheid have been blinded by racism. This blindness creates a moral vacuum and a psychological disconnect that makes the government unable to appreciate the sufferings of Blacks. The laws of the apartheid regime represent legal positivism that Gordon Tullock describes as a law that "was simply what the state decreed, and morals were not involved" (4). Black South Africans, who have been placed at the bottom of the social pyramid created by apartheid, are subjected to severe hardship as Mandela shows using his narratives.

Mandela's legal rhetoric acts as a form of moral luminescence that is constructed to expose the inherent contradictions in apartheid policies, which serve to dehumanize people of colour.

Mandela exploits his Western legal training, which finds a counterpart in his deeply ingrained African roots, to ironically lay bare the deception of apartheid legal rhetoric. By exploiting the Western legal framework, Mandela symbolically holds up a rhetorical mirror that reflects back to the Afrikaners a distorted image of their legal heritage in a way that is compelling. Mandela's deliberative rhetoric acts as the foundation upon which he braids tropes like irony, symbolism, and narratives as instruments for exposing the chimeric nature of apartheid policies. The first step taken by Mandela is to subject himself to a legal system through which he has been cruelly oppressed. Mandela subjects himself to the law for one significant purpose that is captured in the following words:

I hope to be able to indicate...that this case is a trial of the aspirations of the African people, and because of that I thought it proper to conduct my own defense. I wanted to make it clear to the bench, the gallery, and the press that I intended to put the state on trial. I then made application for the recusal of the magistrate on the grounds that I did not consider myself morally bound to obey laws made by a Parliament in which I had no representation. Nor was it possible to receive a fair trial from a white judge (*Long Walk*, 326).

It is quite important to see how Mandela's subjection of himself to the law is ironically a subjection of the apartheid legal framework to the law of scrutiny. Jacques Derrida describes Mandela's subjection of himself to the apartheid legal system – as a deliberate strategy employed to showcase the illegality of the Afrikaner Nationalist policies. This subjection becomes a powerful rhetorical move for showing Mandela as a man of the law, who is fighting against unjust laws. This move is presented by Rhetorician and Philosopher Phillippe – Joseph Salazar in his description of Mandela's rhetoric as “implicit” without aspiring to present itself as a mastery of public speaking, which would invariably seem redolent of the old regime. In essence, Mandela's rhetorical appeal is dependent on the subtlety that characterizes his language, which he employs to expose the deceptive and violent nature of apartheid laws.

Mandela's Contextual Tropes

The multilayered conflicts in South Africa created a contextual complexity that made Mandela's braided rhetoric and discourse particularly interesting. The role of context in communication is significant, and it is particularly so in the examination of Mandela's rhetoric. Context to Dijk is two-fold: macro and micro. The macro context refers to the historical, cultural, political, and social formations under which communication takes place while the micro context is concerned with the proximate circumstances and context in which a speech event takes place. Dijk views the micro context as located in cognition. This location makes communication a mental event through which symbols regulate the structure of text production and comprehension that are conveyed in genre, topic, cohesion, speech act, style, imagery, and more.

The cognition Dijk refers to is evident in the irony employed by Mandela to construct juxtaposed narratives drawn from various rhetorical traditions. Dijk's ideas echo I. A. Richards' concept that the "macroscopic scale" consists of how the different channels through which large parts of a discourse are communicated. Likewise, the "microscopic scale" is the employment of the theorems whereby units of meaning and their contextual connections are made (24). Richards therefore theorizes context as the fundamental basis for meaning making. Richards's idea is an extension of psychological associations whereby a cluster of ideas, rather than a single image, serves as the "reference" for a discourse. Thus, "context" represents that set of associations through which experiences are expressed in words. Consequently, the South African complex political/social milieu conveys experiences through discourse with layered semantic implications. Therefore, Mandela's strategies for drawing attention to apartheid screens enabled his audience to move from abstractions to concrete realities and vice versa. For example, Mandela uses narratives

that describe his homeland experiences, through which the African rhetorical tradition is made most visible, to make a contrast of the existence of Blacks in South African slums (by drawing on the Western rhetorical tradition) to illuminate the realities of apartheid racist policies, state brutalities, and racial inequalities.

Dijk examines the relationship between discourse and context to give an insight into the cognitive aspect of discourse production and comprehension, which requires vast amounts of shared knowledge of the participants. This shared knowledge is highly active in interactions. In addition, the shared knowledge and interactions give room for manipulations and power abuse in communication. Knowledge of the world and the experiences that are real to members of a community (be it cultural, economic, political, social or whatever it is that brings them into contact) are represented within the semantic components and social memory that are in turn stored in the episodic memory. Mandela exploits this knowledge to strategically communicate his illumination of apartheid deception to his local South African as well as the international audience.

The interconnectivity of context and meaning makes Critical Discourse Analysis, henceforth referred to as CDA, supportive of Burke's preoccupation with human motives as having significant ramifications in conflict. Dijk summarizes the main tenets of CDA as follows: (1) addressing social problems, (2) power relations are discursive, (3) discourse constitutes society and culture, (4) discourse does ideological work, (5) discourse is historical, (6) the link between text and society is mediated, (7) discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory, and (8) discourse is a form of social action ("Critical Discourse Analysis", 2). The complex nature of the apartheid context makes Mandela's tropes particularly engaging because these tropes are effectively used to put the apartheid oppressive system on display.

Mandela's tropes and narratives are recognizable as performing important functions for his audience because of the shared experience of South African people of colour. The metaphors employed by Mandela exemplify Nietzsche's idea that language is comprised of layers of metaphors because human beings think in metaphors. This human predilection to think in metaphors enables the capacity to dilute "concrete metaphors into a scheme by which pyramids are built up according to castes and classes, a new world of laws, privileges, subordinations, boundary determinations, which now stands opposite the other" (Nietzsche, 250). For example, in saying that "I feel oppressed by the atmosphere of white domination that lurks all around in this courtroom" (A Black man in a white court), Mandela uses metaphor to evoke an image of being caged and hunted by white domination. The imagery employed depicts the courtroom as a microcosm of the South African state where Mandela has been hunted by apartheid policies/brutality all through his life as a lawyer and freedom fighter. The imagery is discernible to both white and Black South Africans, but it is only experienced by Africans. In essence, Mandela is producing an expository performance for this multiple audiences through imagery.

Mandela deploys war tropes to further illuminate how the apartheid government regarded the ANC leaders in the following words: "No worthy leaders of a freedom movement will ever submit to conditions which are essentially terms of surrender dictated by a victorious commander to a beaten enemy, and which are really intended to weaken the organization and to humiliate its leadership" (Mandela, "The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement," 17). Mandela's tropes draw on various contexts that he situates within apartheid racial oppression. For example, he evokes war metaphors to reveal that war generals are usually strategic and do not jeopardize their causes for any reason. Mandela captures the need to remain focused in a war situation in the following words:

The existence of genuine democratic values among some of the country's whites in the judiciary, however slender they may be, is welcomed by me. But I have no illusions about the significance of this fact, healthy a sign as it might be. Such honest and upright whites are few and they have certainly not succeeded in convincing the vast majority of the rest of the white population that white supremacy leads to dangers and disaster. However, it would be a hopeless commandant who relied for his victories on the few soldiers in the enemy camp who sympathize with his cause. A competent general pins his faith on the superior striking power he commands and on the justness of his cause which he must pursue uncompromisingly to the bitter end (“A Black Man in a white Court”).

The deployment of the war metaphor in the text “A Black Man...” indicates that Mandela is not swayed by the token support of some whites. Mandela argues that the few whites who are not in support of apartheid policies represent neither the views of the entire white populace nor the apartheid regime. Mandela sees the few whites who support the aspiration of Blacks as significant exceptions. This white support is significant because it depicts an active conscience on the part of some whites in the face of blatant injustice. However, such exceptions cannot achieve much in halting the oppressive activities of the government. Mandela deploys the war metaphor to draw attention to how the apartheid regime had practically declared war on all forms of opposition. Mandela describes the token support of a few white supporters in the following words:

Some of our judicial officers have even openly criticized the policy which refuses to acknowledge that all men are born free and equal, and fearlessly condemned the denial of opportunities to our people. But such exceptions exist in spite of, not because of, the grotesque system of justice that has been built up in this country. These exceptions furnish yet another proof that even among the country's whites there are honest men whose sense of fairness and justice revolts against the cruelty perpetrated by their own white brothers to our people” (“A Black man in a White man’s Court”).

Acknowledgment of white support was important because any form of support for the oppressed represent some victory. But, how does Mandela assess such support/victory? The need to gain support from the white community does not blind Mandela to the fact that tokenism aims to break the ranks of opposition without delivering any lasting gains. The ANC leaders make up

the competent general captured in the war metaphor, whose vigilance and doggedness are prized above the emotions that token support elicits. Hence, the war metaphor employed is very compelling. The reason that Mandela is not moved by the token support is because every conflict is a type of war, be it conflict of identity, wills, culture, or ideology, and the South African conflict that eventually degenerated into bloodshed was further complicated by racism as well as the struggle for land and resources.

It is important to show how Mandela's employment of contextual tropes was strategic because context was the foundation upon which his rhetoric hung. In essence, to produce *energeia* through imagery, he lays a point and builds on that point for emphasis. The point being made here is that if "[a] competent general pins his faith on the superior striking power he commands and on the justness of his cause which he must pursue uncompromisingly to the bitter end" (Mandela, "A Black Man in a white Court"), the justness of the anti-apartheid cause must remain the main focus for the generals – the ANC leaders. Rather than be swayed by token support, Mandela's employment of the war metaphor goes beyond the metaphorical because the cruelty suffered by South African people of color was not an abstraction. That is because Mandela was a war general in the anti-apartheid struggle both figuratively and in actuality. The "justness of the anti-apartheid cause" required him and the ANC leaders to fight on all fronts regardless of what the end would be. And in his case, the bitter end was 27 years in prison and the death of thousands of people of color.

Mandela's plea for recusal depended heavily on phrases that were contextually symbolic. For example, "I entered the court that Monday morning wearing a traditional Xhosa leopard-skin *kaross* instead of a suit and tie. The crowd of supporters rose as one and with raised, clenched fists

shouted “*Amandla*” and “*Ngawethu!*” (*Long Walk*, 324-325). Interestingly, the employment of the symbolic by Mandela transcends language into the emblematic. He exploits the apartheid context to embody rhetoric of clothing in symbolism. For example, Mandela describes his employment of symbolism in the following words: “The *kaross* electrified the spectators, many of whom were friends and family, some of whom had come all the way from the Transkei. Winnie also wore a traditional beaded headdress and an ankle-length Xhosa skirt. I had chosen traditional dress to emphasize the symbolism that I was a black African walking into a white man’s court” (*Long Walk*, 324-325). Mandela’s braided rhetoric is made manifest in this court appearance where his African rhetoric symbolized through clothing is counterpoised with the Western rhetorical tradition symbolized by the apartheid legal system.

Clothing in the African rhetorical tradition is used in a similar way that African talking drums and dance perform “deep-seated rhetorical functions” (Michael J. K. Bokor, 166) differently from how these cultural artefacts are deployed in the Western cultural contexts. Mandela employs clothing to validate Bokor’s argument that “the drum-dance enactment is a primal symbol that serves important rhetorical purposes – to influence the people’s psychosocial behaviour, to generate public awareness, and to prompt responses for the realization of personhood, and the formation of group identity in the various communities” (166). Although clothing and drums are not languages per se, they belong among the system of signs, symbols, and gestures used in communication. Bokor argues that certain socio-cultural milieu and rhetorical situations necessitate and validate the use of symbols like drums (and clothing for Mandela) for achieving rhetorical impact (168). It can be argued that both the African and Western rhetorical traditions deploy clothing as rhetorical strategies for different purposes. However, Mandela uses African

clothing to enact a contrast of African pride from the distorted image of African identity constructed by apartheid racism.

In essence, Mandela is braiding a rhetoric whereby he combines the contrast he constructs and his knowledge of *kairos* with the shared knowledge he has of the symbolism of African clothing like the *kaross*. According to Mandela, “I was literally carrying on my back the history, culture, and heritage of my people. That day, I felt myself to be the embodiment of African nationalism, the inheritor of African’s difficult but noble past and her uncertain future. The *kaross* was also a sign of contempt for the niceties of white justice. I well knew the authorities would feel threatened by my *kaross* as so many whites feel threatened by the culture of Africa” (*Long Walk*, 324-325). The rhetoric of clothing that Mandela exploited in court had a keen rhetorical effect, in the sense that the emotions that connect people to their culture can be powerful.

The anticipated audience response become part of the rhetorical moment and Mandela builds that reaction into the power of the symbolism. This reaction helps to accentuate the contrast created by Mandela as he walks into the courtroom where he judges the morals of the white court system to be empty. This rhetorical strategy is effective as he appears regal in his decolonization, and he marshals the community behind him as a voice and as collective energy to depict Black numerical power. Mandela ‘s employment of symbolism and narratives in court can be likened to a psychological mirror. This mirror also acts as a moral searchlight, which is metaphorically turned upon the whites in order to expose their fears, biases, and self-contradictions.

The apartheid regime sought to protect their culture and tradition, while destroying that of the Africans. The contextual symbolism of the *kaross* is captured aptly by Zolani Ngwane, who describes the costume as a visual inscription, which forms part of a set of symbols that coalesce on Mandela’s body that is derived from the world of his childhood (128). The *kaross*, which serves

to sensationalize Mandela's court appearance, is employed rhetorically to enhance his performance. Ngwane describes the performance undertaken with the *kaross* in the following words: "[a]lthough some of his biographers, perhaps a reflection of their own fantasy, describe it as either a patchwork of "jackal skins" or, more ambitiously, a "lion skin," it is the leopard that is traditionally considered a Thembu royal symbol of power, majesty, grace, and agility. In that costume Mandela not only reached back, but reached higher in stature than even his father, who was a headman to the ruling princely line of the Thembu" (Ngwane, 128). Mandela's performance exemplifies Fanon's idea of how old tales are recreated for a new purpose in the active stage of anti-colonial struggle and Bhabha's concepts of the scraps and rags of culture as strategies for uniting the people against colonial oppression.

Mandela is "[no] longer simply the counselor to kings that he was groomed to be as a young man, he is now, in that witness box, as if on his throne meting out justice on the system that put him on trial. In a classical folktale twist of fate, where the lowly becomes elevated, Mandela the prisoner sits in judgment at the end, particularly with his closing statement" (Ngwane 128). The symbolism of the *kaross* plays a significant role in Mandela's rhetorical strategies in court. According to Sitze: "[t]he *kaross* Mandela donned in 1962 – in no less a juridical space than the "dock," so named because of its resemblance to a "cage" for animals – was not simply a costume for representing the opposition between "Africa" and "the West"; it was a cunning way to personify the non-identity of Western law with itself, to deploy the machine of Western sovereignty in order to short-circuit the sovereignty of the very court that claimed to be defending the West from its mortal enemies" (152). Mandela's continuous deployment of terms like "African people" draws attention to the fact that it is the entire African people who are on trial in this courtroom.

The phrase, “African people” is used to deliberately draw attention to the class structure and racial pyramid that the apartheid regime had created. This pyramid had the Black majority at the bottom, but disconnected at the top is the white minority. This pyramid is neither holistic nor enacting a continuum. The whites at the top represented the white supremacist (disconnected from the rest of Africans), while the other whites who did not subscribe to apartheid policies in addition to every other race, including the Asians and the Coloureds, were submerged underneath the policies of oppression. According to Mandela, “[t]he premise of apartheid was that whites were superior to Africans, Coloureds, and Indians, and the function of it was to entrench white supremacy forever” (*Long Walk*, 110). Thus, the pyramid is the hegemony kept in place by laws, which are screens of deception and hypocrisy. Mandela braids together a rhetoric through strategies inherent in African contextual tropes with other rhetorical strategies like *kairos*, a shared knowledge, and common experiences. These tropes were effectively deployed in line with the African and Western rhetorical traditions to illuminate the terministic screens in the apartheid legal system.

Religious Rhetoric in Conflict Engagement

The way apartheid policies were constructed to reflect the beliefs and value system of the Afrikaners depict how religion played a key role in the deceptions that were being sold to the world. In essence, religion was used to mask the terministic screens that underpinned the apartheid legal system. The religious beliefs that were used as the basis for apartheid policies exemplify Burke’s concept of logology. Burke describes logology as “a purely empirical study of symbolic action” that connects to the theological theorem of ““Believe, that you may understand” [which] has a fundamental application to the purely secular problem of “terministic screens”” (*Language*,

47). This connection acts as the basis for the convictions that informed apartheid policies. Burke's concept of logology is particularly interesting when used to interpret Crapanzano's observation that apartheid had been greatly influenced by the belief in the Biblical Tower of Babel. In essence, this belief in the Biblical concept of the Tower of Babel was used to account for the idea of apartheid, which means separation. The idea of the Tower of Babel, which practically describes the origin of languages in the Bible, depicts how human speech was mixed up so that people were unable to understand each other's language. The Bible depicts this idea in the following words:

At first, the people of the whole world had only one language and used the same words. As they wandered about in the East, they came to a plain in Babylonia and settled there. They said to one another, "Come on! Let's make bricks and bake them hard." So they had bricks to build with and tar to hold them together. They said, "Now let's build a city with a tower that reaches the sky, so that we can make a name for ourselves and not be scattered all over the earth." Then the Lord came down to see the city and the tower, which they had built, and he said, "Now then, these are all one people and they speak one language; this is just the beginning of what they are going to do. Soon they will be able to do anything they want! Let us go down and mix up their language so that they will not understand each other. So the Lord scattered them all over the earth, and they stopped building the city. The city was called Babylon, because there the Lord mixed up the language of all the people, and from there he scattered them all over the earth (Good News Bible, "Genesis," 11:1-9).

However, this idea of the Tower of Babel that was exploited by the Afrikaners in South Africa was a selection of reality in the sense that what was lost in "Genesis," 11:1-9, was restored in "Acts..." 2: 1-12 of the same Bible. Language harmony was restored because the communication gap created in "Genesis" 11 was bridged in "Acts..." 2 with the descent of the Holy Spirit on the Apostles when people from all over the world could understand the Apostles, who had been given the strange gift of speaking in other tongues. Thus, the Apostles "were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to talk in other languages, as the Spirit enabled them to speak. There were Jews living in Jerusalem, religious people who had come from every country in the world...They were all excited, because all of them heard the believers talking in their own

language” (Acts, 2: 4-6). In essence, if “Genesis” is important, so should “The Acts of the Apostle” be accounted for in the apartheid policies. The Afrikaners were obviously employing ‘selection of reality’ in their so-called Christian motivated policies.

To the Afrikaner, the separation of races, which was premised on the belief in the Tower of Babel, was partly responsible for the policies of racial segregation. The separation of races and its accompanying principle of “*baasskap*, literally boss-ship, a freighted word that stood for white supremacy in all its harshness” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 111) gave rise to Black oppression. It did not help that the Dutch Reformed Church had put a stamp of religion on the notion of white supremacy and the policy of: “*Die wit man moet altyd baas wees*” (The white man must always remain boss) ... The policy was supported by the Dutch Reform Church, which furnished apartheid with its religious foundations by suggesting that Afrikaners were God’s chosen people and that Blacks were a subservient species. In the Afrikaner’s worldview, apartheid and the church went hand in hand” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 111). The exploitation of biblical signs and symbols for such a negative phenomenon, as the suppression of another race, brings home St Augustine’s admonition against the misuse of scripture.

According to Augustine, “all signs in the scripture must be interpreted in a way that they are not in contradiction to “charity.” Because the sign of true worship is revealed in charity, such as when the converts in the “Acts of the Apostles” sold their property and donated the money to the church for the care of those in need” (85). The locution/language of scripture can be interpreted figuratively or literally depending on the context. Augustine recommends scriptural interpretation in the following words: “if a locution is admonitory, condemning either vice or crime, or commending either utility or beneficence, it is not figurative. But if it seems to commend either vice or crime or to condemn either utility or beneficence, it is figurative” (93). Therefore, the

Afrikaner's interpretation of the Tower of Babel, which eschews charity in all ramifications, is erroneous.

Augustine compares the power of scripture to shape the mind to that of rhetoric, and the consequences can be great. This phenomenon was evident in the fact that the Nationalist Party “refused to support Great Britain and publicly sympathized with Nazi Germany” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 110) during World War II and literally campaigned on a racist platform. The Nationalist Party's racist platform was “centered around the *swart gevaar* (the Black danger), and they fought the election on the twin slogans of *Die kaffer op sy plek* (The nigger in his place) and *Die koelies uit die land* (The coolies out of the country) – coolies being the Afrikaner's derogatory term for Indians” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 110). The fact that the Afrikaner identified with Nazi Germany at such a crucial time as the Second World War is indicative of what belief system motivated apartheid.

Religion has often played a significant role in persuasion. Hitler gained recognition and support from his fellow Germans when he raised racism and anti-Semitism to a religious level. Therefore, Richard Weaver's ideas in “Language is Sermonic” prove quite fruitful for understanding how persuasion is achieved using a cause-and effect relationship. (1048). People are persuaded to cooperate when the speaker is “asking in the name of highest reality, which is the same as saying, [the speaker is] asking in the name of their highest good” (Weaver, “Language...,”1048). Weaver argues that people are more likely to accept a policy if they have cause to believe that such policies emanate from authorities who are respected or reliable (1048). According to Weaver, rhetorical appeal of this nature “goes back to a very primitive metaphysics...because it ascribes to the highest reality qualities of stasis, immutability, eternal perdurance – qualities that in Western civilization are usually expressed in the language of theism”

(1049). In essence, when a religious belief is employed as the platform for a particular policy and it is presented as being benevolent, such a policy is elevated to the status of a religious dogma.

Hitler employed rhetoric that had religious coloring to derogate Jews and other races in order to persuade his fellow Germans to believe that the Jews, particularly and other races generally, were responsible for their economic woes. Hitler's rhetoric of violence employed a systematic vilification of Jews by labelling them "vermin," "parasites," and as the enemies of the Germans. As Karen King-Aribisala points out in her inaugural lecture:

When man wishes to oppress an 'other'; he gives that 'other' a sub-human designation of 'name' which enables him to camouflage and overlook his inhumanity. Another case in point is the fate of the character Piggy in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*, (1954). A group of school boys find themselves on a deserted island without adult supervision, and without the rules of 'civilized' society to guide them. They kill "Piggy"; the most vulnerable person among them. However, before doing so, they dehumanize him by calling Piggy, instead of his 'real' name. By so doing, they disguise their evil from themselves (8).

Hitler made no attempt to disguise his evil intentions in his rhetoric of violence; instead, he employed animal metaphors for engaging the minds of his followers, by preaching a gospel of hate, in order to prepare them for the extermination of six million Jews. As King-Aribisala observes, Jews were not regarded as human but as less than human through labelling, which "gave the 'Hitlerites' the license to engage in conscience-free ethnic cleansing in a bid to create a *lebensraum* inhabited exclusively by the Aryan race" (8). Hitler's speeches emphasized and exhorted such human values as bravery, justice, diligence, and patriotism, which he linked with the emotions of his audience and in very rational tones, explained how these German values were under threat from outside influences. Hitler's rhetoric of violence is described by Felicity Rash in the following words:

The pathos of MK is supported by hyperbole: superlative forms and meanings, excessive repetition, accumulation (*haufung*) of words and phrases, aggressive and apocalyptic vocabulary, and exaggerated evaluative descriptions of people and institutions that he despised...Hitler's hyperbolic language served a number of

purposes in MK, all of which were closely linked and interdependent: derogation of his enemies, glorification of the German Volk, exposition of his belief in a racial hierarchy (44).

It is observed that Hitler did not woo the people with his charisma, as it is often assumed, but with his passionate outpouring of hatred. By embellishing his rhetorical styles with a religious passion, he captivated an entire nation. Consequently, when religion is used with the ultimate aim of reducing the collective worth of a group or race, the hate crime against such a group can be tragic. The Germans were made to believe that the extermination of such parasites was an act of self-preservation. Such a belief system helps to appreciate apartheid laws. The white minorities in South Africa were also made to believe that the Black danger had to be kept in their place at all cost through various laws. The laws and their attendant dehumanization of other races showed that both the “letter” and the “spirit” of the law were dead.

Attention is being drawn to the Biblical distinction between letter and spirit whereby the spirit serves to regulate the letter of the law. Mandela’s questions in court served to demonstrate that the “spirit” of the law was dead. The spirit of any law that is not grounded in mercy is dead, and justice over mercy is cruelty. The appeal to religious mercy is not culture bound because this idea is captured in Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice*, where Portia admonishes Shylock for demanding justice rather than mercifully seeking to save Antonio’s life. Mandela’s questions and narratives in court resonate with Portia plea to Shylock in the court scene of Shakespeare’s creation. According to Portia:

The quality of mercy is not strain’d, - / It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven/
Upon the place beneath: it is twice blest, - / It blesseth him that gives, and him that
takes;/ ‘Tis mightiest in the mightiest: it becomes/ The throned monarch better than
his crown;/ His scepter shows the force of temporal power,/ The attribute to awe and
majesty,/ Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings;/ But mercy is above this
sceptered sway, - / It is enthroned in the hearts of kings,/ It is an attribute to God
himself;/ And earthly power doth then show likest God’s/ When mercy seasons justice.
Therefore, Jew,/ Though justice be thy plea, consider this, - / That, in the course of
justice, none of us/ Should see salvation: we do pray for mercy; And that same prayer

doth teach us all to render/ The deeds of mercy. I have spoken thus much/ To mitigate the justice of thy plea (*Merchant of Venice*, IV. I: 183 – 202).

Portia uses Christian virtues to make an appeal in court to indicate that human beings should be concerned for the wellbeing of others. In essence, apartheid insistence on keeping the races apart was inimical to Christian virtues. The fact that the laws that implemented such separation inflicted great suffering on Black communities and practically deprived them of their basic human rights in their own country shows the extent to which the apartheid government used religion that was empty of any Christian virtues to further their cause. The similarity between *Merchant of Venice* and the South African reality is resonant because the Christian morality espoused by Portia ought to be binding on Afrikaners who professed Christianity. In addition, Blacks in South Africa did not commit any crime for which they needed to be pardoned. Their only offense was an existential crime of being Black. In essence, apartheid laws were in themselves illegal according to the United Nations Statutes of basic human rights. The absurdity of apartheid laws stems from the fact that the Western culture that Afrikaners sought to preserve on the basis of religion denies a large group of people essential rights based on the color of their skin; a reality for which they had absolutely no control.

Mandela creatively employs rhetorical devices, which draw upon religious imagery to point out the paradoxes of apartheid laws in order to amplify the hypocritical nature of the regime. Apartheid laws perform the Biblical concept of the voice of Jacob in their crafting and the hand of Esau in their implementation. Mandela takes the pain to show that, rather than serve as a tool for uplift, religion has been used to suppress Blacks in South Africa. For example, Mandela uses another biblical imagery to show the cruelty of apartheid in the following words, “is there no danger that an African accused may regard the courts not as impartial tribunals, dispensing justice without fear or favour, but as instruments used by the white man to punish those amongst us who

clamor for deliverance from the *fiery furnace* of white rule?” (Mandela, “A Black Man...”). The fiery furnace of white rule draws on the biblical story of Meshach, Shadrach, and Abednego, in “Daniel” chapter 3, who are condemned to die in a fiery furnace because they would not obey Nebuchadnezzar’s decrees, which went against their consciences.

There is a strong connection between the biblical trio, who were innocent yet were condemned to die for their beliefs and Mandela, a prisoner of conscience, in conjunction with the entire South African people of color, who were condemned to death in a sense through deprivation, imprisonment, displacement, and violence. According to Mandela, “I have grave fears that this system of justice may enable the guilty to drag the innocent before the courts. It enables the unjust to prosecute and demand vengeance against the just. It may tend to lower the standards of fairness and justice applied in the country's courts by white judicial officers to Black litigants” (“A Black Man...”). It is instructive to note that Mandela employs layers of tropes, and particularly draws upon tropes in the Western rhetorical tradition, which can be easily identified by his white audience. For example, after using the metaphor of the burning furnace, he conjures the image of violence by saying that “I have grave fears that this system of justice [irony] may enable the guilty to drag the innocent [image of violence] before the courts. It enables the unjust to prosecute and demand vengeance [symbol of intimidation] against the just” (“A Black Man...”). Mandela paints the picture of unequal power relations between whites and Blacks in the imagery he employs. We get the sense that the idea of lowering the standards of fairness and justices manipulates the laws, which throws the symbolic scale of justice out of balance.

Subverting Apartheid Machiavellianism

Terministic screens operate through terms that direct attention to one field rather than another (Burke, *Language*, 50). The apartheid government deflects attention from the unjust nature of their laws to a deceptive benevolence of such laws as they affected Black Africans. One of such deceptive laws is the Bantustan system, which originated out of the Tomlinson Commission for the Socio-Economic Development of the Bantu Areas. According to Mandela, “[t]he Bantustan system had been conceived by Dr. H. F. Verwoerd, the minister for native affairs, as a way of muting international criticism of South African racial policies, but at the same time institutionalizing apartheid. The Bantustans, or reserves as they were also known, would be separate ethnic enclaves or homelands for all African citizens” (*Long Walk*, 190). The deflection of reality that Mandela points out in the above text rests in the way the legal separation of races was enacted. Rather than move for a purposive integration of races, the apartheid regime chose to promulgate laws that were outright deceptive. For example, “Africans, Verwoerd said, “should stand with both feet in the reserves” where they were to “develop along their own lines.” The idea was to preserve the status quo where three million whites owned 87 percent of the land, and relegate the eight million Africans to the remaining 13 percent” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 190). The idea of causing Africans to develop along their own lines was the screen behind which apartheid separation was masked.

Deception in government is neither new nor restricted to the apartheid government. Deception is as old as humanity, and it is a trait that other animals possess as well. Deception is often used as a tool for gaining power over others, and Niccolo Machiavelli defends deception in government in the following words:

A ruler must be half lion and half fox, a fox to discern the toils, a lion to drive off the wolves. Merciful, faithful, humane, religious, just, these he may be and above all should seem to be, nor should any word escape his lips to give the lie to his profession: and in fact, he should not leave these qualities but when he must. He should, if possible, practice goodness, but under necessity should know how to pursue evil. He should keep faith until occasion alter, or reason of state compel him to break his pledge. Above all, he should profess and observe religion, 'because men in general judge rather by the eye' than by the hand, and everyone can see, but few can touch (W. E. Henley, "Introduction", xxxiii – xxxiv).

Apartheid deception connects with Machiavelli's idea of driving away the wolves, which in this case have been depicted as the Black danger. This connection supports Machiavelli's recommendation that whatever evil a ruler does, it "must be deliberate, appropriate, and calculated, and done, not selfishly, but for the good of the State of which he is trustee" (Henley, "Introduction", xxxiii). It is important to examine in what ways terministic screens, direction of intention, selection of reality, deflection of reality, deception, and lies are interwoven in the apartheid context. The screens revolve around a deliberate attempt to conceal facts through legislations. That is because deception is far more successful when the discourse contains some modicum of truth. Sperone Speroni argues that an "orator will speak with the intention of deceiving people, leading them to think his aim is the truth, rather than something merely similar to the truth" (115). In essence, the apartheid policy of separate development in the Bantustan system belies their intention of deprivation and impoverishment. The same method of deception was employed in several other oppressive policies. The deceptive nature of the Bantustan or Homeland is captured by McLachlan in the following words:

The intention behind the influx control laws is that all Africans must live in their respective "self-governing homelands." Therefore, unless an individual qualifies to live in a white area, he requires permission to work in "white" South Africa as a migrant contract laborer and may not bring his family to live with him. Furthermore, in terms of government homelands policy, once a homeland becomes "independent," its "citizens" automatically lose their South African citizenship, whether they live in the homeland or not (77).

Mandela deliberately illuminates the Machiavellian nature of apartheid policies in order to deconstruct them. Apartheid concealing and Mandela's revealing play out before a worldwide audience. Mandela refers to this drama as "A Black man in a white court," which depicts a trial of the entire opposition who are part of the complex socio-political group he refers to as the African people. Mandela views the people as African people and not as Blacks because he aims to draw attention to the fact that Africans were far from homogenous. That is because the apartheid regime recognized the lack of homogeneity among Blacks; they exploited that heterogeneity for divisive purposes but formulated policies that attempted to homogenize them as a group. And thus, Mandela's implicit reference to the heterogeneous nature of the African people is a strategy through which he shows that in attempting to strip Africans of their humanity, a crime has been committed against the entire human race because almost all races are represented within South Africa.

Mandela exposes apartheid as a distortion by evoking the Western legal system, which is the bedrock of a democratic society. In "A Black Man in a white Court," Mandela's employs exordium, which is addressed to the prosecutor, in an epideictic manner. This deployment portrays Mandela's great respect for the Western legal framework to which he owes his legal formation. Mandela's praise of Western law is what Jacques Derrida describes as interiorizing the law to the extent that "he has interiorized the principle of interiority." Mandela's great respect for the rule of law, his training, and expectations proved antithetical to his experience of apartheid laws and their implementation. The reality of apartheid laws is captured by Adam Sitze in the following words: "Academic jurisprudence under apartheid doubled as a form of social discipline: it was a mode of controlling, subjugating, and normalizing thought, a training in obedience and quietism, a point of entry into a regime that used the legal lexicon to reassure itself of its own rectitude and to rage

against its adversaries with self-righteous cruelty” (135). Mandela’s experiences in court were clear indications that the white man’s court had no place for a Black man.

Mandela’s rhetoric amplifies the double jeopardy embedded within apartheid policies. He tactically illuminated the inherent contradictions of Afrikaner political undertones of racism. The nuanced manner through which he absolved himself of complicit rhetoric and the fallacy of essentialism is very compelling. For example, he enters a plea for recusal in “A Black Man in a white Court” with the following caveat: “In the course of this application, I am frequently going to refer to the white man and the white people. I want at once to make it clear that I am no racist, and I detest racism because I regard it as a barbaric thing, whether it comes from a Black man or from a white man. The terminology that I am going to employ, will be compelled on me by the nature of the application I am making” (Mandela, “A Black Man...”). Mandela turns the table by overtly shifting the blame for essentialism to his white accusers.

The charge of racism against his accusers is deliberately overt when he describes the nature of his application. Mandela’s “implicit,” or “subtle,” or “covert” rhetoric employs imagery and irony especially in court for illuminating the concealed deception of apartheid policies. Mandela draws upon multiple rhetorical genres and employs surface linguistic structures that are nuanced with deep semantic implicatures to argue for recusal in “A Black Man in a white Court.” He combines deliberative rhetoric, forensic logic, and narratives, which are layered with contrasts and antithesis, to evoke images of injustice. These images draw attention to a dis(connect) in the moral fabric of the apartheid legal structure.

Mandela's Narratives as a Legal Strategy

Apartheid laws were informed largely by the haunting fears Afrikaners had of being outnumbered and dominated in a free and democratic system. Interestingly, white superiority complex sought to camouflage this fear by constructing sophisticated legal terms. As a result, the complex emotions that produced apartheid laws needed to be addressed at a cognitive level in order to deconstruct them. The fear that led to the promulgation of apartheid laws was carefully concealed to reflect a different reality of separate development. The laws of separate development were smoke screens deliberately crafted to mask their racist bent of curbing the “Black danger.” Even though the laws were couched to deceive, their implementation made it obvious that the laws protected one group and oppressed others. Mandela exposed the racist nature of the laws through the narratives that were woven in a highly rhetorical manner.

Why would Mandela choose to use narratives in a court session? Narratives constitute an integral part of Mandela's braided rhetoric, and narratives perform a dual role in his rhetoric. Mandela acquired the love for stories from both the African and Western rhetorical traditions that helped to form him. Narratives were used to draw attention to apartheid injustices and to demonstrate how helpless Blacks had become in a skewed system like apartheid. Mandela makes manifest the rhetorical contrast being constructed in the following narrative:

Many years ago, when I was a boy brought up in my village in the Transkei, I listened to the elders of the tribe telling stories about the good old days, before the arrival of the white man. Then our people lived peacefully, under the democratic rule of their kings and their amapakati, and moved freely and confidently up and down the country without let or hindrance. Then the country was ours, in our own name and right. We occupied the land, the forests, the rivers; we extracted the mineral wealth beneath the soil and all the riches of this beautiful country. We set up and operated our own government, we controlled our own armies and we organized our own trade and commerce. The elders would tell tales of the wars fought by our ancestors in defense of the fatherland, as well as the acts of valor performed by generals and soldiers during

those epic days. The names of Dingane and Bambata, among the Zulus, of Hintsa, Makana, Ndlambe of the AmaXhosa, of Sekhukhuni and others in the north, were mentioned as the pride and glory of the entire African nation (“A Black Man...”).

Mandela deploys the above narrative like a typical *imbongi* to bring into the current context the significance of the people’s collective memory. By drawing upon his African sociocultural and political heritage, Mandela employs the African rhetorical trope of communal cohesion and freedom in contrast to apartheid curtailment. Mandela’s narratives in “A Black Man in a white Court” make visible the paradox of the apartheid legal framework. Mandela pointed out in this court scene that the apartheid laws represented a *fait accompli* for Blacks because they were more often than not denied justice. Apartheid laws were founded upon a concept of white-protection, and a change to such laws was an obvious threat to white interest. The unjust nature of apartheid laws was captured by Mandela in the following words: “[i]t is true that an African who is charged in a court of law enjoys, on the surface, the same rights and privileges as an accused who is white in so far as the conduct of this trial is concerned. He is governed by the same rules of procedure and evidence as apply to a white accused. But it would be grossly inaccurate to conclude from this fact that an African consequently enjoys equality before the law” (“A Black Man...”). The discrepancy between the letter of the laws and their implementation indicated that there was a deliberate ploy to mask the inequality between whites and Blacks.

Mandela argues that equality before the law goes beyond paying lip service to the concept of equality. In essence, equality implies the right to participate in the making of the laws by which a group of people are governed and to produce a constitution that guarantees democratic rights to all sections of the population. Equality also means the right to approach the court for protection or relief in the case of a violation of the rights guaranteed in the constitution and the right to take part in the administration of justice as judges, magistrates, attorneys-general, law advisers and similar

positions (Mandela, “A Black Man...”). According to Mandela, the absence of these safeguards indicated that the phrase 'equality before the law,' in so far as the laws are applied to Blacks, is meaningless and misleading. Whites monopolized all the rights and privileges in apartheid laws, and Blacks enjoyed none of them.

Mandela captures the inequality in the apartheid legal system in the following words: “[t]he white man makes all the laws, he drags us before his courts and accuses us, and he sits in judgement over us” (“A Black Man...”). It can be deduced that those in charge of the apartheid legal system were either oblivious or pretended to be oblivious to the inequity of the rigid coloured bar described by Mandela. The moral disconnect of apartheid made it impossible for the regime to enthrone an equitable legal system. Mandela deployed logical deductions and forensic logic, which were woven into his narratives to expose the reality of apartheid racist order. For example, Mandela describes the equity in the African society in contrast to apartheid in the following words:

All men were free and equal and this was the foundation of government. Recognitions of this general principle found expression in the constitution of the council, variously called Imbizo, or Pitso, or Kgotla, which governs the affairs of the tribe. The council was so completely democratic that all members of the tribe could participate in its deliberations. Chief and subject, warrior and medicine man, all took part and endeavored to influence its decision. It was so weighty and influential a body that no step of any importance could ever be taken by the tribe without reference to it. (“A Black Man...”).

Mandela deployed narratives like the above in the courtroom because the legal system and court proceedings proved that no matter the strength of the argument he put forward, it would prove ineffective. That is because the laws were made by whites, for whites, interpreted by whites, and implemented by whites. In essence, Mandela was confronting a peculiar democracy that demarcated justice along racial lines and excluded Black interests. Mandela pragmatically deploys stories to draw attention to the deplorable situation of Blacks in order to prick the conscience of his white audience.

Mandela's rhetorical appeal lies in the manner in which he crafts narratives that draw on the communal tropes of the African rhetorical tradition to counter the apartheid deceptive legal rhetoric and framework. Mandela's love of stories helped him to internalize the principles that guided his life, and this idea is captured in the following words: "The structure and organization of early African societies in this country fascinated me very much and greatly influenced the evolution of my political outlook" ("A Black Man..."). African societies inculcate values using the African rhetorical tradition, and these values are highly narrative in texture in the form of folktales, proverbs, songs and dances. The narratives Mandela wove are drawn from both the Greco-Roman and the African rhetorical traditions. The narratives served to create images that exposed the sufferings of South African people of color. These images, in turn, generate cognitive activities in the minds of the complex audiences to whom Mandela needed to make an appeal.

Mandela's narratives in court served to demonstrate how the spirit of freedom enjoyed by the South Africans before the advent of whites had been destroyed by apartheid laws. Narratives are deployed by Mandela in a way that is imitative of Jesus Christ's employment of stories and parables in his earthly ministry. For example, whenever Jesus needed to teach a lesson with deep insight, he used narratives. Many of Jesus' parables were succinct with deep moral lessons. For example, when the teacher of the law asked Jesus who his neighbour was, Jesus told him the parable of the Good Samaritan ("Luke" 10:29-37). The Good Samaritan has become a metaphor for any charitable person who takes care of the poor and needy.

Why did Jesus employ stories and parables in his teaching? It might be argued that a straightforward answer would be inadequate to teach some profound lessons. Therefore, Jesus always used the stories and parables to capture the conscience of his audience in order to build ethical values. Narratives depend on tropes to effectively capture the minds of an audience because

the human mind will most likely be unable to shake the images produced by such narratives. Therefore, persuasion is achieved by taking the human imagination captive. The manner in which moral virtues are instilled through the imagination is portrayed by authors like Vigen Guroian, Flannery O'Connor, and Bruno Bettelheim who explore the role of fairy tales in developing the moral compass of children.

According to Guroian, “[t]he great fairy tales and fantasy stories capture the meaning of morality through vivid depictions of struggles between good and evil, where characters must make difficult choices between right and wrong, or heroes and villains contest the very fate of imaginary worlds” (“Awakening the Moral Imagination: Teaching Virtues through Fairy Tales”). Ethical morality is the foundation upon which the consciences of children are built, and for adults, narratives serve to stimulate the metaphors that already exist. The narratives that Mandela deployed in the courtroom were a rhetorical strategy that was used to stir up the conscience of his audience by conjuring images of the South African glorious past in contrast to the present deplorable condition of Blacks.

Illuminating Legal Racism in Civilization

The concept of civilization has played a significant role in colonialism because imperialist claimed that Africans needed to be civilized. This claim was used as a ploy to enslave Africans and plunder their land. Civilization becomes what Burke describes as a god-term, which is employed to produce a contrast with the so-called “primitive” life of Africans. The freedom enjoyed by Africans before the advent of whites in South Africa became eroded by the so-called civilization of Africans. Mandela overtly refers to racism as it operates within the context of the

“civilized world” of apartheid South Africa. Mandela’s constant reference to the term “civilized” is ironical because civilization takes on a burden in contrast with primitiveness when scrutinized under the searchlight of apartheid human rights abuses. A civilized society has the responsibility of ensuring that there are equal rights and equity for all. Mandela’s strategy for drawing attention to the inherent contradictions in apartheid laws and the disastrous consequences for the people of color casts an ominous darkness on the idea of Western civilization.

These laws that were supposed to represent “civilization” (another terministic screen for imperialist incursion) have brought with them death, in a theological, cultural, and psychological sense. Mandela deconstructs apartheid policies as terministic screens whose colour filters are “Black” versus “white” and “civilized” versus “uncivilized.” In essence, Western civilization helped to undermine the socio-political life of Africans through policies that were crafted in deception. The contradiction that is depicted by apartheid laws connects with Sitze’s argument that South African laws fail to represent the identity that they proclaimed rhetorically. According to Sitze:

For Jabavu and Matthews, and for Plaatje as well, South African law was not at all self-identical with itself. Even prior to the dark years of the 1950s, and without any assistance from Gandhian satyagrahs or revolutionary Marxists, South African law already hosted within itself the very anomie Hoernle seemed to fear. Instead of the rule of law, it was governed by dictatorship; instead of peacetime norms, it was ordered according to the exceptions of martial law; instead of health, welfare, and safety, its administrative apparatus produced conditions for the extermination of the African populations (148).

Sitze analyzes the position of scholars like D. D. T. Jabavu, Sol Plaatje, Z. K. Matthews, and R. F. A. Hoernle, who objected to apartheid laws but objected to Mandela’s agitation for armed struggle. These experts argue that “constitutional change ought to be accomplished within the limits of the existing constitutional order” (Sitze, 148). The premise for such a position rests on the idea that South African laws were self-identical with itself. Despite Mandela’s great respect

for the rule of law, his training in jurisprudence and his experiences acquainted him with the knowledge that “South African courts were defined by their non-identity with the very tradition of law in which they rooted their “Western” identity” (Sitze, 146). Mandela sheds light on the distorted nature of South African laws that preached one thing and practiced another. The idea that Western laws in South Africa are self-identical with itself is a subterfuge. Therefore, Mandela overtly and covertly exposed the inherent deception of apartheid laws or deflection of reality in the following words:

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights provides that all men are equal before the law, and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. In May 1951, Dr D F Malan, then Prime Minister, told the Union parliament that this provision of the Declaration applies in this country. Similar statements have been made on numerous occasions in the past by prominent whites in this country, including judges and magistrates. But the real truth is that there is in fact no equality before the law whatsoever as far as our people are concerned, and statements to the contrary are definitely incorrect and misleading (“A Black Man.”).

Mandela uses metaphor and narratives to amplify the deceptive concept of a civilized world, which was supposedly founded on the rule of law. The idea that apartheid laws were misleading is evinced by Mandela as a strategy for drawing attention to the lived experience of South African people of color. This strategy was “in response to a set of unprecedented possibilities that define Western law and yet that Western law – tragically divided against itself, fighting itself – neutralizes, restrains, excludes, and denies” (Sitze, 156) the very foundation upon which it was built. It can be argued that Mandela’s struggle attempts to re-institute Western laws that were self-identifiable with the state. The Western laws he had fallen in love with and had spent many years of his life studying in order to understand and practice as a servant of Lady Justice did not exist in apartheid South Africa – at least not for Blacks. The legal system that was being applied to South Africa people of colour was a perversion of the Western legal system. Mandela and the ANC had embarked on heroic measures to rescue Lady Justice for the people they represented. The Freedom

Charter was the platform under which equal rights for all was promulgated. Through the Freedom Charter, all oppressed groups like the ANC, the South African Indian Congress, the Colored People's Organization, and the Congress of Democrats (all of whom unanimously adopted the Charter) hoped to gain back the rights they had been denied. The preamble of the Freedom Charter is captured in the following words:

We, the people of South Africa, declare for all our country and the world to know: That South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white, and that no government can justly claim authority unless it is based on the will of the people; That our people have been robbed of their birthright to land, liberty and peace by a form of government founded on injustice and inequality; That our country will never be prosperous or free until all our people live in brotherhood, enjoying equal rights and opportunities; That only a democratic state, based on the will of all the people, can secure to all their birthright without distinction of color, race, sex, and belief; And therefore, we, the people of South Africa, black and white together – equals, countrymen and brothers – adopt this FREEDOM CHARTER. And we pledge ourselves to strive together, sparing nothing of our strength and courage, until the democratic changes here set out have been won (Mandela, *Speeches*, 67).

The Freedom Charter encapsulated the laws meant to ensure no one was disenfranchised in a new South Africa. The Freedom Charter directly countered apartheid racist laws as a correction of apartheid human rights abuses. The Freedom Charter was conceived and crafted to reflect the hopes and aspirations of the masses the way it should be in a civilized society. Apartheid practiced Western laws to reflect the moral disconnect that produced racial segregation in the first place. Mandela depicts why it was impossible to accept apartheid laws in the following words: “[t]he law as it is applied, the law as it has been developed over a long period of history, and especially the law as it is written and designed by the Nationalist government is a law which, in our views, is immoral, unjust, and intolerable. Our consciences dictate that we must protest against it, that we must oppose it and that we must attempt to alter it” (*Long Walk*, 330-331). Mandela and the ANC had employed constitutional means to attempt a change, contrary to what Jabayu, Plaatje,

Matthews, and Hoernle had inferred. However, apartheid policies and their implementation created insurmountable obstacles that made Mandela refer to himself and his people as having been caged.

Mandela had fallen in love with a rule of law that was the ideal example of what was being enjoyed by whites in the Western (civilized) world and South Africa, but the reality for Blacks was a far cry from this ideal. Some of the apartheid laws like (1) the Population Registration Act 30 of 1950, which classified each person according to their color or ethnic group upon registration of a birth; (2) the Group Areas Act 41 of 1950, which restricted different groups to separate geographical areas; (3) Pass Laws and Influx Control Law, which required Africans over the age of 16 to always carry on them a passbook showing they had a right to be in a white area; (4) the Bantustan or “Homeland” Law, which required that all Africans must live in their respective “self-governing homelands;” (5) the Natives Land Act, which prevented Africans from acquiring land outside of “reserves;” (6) the Terrorism Act, which provided for indefinite detention without trial; (7) the Bantu Authorities Act, which removed Coloureds in the Cape Province from the Parliamentary Voter Roll; (8) the Native Trust and Land Act, which increased the reserves from about 7% to 13%; and (9) the elimination of African voting rights as well as other laws such as; the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages; the Bantu Education Act; Suppression of Communism Act; and the Immorality Amendment Act that represented the abolition of human rights of Blacks in one form or another.

All the above laws are a deflection of reality, whereby there is a deliberate attempt to direct attention away from the ultimate aim of the act through a manipulation of the legal lexicon. In essence, the laws were deceptive in the way they were crafted; however, the implementation of the same laws betrayed the intention of the apartheid regime. According to Mandela:

As a student, I had been taught that South Africa was a place where the rule of law was paramount and applied to all persons, regardless of their social status or official position. I sincerely believed this and planned my life based on that assumption. But my career as a lawyer and activist removed the scales from my eyes. I saw that there was a wide difference between what I had been taught in the lecture room and what I learned in the courtroom. I went from having an idealistic view of the law as a sword of justice to a perception of the law as a tool used by the ruling class to shape society in a way favorable to itself. I never expected justice in court, however much I fought for it, and though I sometimes received it (*Long Walk*, 260).

Mandela's experience and narratives depict a reality whereby the rule of law, which ought to operate as the bastion of civilization, was being wielded against people of color in ways that were far from civilized. How, then, could whites justify their claims of wanting to civilize the uncivilized? How could the so-called civilized people lay claims to being civilized without the rule of law? The Afrikaner poet, Breyten Breytenbach, who was arrested in South Africa in 1975 and charged with terrorism, describes the South African situation as "the world of difference between pretensions and reality...[where] those in power in Pretoria claim that, as the arbiters of peace and progress, they are carrying the illuminating force of Western civilization into the heathen darkness, that they are God's lonely soldiers battling against communism and barbarism. Many of them even believe it. Some powerful individuals abroad do too, or pretend to" (28). Apartheid laws exposed the heart of a pseudo-civilization, which the apartheid regime projected as civilized rule of law that withheld human rights on the basis of skin color. According to Breytenbach, this was a "world of madness, of calculated madness, of sublimated madness" (28). The madness conceptualized by Breytenbach pervaded all the apartheid laws both in their formulation and in their execution.

For example, the Population Registration Act 30 of 1950 laid the foundation for all of the oppressive laws. According to McLachlan, "[u]pon the registration of a birth, each person is classified as white, Colored or African. Coloreds and Africans are further divided into ethnic or other groups. Generally, a child will have the same classification as his/her parents, but for those

who do not fall into any definite category, their status will be determined by criteria such as descent, appearance (hair, lips, nails, etc.), social acceptance, habits, speech, and education” (76). From this law, it is obvious that the foundation of the apartheid laws that were applied to people of colour was created in chaos, and the ultimate consequence was confusion. The confusion is captured in the following words: “A person may apply for reclassification to another group or third parties may object to the official classification awarded. Any classification other than white means fewer rights. This Act causes much human suffering as families are torn apart by different classifications” (McLachlan, 76). The Population Registration Act was employed to redefine humanity; whereby, the more colour a person possessed in their pigmentation, the less human they were considered to be and the less rights they were entitled to.

Mandela depicts how the classification of people of color was perpetrated to strip them of their humanity and power in a sly and derogatory manner. The devious nature of the scheme was cleverly masked as an attempt to keep people together within their own communities; but at the same time, such classifications divided the people through varying degrees of disempowerment. In addition to the stereotyping that informed the classification, it was inhumane and arbitrary. The arbitrariness with which a person’s race was determined made the rule of law a mockery. Mandela captures this mockery in the following words:

Working as a lawyer in South Africa meant operating under a debased system of justice, a code of law that did not enshrine equality but its opposite. One of the most pernicious examples of this is the Population Registration Act, which defined that inequality. I once handled the case of a Colored man who was inadvertently classified as an African. He had fought for South Africa during World War II in North Africa and Italy, but after his return, a white bureaucrat had reclassified him as African. This was the type of case, not at all untypical in South Africa that offered a moral jigsaw puzzle. I did not support or recognize the principles in the Population Registration Act, but my client needed representation, and he had been classified as something he was not. There were many practical advantages to being classified as Colored rather than African, such as the fact that colored men were not required to carry passes. On his

behalf, I appealed to the Classification Board, which adjudicated the cases falling under the Population Registration Act. The board consisted of a magistrate and two other officials, all white. I had formidable documentary evidence to establish to establish my client's case and the prosecutor formally indicated that he would not oppose our appeal. But the magistrate seemed uninterested in both my evidence and the prosecutor's demurral. He stared at my client and gruffly asked him to turn around so that his back faced the bench. After scrutinizing my client's shoulders, which sloped down sharply, he nodded to the other officials and upheld the appeal. In the view of the white authorities those days, sloping shoulders were one stereotype of the Colored physique. And so it came about that the course of this man's life was decided purely on a magistrate's opinion about the structure of his shoulders (*Long Walk*, 151-152).

The arbitrariness described by Mandela in the above text resonates with Dijk's depiction of "abuse of power" or "illegitimate exercise of power," which produced inequity and inequality ("Critical Discourse Analysis," 5). Mandela's description connects to Dijk's perspective of discourse as it operates at the micro level for constructing power in interaction. The unequal power relations, which has the potential to disempower the "other" through discourse at the macro level, is made manifest in the South African judicial system. The unjust nature of the Population Registration Act lies in its power to keep the visible difference of "the other" races starkly visible. The ominous nature of the stereotyping that accompany visible difference is theorized by Michael Omi and Howard Winant as well as Linda Alcoff as potentially disempowering the 'other' whose humanity is undermined.

Omi and Winant argue that race is a social and political construct, which is operative at the micro level (individual identity) as well as the macro level (collective social formation), that has undergone various formation processes. However, the social construction has often revolved around the need for control, hegemony, and dominance of one group over another. Consequently, the construction of Blacks and other minority groups as inferior to the white race has become entrenched in historical and scientific postulations that rely on visible identities for the justification of white supremacy. And, "the categories employed to differentiate among human groups along racial lines reveal themselves, upon serious examination, to be at best imprecise, and at worst

completely arbitrary” (Omi and Winant, 55). The effects of the hegemony, which such race construction enacts, is captured in the following words: “How one is categorized is far from a merely academic or even personal matter. Such matters as access to employment, housing, or other publicly or privately valued goods; social program design and the disbursement of local, state, and federal funds; or the organization of elections (among many other issues) are directly affected by racial classification and the recognition of “legitimate” groups. The determination of racial categories is thus an intensely political process” (Omi and Winant, 3). Though preoccupied with the racial problem in the US, the argument of Omi and Winant is highly resonant with the Black experiences described by Mandela.

The case described by Mandela is similar to a case study captured by Omi & Winant in the US. According to Omi and Winant, “[i]n 1982-82, Susie Guillory Phipps unsuccessfully sued the Louisiana Bureau of Vital Records to change her racial classification from Black to white. The descendant of an 18-century white planter and a Black slave, Phipps was designated “Black” in her birth certificate in accordance with a 1970 state law, which declared anyone with a least 1/32nd “Negro blood” to be Black” (53). The interesting similarity and difference between the cases described by Mandela and Omi and Winant lay in the fact that Mandela’s client was applying to belong to a racial spectrum that did not threaten the white class. However, Omi and Winant’s Phipps aimed to join the white class. Phipps was denied that right because the exclusivity of whiteness gives access to privileges that the whites were unwilling to share, whether in the US or in South Africa.

Omi and Winant argue that racial formation in the US has moved from biological Darwinism to Social Darwinism, whereby, “[t]heoretically, the ethnicity paradigm represents the mainstream of the modern sociology of race” (14). This paradigm “arose in the 1920s and 1930s

as an explicit challenge to the prevailing racial views of the period. The pre-existing biologicistic paradigm that evolved since the downfall of racial slavery was used to explain Black racial inferiority as part of a natural order of humankind. “Whites were considered the superior race; white skin was the norm while other skin colours were exotic mutations, which had to be explained” (Omi and Winant, 14). The idea of racial norm and the practice of punishing the deviation from the racial norm produced the kind of psychological trauma described by Fanon.

The trauma was particularly damaging to people of colour because “[r]ace was equated with distinct hereditary characteristics. Differences in intelligence, temperament, and sexuality (among other traits) were deemed to be racial in character. Racial intermixture was seen as a sin against nature, which would lead to the creation of “biological throwbacks.” These are some of the assumptions in social Darwinist, Spencerist, and eugenicist thinking about race and race relation” (Omi & Winant, 14). Having no biological reasons for racial segregation and oppression, the evolution of racism in the US and apartheid South Africa can be described as “internal colonialism,” which is made manifest in economic, political, and cultural exploitation (Omi and Winant, 44-45). The pushback against any form of colonialism, which led to the emergence of independent states across Africa and other parts of the world, makes understandable the reason the apartheid regime would need to employ a lot of smoke screens. These smoke screens, according to Mandela, were a way of making the racially defined laws look benevolent. According to Mandela, most of apartheid laws “epitomized the ethos of the Nationalist government, which pretended to preserve what they were attempting to destroy. Laws stripping people of their rights were inevitably described as laws restoring those rights” (*Long Walk*, 122). The need to continually reveal the deception of apartheid as a system whose schemes resulted in the cruelty meted out to people of colour depicted civilization in very negative light.

The insensitive manner with which Blacks were disenfranchised in every way imaginable revealed a barbarism that is far from civilized. For example, Sophiatown was one of the few places where Blacks could own homes and have a sense of identity and dignity. Despite the poverty and the lack of amenities, “Sophiatown had a special character; for Africans, it was the Left Bank in Paris, Greenwich Village in New York, the home of writers, artists, doctors, and lawyers. It was both bohemian and conventional, lively and sedate” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 154). The government failed to take into consideration what Sophiatown meant to the people, but they executed an evacuation campaign of its residents. According to Mandela, “[t]he excuse given by the government was slum clearance, a smoke screen for the government policy that regarded all urban areas as white areas where Africans were temporary residents” (*Long Walk*, 154). Such inhumane laws and policies made all attempts to project apartheid laws as benign or paternalistic fall flat.

Mandela recognized that capitalism, fuelled by materialism, had displaced the humanism that ought to be the kernel of a civilized legal system. Materialist capitalism is persuasive in its allurements; an idea that is captured by Breytenbach in the following words: “Those in power in Pretoria fully insist that they are the only ones who can assure Western capitalist investment in the subcontinent. In the process of so pretending, they are, inter alia, corrupting the power brokers of the West – often, alas, so easily corruptible. They are also raping Africa; but that would seem to be by the way, as the West closes a complacent eye and leers tolerably at those goings-on as just a healthy sexual romping” (28). For the material rape of South Africa to go on unhindered, the apartheid regime needed laws designed to make Africans appear barbaric and, thus, keep them in their place.

The intolerable nature of this material rape pulled Mandela to the ideas of Marx and Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Tse-tung, and others who probed into the philosophy of dialectical and

historical materialism. According to Mandela, “Dialectical materialism seemed to offer both a searchlight illuminating the dark night of racial oppression and a tool that could be used to end it. It helped me to see the situation other than through the prism of Black and white relations, for if our struggle was to succeed, we had to transcend Black and white. I was attracted to the scientific underpinnings of dialectical materialism, for I am always inclined to trust what I can verify” (*Long Walk*, 118). The materialistic analysis of economics appealed to Mandela because the idea that the value of goods was based on the amount of labour that went into them seemed particularly appropriate for South Africa. However, it riled him that the ruling class paid African labourers a subsistence wage and, then, added value to the cost of the goods that they retained for themselves. The oppression of any group of people, either racially or economically, will always create psychological trauma, which in turn will produce the kind of chaos that will undermine the so-called civilized society.

For economic oppression to succeed, political, cultural, and ideological oppression must occur *pari passu*. Robert Davies, Dan O’meara, and Sipho Dlamini describe the oppression of Black South Africans as a phenomenon that needs not be “explained simply in terms of racial prejudice” (99); rather, it should be conceptualized within the system of racial capitalism. According to Davies et al, “the various changing historical forms of national oppression and racism in South Africa are organically linked with, and have provided the fundamental basis for, the development of a capitalist economy” (100). In essence, racism was the basis for imperialism, but materialism was the dagger behind the cloak of civilizing the natives. Therefore, Western industrial revolution had tremendous consequences for the conquered territories of the world. Consequently, “the various complex and intersecting class struggles through which capitalist forms of production and relations of production were developed and consolidated under colonialism in South Africa,

themselves generated racist ideologies and a racially structured hierarchy of economic and political power” (Davies et al, 100). This material colonialism that is existent in South Africa is equally made manifest in the US. Civil rights movements in the US can be described as being germane to the anti-apartheid movement in ways that were quite stark.

The most important feature of the South African apartheid laws is the deliberate attempt to deceive the entire world that the government had the interest of the people of colour at heart. Therefore, the lexicon with which the laws were crafted was deliberately misleading. The language of apartheid laws does not only deflect attention from the racist reality of their laws or direct attention away from the intention, the language actually aims to create internal division among the oppressed groups. Consequently, Mandela’s strategically employs various rhetorical devices to illuminate and expose the smoke screens behind which apartheid laws gradually and eventually stripped Africans of their rights to land, free speech, freedom of movement/association, and freedom to earn a decent wage.

Chapter 5

Peace on a More Solid Ground

This final chapter examines how Mandela's rhetoric transforms as he transitions from activist to statesman. As Mandela's roles in the political milieu of South Africa shift, so do his rhetorical practices. His braided rhetoric that employs a lot of communal tropes and *imbongi* style narratives of African rhetorical tradition as well as different Western rhetorical tropes is still discernible. Furthermore, his rhetorical identification strategically moves from that of a freedom fighter on the margins of apartheid South Africa, through acting as a midwife who helps to birth the nation, to that of the parent of the nation when he occupies the presidential position in the center. Mandela's rhetorical transformation is made manifest in his speeches, *Nelson Mandela: Conversations with Myself*, and *Long Walk to Freedom* as well as his inaugural speech in 1994.

Mandela's rhetorical moves when he takes on the role of parenting the nation upon becoming president indicated that he had been shaped by the anti-apartheid struggle in a profound way without being defined by it. The point being made here is that Mandela's inclusive rhetoric that is exemplified through identification with both whites and Blacks is evidence of his *kairotic* ontology and political sagacity. His rhetorical shifts depict how significant it was to keep the past in sight, while *kairotically* seizing the moment and taking the future into consideration. Mandela survives the fierce racism of apartheid through his dynamic leadership skills and, in particular, his abilities as a rhetor that proved so critical to the success of the anti-apartheid struggle. Having survived, the fact that he continues to serve the cause – and still emerges as a president who calls for reconciliation between the oppressed and oppressor makes him a fascinating rhetor.

Mandela's rhetoric of peace and healing makes valid the argument that the Truth and Reconciliation Commission may have been constituted to produce a catharsis necessary for overcoming the long years of apartheid violence. The importance of Mandela's rhetoric of peace and reconciliation is described by McPhail in *The Rhetoric of Racism Revisited: Reparations or Separation* as "provocative and profound" because "while a rhetoric of retribution might have been expected with Black majority rule in South Africa, instead we have heard a rhetoric of reconciliation" (ix). Mandela's rhetoric of peace, reconciliation, and of "healing the wounds" in his inaugural speech reinforces the ethos that characterized his rhetoric all through the struggle. Mandela's leadership of dynamism, diplomacy, and *kairotic* ontology is made manifest through a balance of conciliation and directness. Therefore, his radical shift proves quite challenging but successful as the entire people of South Africa (whether white, Black, Indians, Asians, or Coloured) become his constituency.

Drawing upon Burke's notion of dramatic pentad as well as his concepts of merger and division, this chapter examines how Mandela enacts a merger with the entire South African populace when he becomes president. Burke articulates the concept of merger and division as unity and plurality as well as a progressive development from homogeneity to heterogeneity (*A Grammar of Motives*, 404). The concept deploys the birth metaphor to describe the offspring who is "substantially one with the parent" in a merger undergoing a division at the point of birth. Burke argues that dialectical merger and division play key roles in persuasion because they are complementary to identification. Mandela's anti-apartheid rhetoric makes him substantially one with Black South Africans; however, he enacts both a merger and division from these same Blacks at the birth of the nation.

The birth metaphor is realized when the apartheid system is dismantled in order to give birth to a united nation, instead of a divided country. The end of apartheid necessitates Mandela's metamorphosis from being consubstantial with the oppressed to being one with the nation. According to Salazar, Mandela's first parliamentary speech "was attempting the nation's "delivery" ...as labor or travail of the South African nation and of the orator himself" (21). Mandela's presidential role as parent to the nation embraces all South Africans (the oppressors, the oppressed, and those in-between). This embrace helps to midwife the birth of South Africa and usher in the peace and reconciliation process. The effect of Mandela's rhetoric in bringing about nationhood, peace, and reconciliation will be investigated under the following subheadings: (1) Deconstruction of Contextual Discourse Deploying Education as a Privileging Tool, (3) The Thorny Path to Peace Negotiation, (4) Mandela's Dynamism and Diplomacy in the Peace Process, (5) Rhetorical Merger and Division in Birthing the Nation, (6) Mandela's Transformation from Activist to Nation Builder, and (7) The Catharsis of Truth and Reconciliation.

Deconstruction of Contextual Discourse

After apartheid had been dismantled and Mandela had been elected the first Black president, he was confronted by a complex situation that was triangulated. The threefold problems Mandela had to deal with were economic, political, and rhetorical in nature. These problems threatened to tear the fragile fabric of the new nation apart. The problems were such that Blacks who now had political power were left without any economic power. The whites who had the economic power firmly in their hands felt threatened by their lack of political and numerical power. Mandela had the onerous task of crafting the rhetoric needed to bring all the groups who were suspicious of each other into that space where they could learn to take and yield. It was also

important to create a new economic system where Blacks could be given the platform required to climb out of their impoverished state without giving the impression that their white counterparts were being deprived of their economic power. Blacks were impatient because they had been oppressed for too long, and the anti-apartheid struggle had taken a toll on them in many different ways.

It was imperative for Mandela to strive for the equilibrium that would forestall a counter white insurgency. The racist rhetoric that helped to create the imbalance in the first place was firmly etched in the minds of some South Africans, and the racial ideology behind that rhetoric needed to be deconstructed. White hegemony was established and perpetuated in discourse; therefore, it would require discourse to dismantle it. Fairclough examines such discourse through sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, and pragmatic lenses in order to account for the “what?” as well as the ‘why?’ and ‘how?’ questions used to describe the social relationships of power. A combination of these theoretical approaches to language use helps to explain the relationships between language and power and ideology.

This relationship helps to throw light on how existing sociolinguistic orders are created, how they are sustained, and how they might be changed to the advantage of those who are dominated by them (Fairclough, 8). According to Fairclough, a critical linguist, “[i]deologies are closely linked to power, because the nature of the ideological assumptions embedded in particular conventions, and so the nature of those conventions themselves, depend on the power relations which underlie the conventions; and because they are a means of legitimizing existing social relations and differences of power, simply through the recurrence of ordinary, familiar ways of behaving which take these relations and power differences for granted” (*Language*, 2). Therefore,

it can be argued that racism is an ideology that constructs power when it is embedded within the conventions that shape social relations.

The power constructed by racist discourse makes it important to examine the questions raised by Chilton, a cognitive linguist, such as: “why this kind of category formation is so persistent a factor in social behavior, and why the language forms associated with it are so potent” (Chilton, 24). Finding answers to such questions will be fruitful for interrogating how the human mind constructs as well as responds to social and political discourse. These constructs are connected to ideologies that “are closely linked to language because using language is the commonest form of social behavior, and the form of social behavior where we rely on ‘common-sense’ assumptions” (Fairclough, *Language*, 2). Chilton argues that the manner in which discourse constructs social reality implies that some sort of causal relationship exists between language use and social action.

This causal relationship makes CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis) productive as a tool for explaining racism and xenophobia. CDA accounts for how “particular language users establish exclusionary attitudes and maybe practices by recurrently and selectively asserting certain attributes (i.e. social roles, behavioral characteristics, physical appearance, etc.) of social and ethnic groups” (Chilton, 24). CDA is effective for establishing the connection of context as existing in “a causal relationship to social action (by which we might understand social relationships, group membership, the formations of social and political institutions and the like)” (Chilton, 23). This connection paves the way for showing that discourse as social action is transforming and transformative. The transformation caused by contextual discourse is exemplified by Mandela when political changes cause him to deploy language differently from how he had in the past. As he moves towards the political center, Mandela faces new challenges

and possibilities that force him to make strategic rhetorical changes. For example, when he addressed South African business executives just before he was elected president, he says to them:

We are very conscious of the critical importance of such matters as the confidence in the future of both the national and international business communities and investors. We accept that both these sectors are very important to the process of the further development of our economy. We can, therefore, have no desire to go out of our way to bash them and to undermine or weaken their confidence in the safety of their property and the assurance of a fair return on their investment. But we believe that they must be sensitive to the fact that any democratic government will have to respond to the justified popular concern about the grossly unequal distribution of economic power (“We Must End the Old Social Order and Bring in a New One,” 63).

It is interesting to observe what Mandela does in the above speech. When he uses the pronouns “we,” “our,” and “us,” he is identifying with these group of people who hold all the economic power as his equals. Although Blacks do not have the desired political power yet, Mandela is communicating with the assurance that the political power will eventually be attained. Therefore, he is projecting towards the future based on the present reality and having in mind the past injustices of apartheid. In essence, the assurance of power is reflected in Mandela’s speech. The way power shapes human behaviour is captured by Fairclough, who argues that “[p]ower exists in various modalities, including the concrete and unmistakable modality of physical force. It is a fact, if a sad fact, that power is often enough exercised through depriving people of their jobs, their homes, and their lives, as recent events in for example South Africa have reminded us” (3-4). For Fairclough, power is not just a matter of language; power assumes various forces. Identifying the various modalities of power helps to produce a wide variance between the exercise of power through coercion of many different forms such as physical violence, and the exercise of power through consent or acquiescence. Mandela attempts to gain consent among white South Africans even before he becomes president by pointing out the unequal power relations between Blacks and whites.

Achievement of assent in apartheid and post-apartheid South Africa was quite a complicated issue because the interests were as diverse as the groups. Mandela captures the complexity of the South African socio-economic and political milieu in the following words: “We hope that the fact that we are meeting here signifies that there is a common acceptance among us that we necessarily must cooperate to ensure that the people do indeed enjoy a decent standard of living in conditions of freedom. To establish a system of cooperation requires that we have to overcome the mutual mistrust that, to some degree, undoubtedly exists between us. And we do not have to elaborate the reasons for that distrust” (We Must End the Old Social Order and Bring in a New One,” 58). Mandela’s rhetorical shifts is evident in how the pronoun “us” is sometimes inclusive of the Business Executives who are all whites and who are in control of the national economy; while at other times, the use excludes them.

To overcome the unequal economic power between whites and Blacks, the need for consent is particularly important. To buttress the point, Mandela argues that the most important clauses of the Freedom Charter have to do with job creation and the provision of food, housing, and education for all. The reason that these clauses are so important is because “on one side of the street are the haves, and on the other, the have-nots; on one side, the whites, and on the other, the Blacks” (“We Must End the Old Social Order and Bring in a New One,” 57-58). Mandela deploys rhetoric in a way that can be described as covert in the sense that both he and his white audience can recognize that the freedom struggle was heading in only one direction, and that direction was victory for Blacks. Whites would have to yield political power as well as some economic power in order to ensure that there is a decent standard of living for Blacks. However, he does not merely use facts to make his rhetorical appeal. In his usual manner, he resorts to narratives, poetry, and rhetorical questions to disturb the conscience of his audience.

He employs a rhetorical strategy of drawing upon the Western rhetorical tradition by appropriating the English nursery rhyme “Baa, baa, black sheep” and Shakespeare’s *Merchant of Venice* to connect with his white audience. He says, for example, “you will, I am certain, remember the rhyme: Baa, baa, black sheep” (“We Must End the Old Social Order and Bring in a New One,” 58). After reciting the rhyme, he says to them “could it be that when the children composed this simple verse, they could understand that it was only the figurative Black sheep that would – because it was itself excluded – have a sufficient sense of justice to remember the little boy down the lane! Was it because they had seen in practice that the white sheep apportioned only a tenth of its wool, or none at all, to the little boy down the lane?” (“We Must End the Old Social Order and Bring in a New One,”58). Mandela uses the idea of “a tenth” or “none at all” to allude to the desperate economic situation of Blacks – “the have-nots” – to make an appeal to these Business Executives who are the “haves.” It can be argued that Mandela deployed the metaphor of numbers and percentages to evoke pathos in the minds of these business men who could appreciate the effect that such numerical strength or a lack of could have in economic terms. Therefore, this rhetorical strategy is effective for setting up the stage for deconstructing racism and the impact of racist policies in the lives of South African Blacks. To further depict the power of racism to blind people to the pain of the “other,” Mandela draws upon Shylock’s character in the following words:

Many a time the martingales and deprived people whom we represent have posed the same bitter questions that Shylock posed in Shakespeare’s *Merchant of Venice*: “Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? Questions such as these, whether about black sheep or the universal nature of human pain and suffering, can only be posed by people by people who are discriminated against, in a society that condemns them to persistent deprivation of the material artifacts and the dignity that are due to them as human beings. We pose them for the same reasons (“We Must End the Old Social Order and Bring in a New One,”58-59).

Mandela's analogies in the above quotation are particularly provocative because this audience would rather not have to answer such questions. This rhetorical strategy is especially nuanced because the "other" is placed on the same level as the racist that Shylock evokes in the play. However, in drawing upon the Western canon and rhetorical tradition, he connects with this audience on many levels. He connects with them on the level of equals when he used the pronoun "we" in "the people we represent." He shifts away from them by using the "us" versus "them" polarity that can be accusatory. He identifies with oppressors on the level of equal power and shifts ground to stand with the oppressed when he says that "We pose them [questions] for the same reasons [unequal power relations]." This continuous shifting of rhetorical grounds characterizes Mandela's discourse during the negotiation process and after he becomes the president.

Mandela's shifts are rhetorically appealing because he continuously exposes the unequal power relations in South African as one of the contexts for producing assent and cooperation in the peace process. Mandela's rhetorical moves validates Fairclough's argument that power relations depend on both coercion and consent in varying proportions to portray the fact that ideology is the primary means of manufacturing consent (Fairclough, 3-4). Mandela's arguments connect to Fairclough's idea that unequal power relations have huge implications. According to Mandela, "[t]he issue we are addressing is one of power and the uses and abuses of power. Those among us who are white come from that section of our population that has power, and in a sense, total power over the lives of the Black people. Nothing within the sphere human endeavor is excepted – be it political, economic, military, educational, or any other. Indeed, this even extends to the right to decide who shall live and who shall die" ("We Must End the Old Social Order and Bring in a New One," 59). In essence, discourse in context is a significant factor for producing economic and political domination of the "other." Such domination is described by Derrida as a

cause and effect phenomenon emanating from language use. According to Derrida, “the properly *performative* act must produce (proclaim) what in the form of a *constative* [all emphasis in the original] act it merely claims, declares, assures it is describing” (18). In essence, there is a sequence to the various acts, and in the case of racial violence, the constative precedes the performative act.

The extent to which racial violence, as a performative act, can deform a society is often overlooked; however, “not all performatives, a theoretician [J. L. Austin] of *speech acts* would say, are “happy.” That depends on a great number of conditions and conventions that form the context of such events. In the case of South Africa, certain “conventions” were not respected, the violence was too great, *visibly too great*, at a moment when this visibility extended to a new international scene, and so on” (Derrida, 18). This violence derives its magnitude from the fact that the white community was too much in the minority, and the disproportion of wealth was too flagrant and too skewed in favour of whites. Consequently, the harm caused by this disproportion to South African people of color was excessive. The excessive effect of Black impoverishment by the apartheid regime was manifesting in the bitterness and impatience of the Black population.

Deploying Education as a Privileging Tool

The domination of Black South Africans was executed through several methods such as “a parody of education, the hasty manufacture of a few thousand subordinate functionaries’ “boys,” artisans, office clerks, and interpreters necessary for the smooth operation of business” (Desai Gaurav and Nair Supriya, 62). Based on Gaurav and Supriya’s evaluations, the South African situation was typical of colonial oppression that aims to ensure the colonized remain below the poverty level. Mandela captures this tactic of impoverishing South African Blacks in the following

words: “before the Nationalists came to power, the disparities in funding tell a story of racist education. The government spent about six times as much per white student as per African student. Education was not compulsory for Africans and was free only in the primary grades. Less than half of all African children of school age attended any school at all, and only a tiny number of Africans were graduated from high school. Even this amount of education proved distasteful to the Nationalists” (*Long Walk*, 166). The main reason that education for Africans would be distasteful to the Nationalist is because education was the gateway to intellectual and economic empowerment.

According to Mandela, “[t]he Afrikaner has always been unenthusiastic about education for Africans. To him, it was simply a waste, for the African was inherently ignorant and lazy and no amount of education could remedy that. The Afrikaner was traditionally hostile to Africans learning English, for English was a foreign tongue to the Afrikaner and the language of emancipation to us” (*Long Walk*, 166). The adjectives – distasteful, unenthusiastic, and hostile – used by Mandela to describe the Afrikaner’s attitude towards education for Africans depict the gravity of the emotions that gave rise to such destructive policies. Both the policies and the inherent contradictions in the policy that depict such a warped view of Africans magnify the psychology of racist apartheid. If Africans were ignorant and lazy as claimed by the Afrikaners, it would be assumed that education would be proposed as the antidote and not the other way around.

Therefore, the branding of Africans as ignorant and lazy was just an excuse to deny them the much-needed education. Africans were being denied education because an educated Black population had the potential to rise above their current social, political, and economic conditions to be on an equal level with their white counterparts. In essence, education of Blacks implied a destabilization of the hierarchy/hegemony of white supremacy. Mandela’s take on the sub-

standard education indicate that Afrikaners did not want the potential risk of an enlightened so-called inferior race. That is because it would be much easier to suppress an ignorant group than to dominate an educated one. The idea of denying Blacks education and resources for improvement connects strongly to Fairclough's concept of the various modalities of power.

Theorizing the modalities of power helps to put in perspective how denying standard education to Blacks was an attempt to colonize their minds. Mandela links the substandard education designed for Blacks to the strategy of permanently subjecting them to an inferior position. For example, Mandela argues that Dr. Hendrick Verwoerd, the minister of Bantu education, reasoned that the education offered to Black must be to train and teach the people in accordance with their opportunities in life. Verwoerd could not imagine an African population with intellectual potentials; therefore, it was useless to educate them. Quoting Verwoerd, Mandela says that "[t]here is no place for the Bantu in the European community above the level of certain levels of labor," he said. In short, Africans should be trained to be menial workers, to be in a position of perpetual subordination to the white man" (*Long Walk*, 167). Mandela's argument is proof that the constative act of labelling Blacks inferior set the stage for the performative act of their perpetual inferiorization through the apartheid education policy.

Mandela depicts how the economic, social, and political subjugation of Blacks was designed, using the educational system as the foundational framework. This framework placed a ceiling on their chances for opportunities by putting a cap on how much education a Black person could attain. Consequently, the social, political, and economic growth of Blacks was predetermined by an educational policy designed to inferiorize them. To concretize their inferiorization, Blacks could neither vote nor hold public offices; and this exclusion from power erased their potential for self-determination. The tenacity with which the apartheid government

pursued the subjugation of Blacks was evident in the various levels of physical, economic, and psychological injustice meted out to the Black population. These injustices caused great anger and pain in Mandela as well as other Black leaders, and the resentment made them all the more determined to dismantle apartheid.

The Thorny Path to Peace Negotiation

Mandela's long incarceration did not end the anti-apartheid struggle; instead, there was an escalation of violence with the country tethering on the verge of economic, social, and political collapse. The South African socio-political and economic landscape was greatly racialized, polarized, and fragmented. Crapanzano describes the situation prior to the release of Mandela as a time when South Africa "is caught in a deadened time of waiting. For most whites, waiting is compounded by fear; for most Blacks, however great their poverty or despair, waiting is illuminated by hope, by a belief that time is on their side. For the Coloureds and Asians, there is both fear and hope in waiting" (xxii). This deadened time of waiting and the immense suffering experienced by South Africans generally and Blacks particularly caused Mandela to step into the vacuum created by the stalemate between the government and the leaders of the anti-apartheid struggle.

The reasons for the impasse were quite glaring, and the root causes of the conflicts that gave birth to the impasse were often submerged in identification, moralization, and the subjective ways that terminologies were interpreted among the conflicting parties. The impasse required transcendence, which readily undercuts racial and philosophical affiliations in order to mitigate and resolve the lingering conflicts. Transcendence accounts for Mandela's shift in mindset that

resulted in a transitional rhetoric, while remaining faithful to the tenets of the anti-apartheid struggle. The first inkling of transcendence on Mandela's part can be glimpsed from the correspondences he initiated from prison in the following words: "THE DEEPENING [capitals in the original] political crisis in our country has been a matter of grave concern to me for quite some time, and I consider it necessary in the national interest for the African National Congress and the government to meet urgently to negotiate an effective settlement" (Mandela, "The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement," 9). Mandela's rhetorical shifts can be seen in the way he deploys the English lexical structure to convey a meaning potential that is dynamic.

The usage of the pronoun 'I' by Mandela on several occasions in the letter to the apartheid government indicate an individuality that may be viewed as overshadowing his collective intent. Rather than view the individualized pronoun "I" as a deliberate attempt to separate himself from the collective frame of the struggle, it should be examined as a depiction of Mandela's transcendence. When analyzed vis a vis his initiative of brokering peace, Mandela's language symbolizes a practice of rising above the complex chaos that the nation had degenerated into. The incessant violence, the rising death rate, especially the death of Black South Africans, coupled with the ostracization of South Africa in the comity of nations all converged to galvanize Mandela into making the peace moves. Mandela's letter to the government from prison and his employment of the pronouns "I" and "We" served to symbolize his singularity on the one hand and the collectivity symbolized by the ANC as the arrowhead of the anti-apartheid struggle on the other hand. Mandela's deployment of the individual and collective pronouns for resolving the apartheid conflict exemplifies Burke's ideas in the five key terms of dramatism. The five key terms – Act,

Scene, Agent, Agency, and Purpose – help to determine the motives behind certain discourses, especially that employed in conflict. According to Burke,

Men may violently disagree about the purposes behind a given act, or about the character of the person who did it, or how he did it, or in what kind of situation he acted; or they may even insist upon totally different words to name the act itself. But be that as it may, any complete statement about motives will offer *some kind* [emphasis in the original] of answers to these five questions: what was done (act), when or where it was done (scene), who did it (agent), how he did it (agency), and why (purpose) (*A Grammar*, xv).

The internal relationship between these five terms, their possibilities for transformation, and their range of permutations and combinations have bearings on human motives. The internal relationship enables the appreciation of Mandela's role in dealing with the apartheid complexities and their implications for defining the context of the political impasse. Mandela's individualistic actions and language require rigorous examination in light of Burke's argument that "[r]andom or unsystematic statements about motives could be considered as fragments of a philosophy" (*A Grammar*, xvi). In essence, Mandela's philosophy of communal harmony that is in tandem with his African identity provides the framework for understanding the motives behind his rhetoric. The social, racial, and political cleavages in South Africa (while Mandela languished in prison) affected him personally in a way that makes the nation of South Africa a personification of Mandela's own physical body. Mandela's principle of looking beyond himself informs the trope of equating the nation with his being. To extend the idea that grammatical resources represent principles of identification, Mandela's linguistic deployments require investigating in the context of his rhetorical evolution over the course of the struggle.

Burke argues that various philosophies are *casuistries* through which these principles apply to temporal situations. Therefore, the term 'Scene' simply acts as a blanket term for the concept of background or setting in general, which is also a name for any context in which acts or agents

perform (Burke, *A Grammar*, xvi). The scene in question here (a fragmented South Africa) necessitated the act (of initiating correspondences with the government) on the part of Mandela, the agent. This act was considered unwise because Mandela's philosophy of rising above the contextual complications of the conflict and its consequent political deadlock was not apparent to everyone. However, the motive and the act were transcendental because Mandela sacrificed his personal interest for the general good.

Mandela captures that transcendence in the idea of "national interest. This principle resonates with Mandela's desire for peace, equality, and unity that makes up the why (purpose) of his act. In addition, the role of "act", "agent", "agency", and "purpose" in the central place of "scene" (Burke, *A Grammar*, xvii) operate as the ultimate ground for human action. According to Burke, a person may employ "God," another uses "nature," a third uses "environment," or "history," or "means of production" as a philosophical motivation for action. And, "since each philosophical idiom will characterize this background differently, there will remain the question of which characterization is "right" or "more nearly right" (Burke, *A Grammar*, xvii). In order to examine whose motivation is more right in the case of the South African stalemate, Mandela's actions make the question of rightness quite interesting.

The point being made here is that not only did Mandela risk his reputation and position with the ANC, he also risked failure in the peace process. Despite these risks, he was undeterred from initiating the peace moves because his concern for the national state of affairs transcended all other concerns. The suffering endured by the leaders of the anti-apartheid struggle paled into insignificance when compared to the deplorable living conditions of Black South Africans as a result of the protracted conflict. The reality of how bad things had become in South Africa is captured by Mandela in the following words:

I am disturbed, as many other South Africans no doubt are, by the specter of a South Africa split into two hostile camps – blacks (the term blacks is used in a broad sense to include all those who are not whites) on the one side and whites on the other – slaughtering one another, by acute tensions which are building dangerously in practically every sphere of our lives – a situations which, in turn, preshadows more violent clashes in the days ahead. This is the crisis that has forced me to act (“The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement,”10).

Mandela’s rhetoric in the peace process requires serious scrutiny. That is because his rhetoric undercuts the manoeuvrings usually employed in conflict situations. Such manoeuvring is described by Burke as a move “to formulate the basic stratagems which people employ, in endless variations, and consciously or unconsciously, for the outwitting or cajoling of one another. Since all these devices have a “you and me” quality about them, being “addressed” to some person or to some advantage, we classed them broadly under the heading of a Rhetoric” (Burke, *A Grammar*, xvii). Mandela does not seek to either outwit or cajole; rather, his tone is matter-of-fact, informative, conciliatory, and sometimes antagonistic. When he employs the “I/we” versus “you” pronoun, it is with the intention of collapsing the walls that these oppositions normally erect in a conflict situation.

Mandela’s rhetoric explicitly illustrates Burke’s key terms of dramatism as a way of showing how he takes charge of the situation. It can be argued that Burke’s concepts of “act,” “agent,” “scene,” “agency,” and “purpose” work together to depict the shifts in Mandela’s rhetoric. In essence, the shifts are enacted when he uses language that portrays conciliation in one instance and in another instance, his language is accusatory when addressing the apartheid government. It can be argued that this shift was not an effort to exploit the situation to gain any advantage; instead, Mandela deploys this rhetorical shift to expose the level to which Blacks have been totally stripped of power. In fact, Mandela’s words reveal how the people had been suppressed and how Black

leaders have been targets of apartheid repression through scapegoating. The leaders of the anti-apartheid struggle were framed as terrorists and communists to justify their scapegoating.

By implication, Black leaders and white supporters of the movement were depicted as troublemakers who were being blamed for the instability in apartheid South Africa. By labeling these leaders communists and terrorists, the apartheid government was acting out a script. The script was based on the knowledge that “[t]errorism inevitably reflected poorly on those who used it, undermining any public support it might otherwise garner” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 282). This labelling created huge problems for Mandela and other ANC leaders because this labelling provided an excuse for their brutalization. Such labelling ensured the leaders got the worst treatment in prison because “if a man worked for the prison service, he was probably brainwashed by the government’s propaganda. He would have believed that we were terrorists and communists who wanted to drive the white man into the sea” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 419). Despite being scapegoated and severely punished for his beliefs, Mandela always hoped for and worked towards cooperation, which accounts for his peace moves and ultimate call for reconciliation.

Mandela’s Dynamism and Diplomacy in the Peace Process

The idea of preserving lives and cohesion in the community was a part of his African communal trope, and it played a key role in Mandela’s response to conflict. Consequently, even when Mandela shifted from nonviolence to armed struggle, he and the ANC chose sabotage particularly “[b]ecause it did not involve loss of life [and] it offered the best hope for reconciliation among the races afterward. We did not want to start a blood feud between white and Black. Animosity between Afrikaner and Englishman was still sharp fifty years after the Anglo-Boer

War; what would race relations be like between white and Black if we provoked a civil war? Sabotage had the added virtue of requiring the least manpower” (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 282 -283). Parenthood and transcendence, whereby every form of partisanship is submerged for the interest of the South African state, describe Mandela’s choices and peace efforts. Mandela’s transcendence enabled his transformation because he changes from the agent that is acted upon by the scene (racist apartheid system) and the co-agents (the implementers of apartheid policies) into the reversal role of a counter-agent. He becomes the counter-agent, who is acted upon and in turn acts upon the scene and the agent.

Mandela employed an interesting strategy in his peace efforts that was constantly morphing. In essence, he would stand firm when he needed to and yield at other times. Mandela stood firm when he argued in support of the ANC by pointing out that some of the preconditions for negotiation stated by the government, “namely that the ANC must first renounce violence, break with the SACP, and abandon its demand for majority rule” (“The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement,” 11), were implausible. Bearing in mind that the same conditions produced the stalemate in the first place, Mandela put forward the argument that showed how the government was more responsible for the stalemate than the ANC leaders. Therefore, it can be argued that Mandela’s rhetoric in the letter to the government bears the hallmark of diplomacy. For example, Mandela argues against the government in the following words:

No dedicated ANC member will ever heed a call to break with the SACP. We regard such as a purely divisive government strategy. It is in fact a call on us to commit suicide. Which man of honor will ever desert a lifelong friend at the instance of a common opponent and still retain a measure of credibility among his people? Which opponent will ever trust such a treacherous freedom fighter? Yet this is what the government is, in effect, asking us to do – to desert our faithful allies. We will not fall into that trap (“The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement,” 15).

Mandela simulates a courtroom in his letter by accusing the government of duplicity and producing an irrefutable argument that is logical and profound. He strategically turns the accuser into the accused as he had done on previous occasions. The strategy of turning the tables on the apartheid government is achieved through forensic logic that lays out proofs of deception and double standard on the part of the government. Mandela captures this double standard by pointing out that “the government also accuses us of being agents of the Soviet Union. The truth is that the ANC is nonaligned, and we welcome support from the East and West, from the socialist and capitalist countries. The only difference, as we have explained on countless occasions before, is that the socialist countries supply us with weapons, which the West refuses to give us” (“The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement,” 15). This directness was a part and parcel of his leadership and rhetorical style. Mandela stated that the ANC had no intention of changing their stand on the question of choosing whom to be loyal to.

He argues that “the government’s exaggerated hostility to the SACP and its refusal to have any dealings with that party have a hollow ring. Such an attitude is not only out of step with the growing cooperation between the capitalist and socialist countries in different parts of the world, but it is also inconsistent with the policy of the government itself, when dealing with our neighboring states” (“The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement,” 15). The point Mandela makes here is that the apartheid regime was being hypocritical in their hostility toward the ANC alliances. The hypocrisy is evident in the fact that “not only has South Africa concluded treaties with the Marxist states of Angola and Mozambique – quite rightly in our opinion – but she also wants to strengthen ties with Marxist Zimbabwe. The government will certainly find it difficult, if not altogether impossible, to reconcile its readiness to work with foreign Marxists for the peaceful resolution of mutual problems, with its

uncompromising refusal to talk to South African Marxists” (Mandela, “The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement,” 15). The double standard enacted by the apartheid regime exemplifies the moral absence that racism breeds.

According to Mandela, “[t]he reason for this inconsistency is obvious. As I have already said, the government is still too deeply committed to the principle of white domination and, despite lip service to reform, it is deadly opposed to the sharing of political power with Blacks. And the SACP is merely being used as a smoke screen to retain the monopoly of political power” (“The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement,” 15). Hafriza Burhanudeen describes five features that diplomatic language should possess. These features include (1) that language use be inoffensive, sensitive, and non-aggressive to avoid conflict in a shared linguistic space, (2) to identify what should be said constructively, as well as accentuate what must not be said, (3) to regard language as a tool for building, making and promoting peace, (4) that communication must be tactful and tactical, and (5) that attitudes, beliefs and emotions be articulated in a positive manner by using adjectives, verbs and nouns that do not degrade other persons in spoken and written texts. An examination of Mandela’s letter to the government may give the impression that he violates the principles of diplomatic language.

The strong language employed by Mandela gives an interesting twist to his directness as a diplomatic strategy for negotiating peace. Diplomatic language often employs wordiness, modal auxiliaries such as ‘must,’ ‘shall,’ and ‘will’ as well as repetition in order to adequately convey the intended message. It must be born in mind that the goal of diplomatic language is the promotion of mutual cooperation for resolving conflicts. According to Levinson, “context is understood to cover the identities of participants, the temporal and spatial parameters of the speech event, and ... the beliefs, knowledge, and intentions of the participants in that speech event, and no doubt

much besides” (5). The fact is that Mandela’s language demonstrated that context played a key role in arriving at the meaning potential needed for breaking deadlocks in a conflict. The context of the apartheid reality and the anti-apartheid struggle makes the pragmatic nature of Mandela’s rhetoric quite exigent. It is significant to note that Mandela’s letter meets the required elements of Grice’s co-operative principles. The co-operative principle recommends that you “make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (Levinson, 101). This co-operative principle operates under the four maxims of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner.

The maxims recommend how interlocutors make contributions in a speech event in order not to violate the co-operative principles. For example, (1) “the maxim of quality” requires that a speaker does not say what they believe to be false or that for which they lack evidence, (2) “the maxim of quantity” recommends that a speaker makes their contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of exchange, does not make their information more informative than is required, (3) “the maxim of relevance” indicates that speakers make their contributions relevant, and (4) “the maxim of manner” requires that speakers be perspicuous, and avoid obscurity, avoid ambiguity, be brief, and be orderly (Levinson, 101 – 102). All of these maxims appear to be the blueprint for diplomatic language. Considering that Mandela’s language incorporates these elements, it can be argued that he employed diplomatic language despite presenting certain hard truths.

The language of diplomacy is embedded in etiquette, yet it has not succeeded in eliminating conflicts thus making diplomacy an evolving process. Diplomacy can be described as a process whereby conflicts are prevented and resolved through mediation, conciliation, and negotiation. Therefore, diplomacy involves reconciling different values and historical experiences

as well as shaking up conditions that hinder communication and peace. The contextual complexities of apartheid South Africa makes Mandela's diplomatic language relevant to the discourse context. The South Africa scene at the time Mandela wrote his letter in 1989 to the government enables a greater appreciation of the reason behind Mandela's intervention and his dynamic rhetoric.

Regardless of how Mandela's intervention is viewed, the most important consideration should revolve around the fact that he made a significant move when no one else was willing to take the risk. The risks entailed losing in the peace talk or/and being denounced by his followers and co-leaders because "both sides regarded discussions as a sign of weakness and betrayal" (Read, 318). Mandela depicted Read's point of view in his letter to the government in the following words: "it is in this spirit [of an open mind] that I have undertaken this mission, and I sincerely hope that nothing will be done or said here that will force me to revise my views on this aspect" ("The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement," 11). The risk of appearing weak once again or of being accused of betrayal by his fellow Blacks makes Read's idea of transformational leadership highly instructive.

According to Read, "[s]uccessful transformational leadership depends upon leaders [who produce] qualitative changes in a community's attitudes, belief, and values, as opposed to mere 'transactional leadership' that bargains with human beings instead of changing them" (319). This idea of changing the mindset of the people is evident in Mandela's conversation with Walter Sisulu, one of the ANC top leaders. When he informed Walter that he had commenced talks with the government, Sisulu was suspicious. According to Mandela,

I told him about my letter to the commissioner of prisons and my meeting with Coetsee. I said that I had discussed with Coetsee the idea of beginning talks with the government and that the government seemed interested. What were his views on the matter? I have been through thick and thin with Walter. He was a man of reason and

wisdom, and no man knew me better than he did. There was no one whose opinion I trusted or valued more. Walter considered what I told him. I could see he was uncomfortable, and at best, lukewarm. “In principle,” he said, “I am not against negotiations. But I would have wished that the government initiated talks with us rather than us initiating talks with them.” I replied that if he was not against negotiations in principle, what did it matter who initiated them? What mattered was what they achieved, not how they started. I told Walter that I thought we should move forward with negotiations and not worry about who knocked on the door first. Walter saw that my mind was made up and he said he would not stop me, but that he hoped I knew what I was doing (*Long Walk*, 534 – 535).

Mandela’s logical reasoning and his ability to persuade his fellow ANC leaders stem from his dynamic and transformative leadership. These leadership qualities are captured by Read as a variable-sum rather than zero-sum game. The concept of the variable-sum is described as the incorporation of various perspectives into producing assent among conflicting views. This concept of variable-sum shaped Mandela’s leadership in essential ways because he consistently sought to persuade others (on all sides). The variable-sum style is traceable to the South African idea of Ubuntu, whereby there is no loser in a conflict. Mandela’s style enabled him to perceive common interests under circumstances in which a different person might easily make a different choice (Read, 318). In addition to Mandela’s leadership qualities, his rhetorical appeal tended to rely heavily on rhetorical questions, which the Western and African rhetorical traditions have in common.

This rhetorical strategy pervades most of his speeches and writings as a means of probing deep into the motives of his adversaries and audience. It can be argued that his deployment of rhetorical questions connects strongly to his training as a lawyer – a profession that depends greatly on argumentation, logic, and dialectics in general. Mandela’s employment of layered tropes to great effect contributed to his rhetorical appeal. For example, the idea of not worrying about “who knocked on the door first” depicts the metaphor of a locked door, which is semiotically realized to

represent the political impasse. The locked door needed to be cracked open or possibly broken down in order move the country forward.

Mandela succeeded in persuading both sides of the need to negotiate for a peaceful resolution because he enacted the variable-sum game strategy, which proves that “[t]here is a common interest in reaching outcomes that are mutually advantageous” (Read, 320), rather than a zero-sum game in which more for one party means less for the other. The decision to reach out to the ‘enemy’ when he did was a rhetorical move that portrayed Mandela’s appreciation of *kairos*. It is important to examine Mandela’s employment of *kairos* in order to show how his foresight as a leader contributed greatly to his success. For example, in his dialogue with his fellow leaders who were afraid that he might have sold out, he enacted a division. He refused to allow his agency to be regarded with undue suspicion.

In a letter to Oliver Tambo, who had expressed fears that Mandela may have sold out to the enemy, Mandela says: “I replied to Oliver in a very terse letter saying that I was talking to the government about one thing and one thing only: a meeting between the National Executive Committee of the ANC and the South Africa government. I would not spell out the details, for I could not trust the confidentiality of the communication. I simply said the time had come for such talks and that would not compromise the organization in any way” (*Long Walk*, 536). Mandela’s words that “the time had come” connect to Bruce Barry and Robert J. Robinson’s concept of “ripeness.”

To Barry and Robinson, “ripeness” “holds that a dispute is ready for constructive negotiation when there exists both a mutually detrimental stalemate that pushes the parties to come to the bargaining table and a shared opportunity for a mutually beneficial settlement that holds out the promise of an attractive outcome” (138). Mandela’s foresight exemplified such ripeness or

kairos, which he seizes upon after his release from prison. This ripeness is captured in the following words: “Our struggle has reached a decisive moment. We call on our people to seize this moment so that the process towards democracy is rapid and uninterrupted. We have waited too long for our freedom. We can no longer wait. Now is the time to intensify the struggle on all fronts” (Mandela, “Now is the Time to Intensify the Struggle,” 22). Mandela gave this rousing speech to his followers while negotiating with the government. This rhetorical strategy that appears like a doubleness depicts his appreciation of *kairos*. Although some people accused him of having sold out, Mandela’s singular act rescued South Africa from the brink of total collapse. Mandela’s effective rhetoric was largely dependent upon his dynamism, which he enacted during the period of negotiation. The effectiveness of his strategies is made manifest through the merger and division he exemplified in his independent actions while remaining faithful to the policies and aims of the ANC.

Rhetorical Merger and Division in Birthing the Nation

The concept of merger and division is exemplified more potently in dialectics. Burke examines dialectics as “reasoning from opinion; the discovery of truth by the give and take of converse and redefinition; the art of disputation; the processes of “interaction” between the verbal and the non-verbal; the competition of cooperation or the cooperation of competition; the spinning of terms out of terms, as the dialectician proceeds to make explicit the conclusion implicit in key terms or propositions used as generating principle” (*A Grammar of Motives*, 403). What is aimed for in dialectics is some form of agreement that is arrived at through the interplay of various factors. These factors modify one another and may appear as voices in a dialogue. Each voice contributes in partiality “to the development of the whole; or the placement of one thought or thing in terms

of its opposite; or the progressive or successive development and reconciliation of opposite; or so putting questions to nature that nature can give unequivocal answer” (Burke, *A Grammar*, 403). The idea of reconciling opposites plays a significant role in Mandela’s effort to bring peace to South Africa. Mandela’s rhetoric exhibits the metaphor of parenthood whereby a parent calls conflicting child to the table of negotiation and reconciliation. Mandela’s parenthood and transcendence are evident in his role of bridging the communication gap between the government and the people. For example, he says:

I must add that the purpose of this discussion is not only to urge the government to talk to the ANC, but it is also to acquaint you with the views current among blacks, especially those in the Mass Democratic Movement. If I am unable to express these views frankly and freely, you will never know how the majority of South Africans think on the policy and actions of the government, you will never know how to deal with their grievances and demands. It is perhaps proper to remind you that the media here and abroad has given certain public figures in this country a rather negative image, not only in regards to human rights questions, but also in respect to their prescriptive stance when dealing with black leaders generally. The impression is shared not only by the vast majority of blacks but also by a substantial section of the whites. If I had allowed myself to be influenced by this impression. I would not even have thought of making this move. Nevertheless, I have come here with an open mind, and the impression I will carry away from this meeting will be determined almost exclusively by the manner in which you respond to my proposal (Mandela, “The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement,”10).

The importance of a nation state at a time when the focus is shifting from nationalism to the concept of transnationalism and global citizenship requires serious examination. The degree of disenfranchisements suffered by Blacks in South Africa undermines the concept of global citizenship “where human rights connect with human responsibilities, as individuals and groups seek to mediate the terms of global integration and interdependence” (Chris Armstrong, 352). Blacks could not afford the luxury of thinking global under apartheid because they had no basic human rights like freedom of movement and engagement enjoyed by their counterpart across the globe. Citizenship, with its rights and privileges, is conferred on people through the processes of

birth or immigration; and though born in South Africa, Blacks could not enjoy those rights and privileges. Consequently, it was extremely necessary for the people to have a nation where they could experience the belongingness that had eluded them through the cruel system of apartheid.

Mandela's strategy of merger and division exemplifies the birth metaphor. He midwives the birth of the nation through his ability to see things from various perspectives in the spirit of communal brotherhood. This communal brotherhood is an essential part of his braided rhetoric whereby the *imbongi*, who is an integral part of the African rhetorical tradition, plays the role of reconciling warring sides. This role of the *imbongi* is an element of his pragmatism, and it was certainly a contributory factor towards the birthing of the South African nation. Before Mandela intervened to break the deadlock, South Africa was not a nation. It was a country at war with itself. Mandela's division from his fellow anti-apartheid leaders enabled him step into the role of the midwife and parent. This transformation results in a merger with the government in order to bring about a greater good. Ironically, he also enacts a division from the government when the need arises.

The merger and division produced by Mandela's actions connects to Burke's argument that many kinds of transformations represent "[d]istinctions...[which] arise out of a great central moltenness, where all is merged" (*A Grammar*, xix). Mandela's division from the scene while still merged with it in his incarceration is exemplified in the various actions and distinctions he ultimately enacts. These actions and distinctions produce a fluidity that is "thrown from a liquid center to the surface, where they have congealed" (Burke, *A Grammar*, xix). Mandela shows how these distinctions that serve as a return to their sources in an alchemic center were instrumental to the peace process. From this center, they may be remade and can again become molten liquid that may enter into new combination, which may be thrown forth as a new crust or a different

distinction (*A Grammar*, xix). To bring about reconciliation, Mandela takes on the risk of enacting a division from the ANC leaders when it was paramount to break the deadlock, while being merged with these same leaders in order to fulfil the ANC objectives.

The move to negotiate with the government was a risk because he had not consulted with the executive committee of the ANC. He was risking the distrust of the ANC leaders because as Read points out, “[t]he ANC’s policy all along had been to seek negotiations with the South African government, but none of the ANC’s preconditions for talks – unbanning the ANC, releasing all political prisoners, allowing free and open political opposition- had been met. Under the circumstances, for Mandela to agree to talks could easily be seen as capitulation” (317). Mandela went ahead to make the overture to the government in order to forestall further loss of lives despite this obvious risk of appearing to have compromised his ethos and that of the ANC. His aptitude for initiating and helping to conclude the peace process can be described as being located in his African culture of communal brotherhood. This African sense of honour when combined with his acquired Western culture of justice makes Mandela a unique rhetor. This sense of honour made him to seek not to dishonour another human being. According to Mandela,

I learned my lesson one day from an unruly donkey. We had been taking turns climbing up and down its back and when my chance came, I jumped on and the donkey bolted into a nearby thornbush. It bent its head, trying to unseat me, which it did, but not before the thorns had pricked and scratched my face, embarrassing me in front of my friends. Like the people of the East, Africans have a highly developed sense of dignity, or what the Chinese call “face.” I had lost face among my friends. Even though it was a donkey that unseated me, I learned that to humiliate another person is to make him suffer an unnecessarily cruel fate. Even as a boy, I defeated my opponents without dishonoring them (*Long Walk*, 10).

The idea of honour, which guided Mandela during the negotiations for peace, was significant in bringing about a smooth transition. In enacting a division with his fellow anti-apartheid leaders, Mandela did not merely merge with any particular group; instead, he enacts a

merger with the entire people of South Africa regardless of race or ideology. The dialectical opposition between individuality of division and the collectivity of a merger is not fully embodied in the prevailing context of peace negotiation. What is observed is that Mandela's individuality is really a consubstantial merger in the sense he is now for all in general and for no one in particular. Mandela's strategy of merger and division occurred within a lot of contextual manoeuvrings. The manoeuvring was exigent because of the fragmented state of the country. The dexterity with which he negotiated with integrity exemplified his sense of honour. His exemplary role resulted in his election as the first Black President of South African. Thus, a nation was born.

Mandela's Transformation from Activist to Nation Builder

Mandela's individuality was instrumental in his transformation from an activist to the father of the nation. This transformation is evident in the merger that he enacts with people of all races such as the business community (made up mostly of whites) and people of all ideological affiliations. The merger and division as a rhetorical strategy is most evident in his address to the South African Business Executives: "We Must End the Old Social Order and Bring in a New One." The pronoun "we" and "us" pervades the entire speech as a way of symbolizing the collapsing wall of division. The existence of the wall is captured in the following words:

Recently, I had the occasion to read an advertisement inserted in the British press by the Anglo American Corporation. It begins by quoting various clauses of the Freedom Charter, which have to do job creation and the provision of food, housing, and education. It then poses the very important and correct question: "If the South African economy doesn't deliver, how can any politician hope to?" That in a sense encapsulates the significance of this conference. Both of us – you representing the business world and we a political movement – must deliver. The critical questions are whether we can in fact act together and whether it is possible for either one of us to deliver if we cannot or will not cooperate (Mandela, "We Must End the Old Social Order and Bring in a New One," 57 – 58).

The lexical structure deployed, which has the inclusive pronouns “we” and “us,” dominates Mandela’s rhetoric as an example of rhetorical identification. Despite exploiting identification, Mandela’s rhetorical tactics are significant because the identification embodied is transformative in the sense that he aims to transform the ‘scene’ (South Africa) through the ‘agency’ of rhetoric/’us’ (South Africans), and the ultimate “purpose” is the chance for racial integration and equity. Mandela’s transformative rhetoric is itself transformed as he gradually moves from the divisive and exclusive pronouns of “we”/”us” versus “you” lexico-semantic discourse of his anti-apartheid rhetoric to that of merger and inclusive pronouns of “us” and “we” as he moves towards the political center of power.

For example, in describing the context of the exclusion of Blacks from power, Mandela serves to remind the powers that be of their role in producing political instability in South Africa. Mandela says that “[t]he cause of our discontent is, in part, our exclusion from the exercise of political power and our consequent condemnation to a situation of being the victims of the abuse of power. The inclusion of all people of South Africa within a genuinely democratic system will therefore remove this particular cause of our discontent” (Mandela, “We Must End the Old Social Order and Bring in a New One,” 59-60). Mandela’s words imply that the strategy of merger and division is deployed in dynamic ways. That is because he moves further away from the “I/we/us” versus “you/them/they” position towards the all-inclusive “we/us” and “you” upon his election as the president. Upon becoming President, Mandela combines the inclusive pronouns with the birth metaphor to depict that every South African is involved in bringing to birth this new nation from its old, wounded, and fragmented form. This birth metaphor is captured in Mandela’s inaugural speech in the following words:

Today, all of us do, by our presence here, and by our celebrations in other parts of our country and the world, confer glory and hope to newborn liberty. Out of the experience of an extraordinary human disaster that lasted too long, must be born a society of which all humanity will be proud. Our daily deeds as ordinary South Africans must produce an actual South African reality that will reinforce humanity's belief in justice, strengthen its confidence in the nobility of the human soul and sustain all our hopes for a glorious life for all. All this we owe both to ourselves and to the peoples of the world who are so well represented here today. To my compatriots, I have no hesitation in saying that each one of us is as intimately attached to the soil of this beautiful country as are the famous jacaranda trees of Pretoria and the mimosa trees of the bushveld. Each time one of us touches the soil of this land, we feel a sense of personal renewal. The national mood changes as the seasons change. We are moved by a sense of joy and exhilaration when the grass turns green and the flowers bloom (Mandela, "Inaugural Speech, Pretoria").

Mandela's braided rhetoric is made manifest in the employment of the birth, land/soil, season, and the flora/fauna metaphors that serve to delineate a spring time when nature is reborn or renewed in life and beauty. The connection to the soil is an African rhetorical topos that serves to show how the African identity is embedded within the soil, and the soil acts as a symbol of wholesomeness, communal co-existence, and ancestral regeneration. Mandela's inaugural speech is a rhetorical transformation that shows he has moved from a position on the margin as an anti-apartheid fighter to the movement towards the political center. Mandela portrays this rhetorical transition in a manner that can be described as the ultimate identification. The identification, which is signified by the pronoun "we"/us," coalesces with the metaphors of springtime to show that all South Africans are being reborn. The effusive manner with which Mandela deploys these metaphors serves to produce an image that is semiotically realized as a beautiful garden where everyone and everything work together in perfect harmony.

Mandela's deployment of the metaphor of a new and beautiful South Africa connects to the image of the Garden of Eden before the fall as an invocation of a Judeo-Christian concept and the Western rhetorical tradition. This image is produced in the following words: "We are moved

by a sense of joy and exhilaration when the grass turns green and the flowers bloom” (Mandela, “Inaugural Speech, Pretoria”) to symbolize a luxurious springtime. Beautiful as the springtime may be, it does not last. The summer time brings with it a scorching heat as Mandela is faced with the challenges of governing a fractured nation. This challenge proved to be a test that threatened to destroy Mandela’s ethos as a leader yet again. When Mandela became the president in May 1994, the people had waited too long for this dream to come true, and they were impatient for quick development. The inability to produce social and economic development at the pace desired by the people caused them to accuse Mandela of selling them out once again. One of those who criticized Mandela in the most vociferous manner was Winnie Mandela, his ex-wife. According to a newspaper interview Winnie is alleged to have given, she says:

Mandela let us down. He agreed to bad deal for the Blacks. Economically, we are still on the outside. The economy is very much ‘white’. It has a few token blacks, but so many who gave their life in the struggle have died unrewarded...I cannot forgive him for going to receive the Nobel (Peace Prize in 1993) with his jailer [FW] de klerk. Hand in hand they went. Do you think de Klerk released him from the goodness of his heart? He had to. The times dictated it, the world had changed, and our struggle was not a flash in the pan, it was bloody to say the least and we had given rivers of blood. I had kept it alive with every means at my disposal...look at the Truth and Reconciliation charade. He should never have agreed to it...What good does the truth do? How does it help anyone to know where and how their loved ones were killed and buried? That Bishop Tutu who turned it all into a religious circus came here...He had the cheek to tell me to appear. I told him a few home truths. I told him that he and his other like-minded cretins were only sitting here because of our struggle and ME [capitals in the origin]. Because of the things I and people like me had done to get freedom (Mandira Naipaul, “How Mandela betrayed us, says ex-wife Winnie”).

Winnie’s criticisms represent a rupture in the ANC body. As Mandela’s ex-wife, a key member of the ANC, and a member of parliament from 1994 – 2003, Winnie’s accusations carried a lot of weight. There was an obvious division stemming from disagreements among Blacks and their leaders. These divisions were most evident during the negotiation phase of the movement where the divide and rule tactics of the governments were at their highest. After the elections were

concluded and power was in the hands of the black majority, the bitterness among Blacks became palpable. Mandela's capacity to see things from different perspectives came to the rescue once again. Through the performance of a pentadic ratio, Mandela points the searchlight upon his own Black people. Thus, Mandela validates Burke's argument that the pentadic ratios are principles of determination (*A Grammar*, 15). In an address on Mashakane Focus Week in Bothaville, South Africa on October 4, 1998, Mandela enacts a merger with his fellow Blacks in a manner that is actually a division from them.

In his address, Mandela explains how actual developments take time and efforts in the following words: “[a]fter apartheid ended, we faced the difficult task of reconstructing our shattered society and providing the most basic of services for our people. We had to build schools and hospitals, to provide housing and jobs, to boost our economy, to protect our people's rights through our constitution and our courts, to help South Africa deal with the division of its past and start the healing process, to deal with abuse and damage, which engulfed most of our communities” (United Nations. “Nelson Mandela: In his Own Words.”). It is interesting to see how Mandela's rhetoric transformed from that of a freedom fighter to that of “the father of the Nation.” Mandela's employment of identification, merger, and division is quite strategic and appealing.

Mandela goes on to add that “government cannot meet challenges by itself. It requires of us all to pull together, into a partnership, in order to bring about the necessary changes,” Mandela changes from the collective pronoun – “we/us,” to the individual/singular pronoun “I” to make the point that the individuals are all “I” within the collective – “we’ in conjunction with the government as “agents.” All these agents must “act” together for the “purpose” of bringing about

the required change in South Africa. Mandela throws the challenge back to the people in the following words:

When we say that the best solutions to these challenges can only be found when we work with each other, it requires a commitment of each and every one of us. Today we should all ask ourselves: What have I done to improve the surroundings in which I live? Do I litter or do I protect my surroundings? Do I spread racial hatred or do I promote peace and reconciliation? Do I buy stolen goods or do I help to reduce crime? Do I pay my dues or do I cheat on my taxes, service fees and licenses? Do I expect everything to be delivered to me or do I work with my councilors to create a better life for myself and my community? (Mandela, *“Address by President Nelson Mandela at a Municipal Infrastructure Programme in the Free State.”*).

In his characteristic manner, Mandela deploys rhetorical questions coupled with various pentadic ratios to probe the consciences of his audience. The pentadic ratio is operating upon the merger and division embodied by the pronoun “I” and the possessive pronoun “my.” The use of “I/my” is a merger with the people to mean “we/ours” and a division to mean “you” as individuals and “your” individual efforts.

Those who accused Mandela of “selling out” because he was willing to share power with their former oppressors failed to realize that the political compromise reached by Mandela was “expressive of the spirit of ubuntu and of long-established African traditions wherein society frowned on extremism of any kind” (Sisifo Ndlovu, 188). Despite the fact that there were attempts to make him appear weak once again by his followers and fellow ANC leaders, Mandela demonstrates that his actual strength lies in the so-called weakness because his Africanness put a burden on his heart such that “[i]n a conflict situation...not even the victor could lay claim to the entire fruits of victory; nor could the defeated enemy be completely excluded” (Ndlovu, 188). The point is that even when there is no obvious employment of African rhetorical mode in his speech, the concept of ubuntu always guided his words and actions. Consequently, having arrived in the

political center, Mandela's rhetorical strategies tended to depict McPhail's rhetoric of coherence, which transcends complicit rhetoric. The rhetoric of coherence is more significant in South Africa where racial conflict had inflicted deep wounds. The racial polarities that brought South Africa to its knees produced several ghosts that needed to be laid to rest for the new nation to move forward. The Government of National Unity and Truth and Reconciliation Commission were the measures through which the nation could begin the process of healing.

Catharsis of Truth and Reconciliation

Mandela always sought ways to produce catharsis, so that the bitterness in the heart of the oppressed will not result in revenge or in the victimization of the scapegoat. For example, in the Vaal township of Boipatong on June 17, 1992, a heavily armed force of Inkatha members (a rival group of the ANC) secretly raided and murdered forty-six ANC members, most of whom were women and children. Mandela wrote that “[p]eople across the country were horrified by the violence and charged the government with complicity. The police did nothing to stop the criminals and nothing to find them; no arrests were made, no investigation begun. Mr. de Klerk said nothing. I found this to be the last straw, and my patience snapped. The government was blocking the negotiations and at the same time waging a covert war against our people” (*Long Walk*, 602-603). Rather than resort to violence, as the people were demanding, Mandela sought ways to diffuse the tension in order to calm things down. According to Mandela,

I addressed a crowd of twenty thousand angry ANC supporters and told them I had instructed ANC secretary-general Cyril Ramaphosa to suspend direct dealings with the government...At the rally, I saw signs that read, “MANDELA, GIVE US GUNS” and “VICTORY THROUGH BATTLE NOT TALK” [capitals in original]. I understood such sentiments; people were frustrated...I was initially sympathetic to this group of

hardliners, but gradually realized that there was no alternative to the process. It was what I had been urging for so many years, and I would not turn my back on negotiations. But it was time to cool things down. Mass action in this case was a middle course between armed struggle and negotiations. The people must have an outlet for their anger and frustration, and a mass action campaign was the best way to channel those emotions (Mandela, *Long Walk*, 604).

Mandela deploys repetition for appealing to the people in order to calm them down in the face of obvious provocation. Mandela's readiness to rise above the moment without losing sight of the exigency or reality of the moment caused him to seek a "middle course" of releasing tension rather than risk an implosion. After his election, he carried on this philosophy of seeking the middle course by setting up the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). The TRC aimed to produce catharsis by revisiting past injustices in a spirit of communal brotherhood through disclosure and, possibly, closure. It was a middle course between the demands of a beleaguered apartheid government that was demanding "that in exchange for loss of power there should be blanket amnesty for all the agents of apartheid, particularly the police and the armed forces" (Njabulo Ndebele, "South Africa: quandaries of compromise") and the call for justice and punishment of perpetrators by the victims of apartheid.

Mandela recognized the need for healing through forgiveness and reconciliation in a way that can be transformative. Mandela's words "I was chained as you were chained. I was freed, and you have been freed. So, if I can pardon my oppressors, you can too," captures his leadership style of leading by example. It is instructive to note that though Mandela has enacted a separation from Dr. King in adopting the armed struggle, it can be argued that he merges his ideas with those of Dr. King in his call for peace and reconciliation. Mandela's motive for the peace and reconciliation commission echoes Dr. King's following words:

We Negroes have long dreamed of freedom, but still we are confined in an oppressive prison of segregation and discrimination. Must we respond with bitterness and cynicism? Certainly not, for this will destroy and poison our personalities...To guard

ourselves from bitterness, we need the vision to see in this generation's ordeals the opportunity to transfigure both ourselves and American society. Our present suffering and our nonviolent struggle to be free may well offer to Western civilization the kind of spiritual dynamic so desperately needed for survival (*A Gift of love*, 98).

The danger of bitterness rests in its possible outlets, which can only be catastrophic. What confronted Mandela on assumption of office as the president was a problem that "was analogous to two powerful steam engines careening towards each other on the same track. Mandela had to slow them both down, stop them, and then reverse each one to a position where they could link up and travel in a completely new direction" (Willie Pieterse, "What Mandela taught the World about Leadership"). The new direction was akin to Dr. King's philosophy of love in the face of hatred. Robin Kelley argues that Dr. King's vision of love as the antidote to hatred should be seriously examined because most ideologies have often fallen short of their ideals. However, the kind of ideals King held was the kind of "transcendence upward" Burke describes, which is done "for the greater glory of God" (Burke, *Attitude*, 337). Mandela needed to hold on to such an ideal that will help South Africans overcome their difficult past.

In his wisdom, Mandela identified that some of the black leaders, particularly his ex-wife, had been accused of human rights abuses in the cause of the struggle. If human rights abuses occurred on both sides of the divide, unjust acts were not exclusive to any particular race. In essence, the fallacy of essentialism is made manifest because the realities and abuses of apartheid and the fight against apartheid indicates that human predilection to abuse of power transcends race. Mandela's call for reconciliation and amnesty rather than a call for retribution "challenges the idea that racism as a social practice of domination can be reduced to a relationship between oppressors and the oppressed, between victimizers and victims, between white people with power and Black people without it. Such a reduction only reaffirms racism's most basic assumption: that we are in essence separate and distinct from one another and only indirectly implicated in each other's lives"

(McPhail, viii). The call for amnesty had seeds that implied that both Blacks and whites needed to heal in the process because everyone comes to the table of reconciliation as human beings not as racially differentiated beings.

However, a blanket amnesty under the circumstances would have made most Blacks feel cheated as victims of apartheid and, consequently, lose confidence in their leaders. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission was instituted as a conditional amnesty because it offered the victims of apartheid “the opportunity to tell what happened to them, and for their sufferings to be publicly acknowledged...[and] the perpetrators of political crimes should account for their deeds by making full and truthful disclosures of their actions” (Njabulo Ndebele, “South Africa: quandaries of compromise”). The act of ‘telling’ is the procedure that produces catharsis for the release of all the pent-up emotions.

The criticism that haunted the TRC was “that it frustrates justice and the desire for punishment” (Ndebele, “South Africa: quandaries of compromise”). It can be argued that punishment assumes varying forms. The singular mode of punishment envisaged by those calling for it entailed lawsuits and, possibly, imprisonment. As Ndebele argued, such criticisms failed to “take into account the fact that many recipients of amnesty experience a kind of punishment they never anticipated: the shame of being publicly exposed. The exposure of their participation in despicable acts of cruelty has in some cases resulted in broken families, disorientation, and loss of self-esteem – a form of punishment that can arguably be far more devastating than that exacted by an ordinary jail sentence” (“South Africa: quandaries of compromise”). All the emotions that the TRC would help to release would partly lead to the catharsis and healing that Mandela hoped for in his negotiations and which was also articulated in his inaugural speech.

It is significant to discuss the way that the healing aimed for by Mandela is re-inscribed through the rhetoric of reconciliation. The inaugural speech shows that “Mandela was attempting the nation’s “delivery” in his speech – “delivery” as labour or travail of the South African nation and of the orator himself...Mandela indeed delivers the eulogy of South Africa at the very moment that consensus, national reconciliation – the new nation as conciliation of difference – is born” (Salazar, 21). The rhetoric of reconciliation, which is Mandela’s course, can be described as an embodiment of McPhail’s concept of the ‘rhetoric of coherence’ because “[b]oth attempt to achieve the same ends: the conscious understanding and integration of difference in order to transform division” (ix). The TRC may have achieved, among other things, a recognition that all human beings are essentially interconnected.

Mandela’s dreams of unity for South Africa can only be realized when people believe that they are “materially, ideologically, and spiritually implicated in each other’s lives. What affects one, as Dr. King so astutely observed, affects all” (McPhail, ix). Did the TRC achieve the aim Mandela hoped for? It can be argued that Mandela did achieve his aim despite the complications that trailed the TRC. For one, there were no inter-racial wars or counter-insurgencies. And the peaceful transition that produced a stable polity hitherto absent in South Africa became a symbol of Mandela’s dynamic leadership. Through the TRC, Mandela attempted to produce unity in plurality, and the consensus he aimed for was achieved through a quotation from the poem of an Afrikaans poet Ingrid Jonker, who he describes as “an Afrikaner woman who transcended a particular experience and became a South African, an African and a citizen of the world” (Salazar, 23). More significantly, the TRC offered an opportunity for examining the psychodynamics that necessitated catharsis and healing in a racially fractured space like South Africa.

The TRC opened up the space for national healing in a unique way particularly because “the contrition leading to a plea for forgiveness, as part of a quest for reacceptance in, can be far more restorative than the hoped-for rehabilitative effects of an ordinary prison term. The cure in the method of the TRC is located within social practice rather than in the artificiality of punitive isolation” (Ndebele, “South Africa: Quandaries of Compromise”). But the healing continues. The peaceful transition through Government of National Unity and the TRC has become a reference point globally. According to Eric Doxtader, “the South African “miracle” has granted considerable presumption to the idea that reconciliation is a crucial if not necessary element of democratization. In a number of countries, including Sierra Leone, Burundi, Rwanda, Indonesia, and Angola, there are now standing calls to define and implement reconciliation processes that deal with the past and promote healing of deep division” (268). Despite the contextual differences between these nations and that of South Africa, the healing that proceeds from reconciliation has proved to be a universal concept. Mandela’s role in the South African context made him a role model for leadership in conflict resolution. According to Pietersen,

Mandela faced the kinds of strategic challenges any national leader might face. His overriding vision of freedom and harmony implicitly embraced three sub goals: a political goal (democracy), a social goal (better living conditions), and an economic goal (shared prosperity). All three, of course, were interrelated. On the political front, the results have been stunning: a peaceful transition to democracy and black majority rule. Mandela was truly the trumpet that sounded the clear sound. He served as a majestic role model of inclusiveness (“What Nelson Mandela Taught the World about Leadership”).

The social, economic, and political fracturing caused by racism is not peculiar to South Africa. Racial inequality has existed in Canada and the US much longer than in South Africa. The TRC in South Africa served as a reference point for its counterpart in Canada where Justice Murray Sinclair compared the Residential School experiences of the Aboriginals to that of Blacks in South Africa. Sinclair claims that the Canadian TRC learned a lot from Mandela and South Africa

because it enabled many victims of the Residential School System have the catharsis and closure that was experienced in South Africa. According to Sinclair, Mandela “was certainly an elder...a wise and kind man who brought with his presence an understanding of what it was that aboriginal people were experiencing and had experienced in the past” (Canada’s Truth...). It is important to ask if the TRC has succeeded in resolving the problem of inequality in South Africa and Canada. The answer is in the negative. That is because equality must pervade all the strata of the society in order to have a stabilizing effect in the society. The lack of economic power on the parts of Blacks proved to be a sore point.

The TRC in South Africa produced a lot of ambivalent feelings among Blacks and whites, leaders and commoners. That is because “there is a decades-long debate over the precise nature of reconciliation and its contribution to the struggle and “negotiated revolution” that ended apartheid” (Doxtader, 268). Reconciliation entails the telling of the past within the present because as Doxtader claims “[r]econciliation beckons story-telling” (280) as a way of getting people to reconcile themselves with their painful past experiences. Therefore, the TRC hoped for a reconciliation that aimed to help reconstruct victim identity, especially within the context of racism. Apartheid framed Black identity in derogatory terms, which reduced their dignity and humanity. In providing the space for the people to tell their stories without any fear of retribution, it can be argued that the TRC succeeded in helping Black South Africans reclaim their identity.

The opportunity for individuals to tell previously censored or lost personal stories that arise from their experiences in relation to others implies that “reconciliation appears in a Kairos, the time of opportunity that remains before the end of time” (Doxtader, 271). The experience of reconciliation appears to mean more for the oppressed than the oppressor, not only because the oppressor loses power in the case of South Africa, but particularly because “[i]ts promise of dignity

in the wake of denigration depends on the remembrance of experience that confirms the self's standing for itself and in the face of the other" (Doxtader, 274). The significance of reconciliation for forging ahead cannot be overemphasized.

The significance lies partly in the potential of the TRC to employ narratives as a means of documenting history and to constitute the form of "[a] movement between the recovery of dignity and the catharsis of acknowledgement" (Doxtader, 280). Presuming that the aim of reconciliation makes more meaning for the oppressed particularly Black South Africans, it is easy to understand why white South Africans remain committed to the ideology of innocence. Despite the "willingness of Black leaders and citizens to forgive and even forget the racial injustices of apartheid" (McPhail, "A Question of Character..." 395), the reason a lot of white South Africans refused to apologize is because the rhetoric of reconciliation closes the old racial contract and requires re-signing the racial contract.

The resistance of whites to the concept of constructing a new racial contract can best be appreciated through the concept of collective memory and historical memory. The current racial contract was based on differences "that emerge from a national history of the idea of race and the practices of racism. They are also differences that emerge from the very divergent ways in which we have experienced or been subjects to that history. They are differences shaped on the one hand by collective memory and on the other by a collective practice of selective memory or, perhaps more accurately, a collective amnesia" (Condon, 10-11). This idea connects strongly to Chilton's argument that the information stored in the long-term memory is often retrieved and processed through the short-term and episodic memory for immediate action. Consequently, the role of narratives in producing these memories cannot be overstated. As McPhail points out, "it is the structure of our collective memory and public discourse that makes racism a persistent problem"

("A Question of Character..." 392). The public discourse, whereby everything is categorized in essential terms and the racial difference that is constructed in separate and unequal terms, gave rise to apartheid. Therefore, the reconciliation aimed for by the TRC calls into question the ethos of the racial contract in South Africa and elsewhere.

Despite the TRC, racism in South Africa mirrors racism in the US where "the projection and protection of white racial privilege and power continue to be exercised and embraced, and in both cases have become much more subtle and insidious" (McPhail, "A Question of Character..." 396). The stronghold of racism among whites is located within psychology, which has been produced over time through the scapegoating of the "other" who represents some threat, whether real or perceived, within the community. The threat is made to appear more potent especially when this racial, ethnic, or religious "other" has been rhetorically constructed to possess an image, which has been demonized over time. The communal identity is strengthened when all the resources and community's cooperative efforts are directed towards fighting this common enemy. The insidious nature of racism, when the monster has been fought head on, begs the question – what are the potentials for rhetoric to transform a mindset that has taken centuries to calcify?

The reason that reconciliation was embraced by Blacks and resisted by whites proceeds from the fact that "freedom, equality, and responsibility have been conceptualized and actualized in radically different ways by peoples of African and European descent" (McPhail, "A Question of Character..." 392). This difference in conceptualization does not dissipate like a mist. That is because Africans and Europeans make up the group whereby "the former see [equality, freedom, and responsibility] in terms of the consequences and material conditions of the Racial Contract, while the latter define these in terms of abstractions and intentions of the social contract. Closing the gap between the two is a prerequisite for coherent reconciliation, and this can only be

accomplished by a collective act of white atonement: a resigning of the Racial Contract” (McPhail, “A Question of Character...” 392). It can be argued that Blacks in South Africa needed the healing that comes from forgiveness and reconciliation far more since they were the most wounded by apartheid, and it is the wounded that needs to heal and move on.

It is also important to reiterate that racism and the injustices that result from racial oppression are founded on the normativity of whiteness as a system of unearned privilege. Therefore, “South Africa’s rhetoric of reconciliation was largely a Black rhetoric: it was the spiritually inspired militancy of a Tutu and the integrative Afrocentricity of a Mandela that formed the substance of a reconstitutive Black rhetoric, a coherent rhetoric of reconciliation” (McPhail, “A Question of Character...” 394). Mandela’s call for reconciliation is the ultimate transition from the rhetoric of complicity as a racial ‘other’ to the rhetoric of coherence as a statesman.

Will whites ever produce the rhetoric of coherence? To answer this question, it is important to retrace the evolution of the rhetoric of racism. The rhetoric of racism is a psychological and social construct, which enables the appreciation of how matters related to race are among the most pervasive mental phenomena of the past few hundred years. In essence, the self-deception of whites and misrepresentation of other races form a part of the cognitive and moral economy physically required for conquest, colonization, and enslavement. This mindset, which Fanon refers to as narcissism is what defines white supremacy; and for whites to apologize or embrace reconciliation, is to redefine the white versus black equation.

Several people – Blacks and whites – refused to apologize during the TRC sitting and the attitude of such people requires serious evaluation. For some of the black leaders, the TRC seemed like a betrayal because they believed they were the wounded party and, thus, their past acts of human rights violations were justified as far as they were concerned. Asking them to apologize

seemed like the ultimate injury from one of their own. Though surprised and grateful by the lack of bitterness and acts of vengeance towards them by Blacks, South African whites remained aloof. The aloofness of these white South African negates the spirit of reconciliation that the TRC aimed for. Despite the negative attitude of some participants and the mixed reactions that greeted the TRC report, the exercise can be described as a success because of its latent potential for the transcendental rhetoric of coherence.

Mandela's concept of reconciliation encapsulates Dr. King's idea of overcoming hatred through love. The reconciliation that brought peace in South Africa was conceptualized and performed in the spirit of Ubuntu, while Dr. King's rhetoric of love is based on the Biblical concept of forgiveness (the golden rule – do unto others as you would have them do unto you). As Doxtader argues, reconciliation is laden with “significant religious and dialectical baggage” (268) and, thus, the term is troubled and distrusted. Therefore, it can be argued that “between a deep mystery (of grace) and naïve simplicity (of synthesis), we are wary of reconciliation because it seems to lack or overdetermine reason” (Doxtader, 268). Doxtader links reconciliation to the salvific sacrifice of Christ, which produced a reconciliation between God and the human race; and to the Greek concept of amnesty. Mandela and Dr. King's strategies for overcoming strife spring from similar ideologies, arising from the African and Western rhetorical and religious traditions.

This similarity proves that the African and Western rhetorical traditions have a lot in common as has been argued in the first chapter. It also proves that both rhetoric and religion are neutral in nature and, therefore, their manipulation or abuse is what has created their potential for harm. Mandela's embodiment as the agent of reconciliation is an indication that his Africanness and his love for Western rhetorical tradition and culture have not only produced his braided rhetoric, it also implies that there is an intermingling of the two rhetorical traditions with which he

makes his rhetorical appeal. This braiding of the two rhetorical traditions is the ultimate transition to the rhetoric of coherence.

The rhetoric of coherence embodied by Mandela, which was enacted through identification and kairotic ontology, can be described as a success despite the discontent among his Black compatriots. It can be argued that the rhetoric of coherence made his commitment to the TRC non-negotiable because his non-racialism was transmitted through identification with the entire nation. Apart from the catharsis that the TRC served to produce, it was an opportunity to interrogate the discourse and context that the catastrophe of apartheid in South Africa produced as well as chart a new course for the reconstituted nation.

Bibliography and Works cited

Abraham, D. Rogers. "Introductory Remarks to a Rhetorical Theory of Folklore." In *The Journal of American Folklore*. Vol. 81, No. 320 (April – June, 1968), pp 143 – 158. Available at <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed Nov, 14, 2016. Web.

Achebe, Chinua. *Things Fall Apart*. New York: Harold Bloom. 2010. Print.

---. "Language and the Destiny of Man" in Achebe, C. *Hopes and Impediments: Selected Essays*. New York: Anchor Books. 1988. Pp 127-137.

Ahmad Ishtiaq. "Terrorism: A Conceptual Framework" in Kumar, Updesh. & Mandal, K. Manash (ed). *Countering Terrorism: Psychosocial Strategies*. India: SAGE Publications. 2012. Pp 3 -25. Print

Albert, M. Ethel. "'Rhetoric', 'Logic', and 'Poetics' in Burundi: Culture Patterning of Speech Behavior" in *American Anthropologist*. Vol. 66, No. 6, Part 2: The Ethnography of Communication. Dec, 1964. Pp 35 – 54. Available at <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed Nov, 14, 2016. Web.

Alcoff, L. M. *Visible Identities: Race, Gender and the Self*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press. 2006. Print.

Armstrong, Chris. "Global Civil Society and the Question of Global Citizenship." In *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and NonProfit Organizations*. Vo. 17, No. 4, (December 2006), pp. 349 – 357. Available in <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27928043>. Accessed Dec, 22, 2018. Web.

An Amnesty International Report. *Political Imprisonment in South Africa*. London: Amnesty International Pub. 1978. Print

Anderson, Patrick. "Pan-Africanism and Economic Nationalism: W. E. B. Du Bois's Black Reconstruction and the Failings of the "Black Marxism" Thesis." *Journal of Black Studies* 2017, Vol. 48 (8) 732 – 757. Available at <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed May 14, 2018. Web.

Anonymous, ca. 403 – 395 B. C. E. 'Dossoi Logoi' available at www.constitution.or/gr/dissoi_logis.pdf. Accessed on Oct 1, 2017. Web.

Aristotle. From "Rhetoric." In *The Rhetorical Tradition*. Boston: Bedford Books, 2001. Pp 151-194 Print.

Arnold Millar (ed). *Steve Biko: Black Consciousness in South Africa*. New York: Springer Publishing Company Inc. 1978. Print

Ashcroft, Bill. Griffiths, Garet., & Tiffin, Helen (eds). *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge. 1995. Pp 18-23. Print.

Austin, J. L. *How to do things with Words*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. 1962. Print.

Barnard Rita (ed). *The Cambridge Companion to Nelson Mandela*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2014. Print.

Barry, Bruce. & Robinson, J. Robert. "Ethics in Conflict Resolution: The Ties That Bind" in *International Negotiation* (7). Netherlands: Kluwer Law International. 137 – 142. 2002. Print.

- Beale, H. Walter. "Rhetorical Performative Discourse: A New Theory of Epideictic." *In Philosophy & Rhetoric*, Vol. 11, No. 4 (Fall, 1978), pp. 221-246. Penn State University Press. Available as <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40237084>. Accessed July 5, 2018. Web.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge. 1994. Print.
- Boehmer, Elleke. *Nelson Mandela: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2008.
- Bokor, J. K. Michael. "When the Drum Speaks: The Rhetoric of Motion, Emotion, and Action in African Societies." *In Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, May 2014, Vol.32(2), pp.165-194. Available at <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/rh.2014.32.2.165>. Accessed Nov 13, 2018. Web.
- Bonilla – Silva, Eduardo. *Racism Without Racists*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Pub. 2010. Print
- Bonner, Philip. "The Antinomies of Nelson Mandela" in Rita Barnard (ed) *The Cambridge Companion to Nelson Mandela*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Pp 29-49. 2014. Print.
- Braithwaite, Kamau, Edward. *History of the Voice: The Development of Nation Language in Anglophone Caribbean Poetry*. London, Port of Spain: New Beacon Books. 1984. Print.
- Brotz, Howard. *The Politics of South Africa*. Oxford, London, & New York: Oxford University Press. 1977. Print.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press. 1969. Print.

- *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1950. Print.
- . *Attitudes Towards History*. California: Hermes Pub. 1959. Print.
- . *Dramatism and Development*. Massachusetts: Clark University Press. 1972. Print.
- . "Othello: An Essay to Illustrate a Method" in Newstok, S. L. (ed) *Kenneth Burke on Shakespeare*. West Lafayette, Indiana: Parlor Press. 2007. 65-100. Print.
- . *Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, University of California Press. 3rd Edition, 1984. Print.
- . *Language as Symbolic Action: Essay on Life, Literature and Method*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, University of California Press. 1966. Print.
- . *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1941. Print.
- Burhanudeen, Hafriza. "Diplomatic language: An Insight from Speeches Used in International Diplomacy" in *Akademika* 67. January 2006. Pp 37-51. www.ukm.my/penerbit/akademika Accessed March 2, 2012. Web.
- Caine, Barbara. "Prisons as Spaces of Friendship in Apartheid South Africa." *History Australia*. Vol 3.2 (2006). 42. *World History in Context*. Available in <https://www.tandfonline.com>. Retrieved June 22. 2016. Web.
- Campbell, Kermit L, "Rhetoric from the Ruins of African Antiquity". *Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, Vol. 24, No. 3 (Summer 2006). Pp 255-274. <http://www.jstor.org/10.1525> Accessed Oct 21, 2016. Web.

- Campbell, Dugald. *In the Heart of Bantuland: A Record of Twenty-Nine Years in Central Africa among the Bantu Peoples*. London: Seely Service and Co. 1922. Print.
- Carson, Clayborne. & Shepard Kris (ed). *A Call To Conscience: The Landmark Speeches of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.* Atlanta: Warner Books Inc. 2001. Print.
- Cesaire Aime. "From Discourse to Colonialism" in Gaurav Desai and Supriya Nair (ed), *Postcolonialisms: An Anthology of Cultural Theory and Criticisms*. New Brunswick and New Jersey: Rutgers University Press. Pp 60-65. 2005. Print.
- Chilton, P. "Missing Links in Mainstream CDA – Modules, Blends and the Critical Instincts." In Wodak, R. and Chilton, P. (ed) *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinarity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Pub. Co. 2005. 19-52. Print.
- Cicero. From "De Oratore." In *The Rhetorical Tradition*. Bizzell, Patricia & Herzberg, Bruce (ed). Boston: Bedford Books, 1990. Pp 200-250. Print.
- Coetzee, J. M. *Waiting for the Barbarians*. New York: 1980. Print.
- Cohen, Robin. "Class in Africa: Analytical Problems and Perspectives." In *The Socialist Register*. 1972. Pp 231 – 255. Available at <http://socialistregister.com>. Accessed September 27, 2018. Web.
- Cohen, R. Jonathan. "Adversaries? Partners? How about Counterparts? On Metaphors in the Practice of Teaching of Negotiation and Dispute Resolution." In *Conflict Resolution Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 4. Summer 2003, pp 433 – 440. Available at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi>. Accessed April 14, 2018. Web.

Condon, Frankie. *I Hope I Join the Band: Narrative, Affiliation, and Antiracist Rhetoric*. Logan: Utah State University Press. 2012. Print.

Crapanzano, Vincent. *Waiting: The Whites of South Africa*. New York: Random House. 1985. Print.

Davies, Robert, O'meara, Dan, and Dlamini Sipho. "The Development of Racial Capitalism." In Mermelstein, David (ed). *The Anti-Apartheid Reader: The Struggle against White Racist Rule in South Africa*. New York: Grove Press. 1987. Pp 99-111. Print.

Debs Eugene. "On the Color Question." Available at <http://www.marxists.org/history/usa/> Accessed Feb 16, 2014. Web.

---. "The Negro and His Nemesis." Available at <http://www.marxists.org/archive/debs/works/> Accessed Feb 16, 2014. Web.

Derrida, Jacques. "The Laws of Reflection: Nelson Mandela, in Admiration." In Derrida, Jacques and Tlili, Mustapha (eds). *For Mandela*. New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1987. Pp 11-42. Print.

Derrida, Jacques & Caputo, John, D. *Deconstruction in a Nutshell: A conversation with Jacques Derrida*. New York: Fordham University Press. 1997. Print.

De Villiers, Rick. "Narrative (De)construction: Mr Coetzee, in the Basement, with the Quill: A Discussion of Authorial Complicity . J. M. Coetzee's Foe." Available at <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed May 14, 2018. Web.

Dijk, Teun. v. "Contextual knowledge management in discourse production: A CDA perspective", in *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis Theory, Methodology and*

- Interdisciplinarity*, edited by Wodak, R. and Chilton, P. p71-100. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005. Print
- , “Critical Discourse Analysis” (working paper) to appear in Tannen, D., Schiffrin, D. and Hamilton, H. (eds) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (in preparation). www.hum.uva.nl/teun/cda.htm, 1998. Accessed Oct 25, 2015. Web
- , “Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power”. www.discourse.org 2012. Accessed Oct 25, 2015. Web.
- Doxtader, Eric. “Reconciliation – A rhetorical Concept/ion”. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. Vol 89, No. 4, November 2003, pp. 267-292. Web.
- . “The Rhetorical Question of Human Rights – A Preface”. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. Vol 96, No. 4, November 2010, pp. 353-379. Web.
- Dubois, W. E. B. *The Conservation of Races and the Negro*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University. 2007. Web.
- During Simon (ed). *The Cultural Studies Reader*. London & New York: Routledge. 1993. Print.
- Ergas, Zeki. *The Catharsis and the Healing: South Africa in the 1990s*. London: Janus Publishing. 1994. Print.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power*. London & New York: Longman. 1989. Print.
- Fanon Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. (Translated by Constance Farrington). New York: Grove Press. 1966. Print.
- . “The Fact of Blackness” in Ashcroft, Bill, Griffiths, Gareth, & Tiffin, Helen (eds) *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge. 1995. Pp 323-326. Print.

---. *Black Skin White Masks*. Translated by Charles Lam Markman. New York: Grove Press Inc. 1967. Print.

Finnegan, Ruth. *Oral Literature in Africa*. Cambridge: Open Books Pub. Available at www.books.google.com.ng 2012.

---. *Oral Tradition and the Verbal Arts: A Guide to Research Practices*. London: Routledge. 1995. E-library.

---. "Child Play is Serious" Children's Games, Verbal Arts, and Survival in Africa." In *International Journal of Play*, 2014. Vol. 3, No, 3, 293 – 315. Available at <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080>. Accessed Mar 20, 2016.

Fiske, John. "Surveilling the City: Whiteness, the Black Man and Democratic Totalitarianism." In *Theory, Culture and Society* 15.2. 1998. 67-88. Available at <http://tcs.sagepub.com> Accessed on Feb 25, 2014. Web.

Gallagher, Susan. "Torture and the Novel: J. M. Coetzee's *Waiting for the Barbarians*" in *Contemporary Literature*. Vol. 29, No. 2 (Summer 1988). Pp 277-285. Available at <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed Nov, 14, 2016. Web.

Gastrow, Peter. *Bargaining for Peace: South Africa and National Peace Accord*. Washington, D. C.: United States Institute of Peace Press. 1995. Print.

Ghose Zulfikar. *Selected Poems*. Oxford, New York, & Delhi: Oxford University Press. 1991. Print.

Guroian, Vigen. "Awakening the Moral Imagination: Teaching Virtues through Fairy Tales". Available at <http://www.catholiceducation.org> accessed on Oct 25, 2017. Web.

- Harris, Allen Randy (ed). *Rhetoric and Incommensurability*. West Lafayette, Indiana: Parlor Press. 2005. Print.
- Henley, W. E (ed). *Machiavelli: The Art of War & The Prince*. New York: AS Press. 1967. Print.
- Hooks, Bell. *Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope*. New York & London: Routledge. 2003. Print.
- Hyde, J. Michael. *The Ethos of Rhetoric*. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press. 2004. Print.
- Hyslop, Jonathan. "Mandela on War" in Barnard Rita (ed). *The Cambridge Companion to Nelson Mandela*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2014. Pp 162 -181. Print.
- JanMohamed, R. Abdul. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory" in Ashcroft, Bill. Griffiths, Garet., & Tiffin, Helen (eds) *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge. 1995. Pp 18-23. Print.
- Kaschula, H. Russell. "Mandela Comes Home: The Poets' Perspective." In *The Journal of Ethnic Studies*; Spring 1991; 19(1). Pp 1-19.
- . "The Oppression of isiXhosa Literature and the Irony of Transformation" in *English in Africa*. Vol. 35, No. 1. May, 2008. Pp 117 – 132. Available in <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed April 4, 2016. Web.
- . "Imbongi and Griot" Toward a Comparative Analysis of Oral Poetics in Southern and West Africa." In *Journal of African Cultural Studies*, Vol. 12, No 1, June 1999, pp 55 – 76. Available at <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed April 4, 2016. Web.

Kaschula, H. Russel & Samba Diop. "Political Processes and the role of the Imbongi and Griot in Africa". *South Africa of African Languages*. January 2000 20(1). P 13-28. Available at <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed April 4, 2016. Web.

Kelley, D. G. Robin. *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination*. Boston: Beacon Press. 2002. Print.

Kubayanda, J. Bekunuru. "Notes on the Impact of African Oral-Tradition Rhetoric on Latin American and Caribbean Writing." In *Afro-Hispanic Review*, Spring -Fall 2002, pp 113 – 120. Available at <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed April 4, 2016. Web.

Kumar, Updesh. & Mandal, K. Manash (ed). *Countering Terrorism: Psychosocial Strategies*. India: SAGE Publications. 2012. Print

Kwame Ayivor. "Thomas Mopoku Mofolo's "inverted epic hero": A Reading of Mofolo's Chaka as an African epic folktale". In *Research in African Literatures*. Vol 28(1), Spring 1997. Pp 49-77. Available at <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed April 16, 2016. Web.

Langmia, Kehbuma and Nunez, Aitza M. Haddad. "Cultural and Rhetorical Tradition of Communication within African/Black Thinking." In *The International Communication Gazette*, Vol. 77, No. 5. 2015. Pp 471- 486. Available at <https://www.journals.sagepub.com>. Accessed on November 4, 2016. Web.

Levinson, C. Stephen. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1983. Print.

Lodge, Tom. *Mandela: A Critical Life*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2006. Print.

Mandela Nelson. *A long Walk to Freedom*. New York: Back Bay Books/Little, Brown and Company Book Group. 1994. Print

- . *Conversations with Myself*. London: Macmillan. 2010. Print.
- . *Speeches 1990: Intensify the Struggle to Abolish Apartheid*. (Edited by Greg McCartan). New York: Pathfinder Press. Print.
- . “The ANC and the Government Must Meet to Negotiate an Effective Political Settlement.” In *Speeches 1990: Intensify the Struggle to Abolish Apartheid*. (Edited by Greg McCartan). New York: Pathfinder Press. Pp 9 – 18. Print.
- . “Now is the Time to Intensify the Struggle.” In *Speeches 1990: Intensify the Struggle to Abolish Apartheid*. (Edited by Greg McCartan). New York: Pathfinder Press. Pp 19 – 23. Print.
- . “The Masses of Our People are Making History.” In *Speeches 1990: Intensify the Struggle to Abolish Apartheid*. (Edited by Greg McCartan). New York: Pathfinder Press. Pp 24 – 30. Print.
- . “We are Committed to Building a Single Nation in Our Country.” In *Speeches 1990: Intensify the Struggle to Abolish Apartheid*. (Edited by Greg McCartan). New York: Pathfinder Press. Pp 31 – 39. Print.
- . “We Must Organize the Masses of Our People into the Struggle.” In *Speeches 1990: Intensify the Struggle to Abolish Apartheid*. (Edited by Greg McCartan). New York: Pathfinder Press. Pp 40 -48. Print.
- . “You are all Allies in the Common Struggle Against Apartheid.” In *Speeches 1990: Intensify the Struggle to Abolish Apartheid*. (Edited by Greg McCartan). New York: Pathfinder Press. Pp 49 – 52. Print.

- . “We Must End the Old Social Order and Bring in a New One.” In *Speeches 1990: Intensify the Struggle to Abolish Apartheid*. (Edited by Greg McCartan). New York: Pathfinder Press. Pp 57 – 66. Print.
- . Inaugural Speech, Pretoria. 1994. Available at <http://www.africa.upenn.edu> Retrieved September 26, 2016.
- . “An Ideal for which I am prepared to die” Available at <http://www.historyplace.com/mandela/speeches> Retrieved September 21, 2016
- . “A Black Man in a white Court”. Available at <http://www.nelsonmandela.org/omalley> Retrieved September 24, 2016
- . *The Struggle is my life*. London: International Defense and Aid Fund for South Africa. 1978. Print.
- , “Address by President Nelson Mandela at a Municipal Infrastructure Programme in the Free State.” Available at www.mandela.gov.za. Accessed September 25, 2018. Web.
- , “Address by President Nelson Mandela at the Opening of Parliament, Cape Town.” Available at www.mandela.gov.za. Accessed September 25, 2018. Web.
- , “Address by President Nelson Mandela on Women’s Day, Pretoria. 9 August, 1996.” Available at www.sahistory.org.za. Accessed September 25, 2018. Web.
- McPhail, Lawrence Mark. “(Re)constructing the Color Line: Complicity and Black Conservatism”. *Communication Theory*. Journal of the International Communication

- Association. Vol 7, No. 2. May, 1997, pp 162 - 178. <http://www.jstor.org>. Accessed Oct, 30, 2016. Web.
- . "A Question of Character: Re(-)signing the Racial Contract." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, Volume 3, Fall 2004, pp 391 – 405. Michigan State University Press. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1353/rap.2005.0013>. Accessed on Oct, 30, 2016. Web.
- . "Passionate Intensity: Louis Farrakhan and the Fallacies of Racial Reasoning." In *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 84 (Nov, 1998): 416 – 429. Available at <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed Oct, 26, 2016. Web.
- . *The Rhetoric of Racism Revisited: Reparations or Separations?* New York: Rowman & Littlefield Pub. 2002. Print.
- . "Dark Menexenus: Black Opportunism in an Age of Racial Anxiety." In *Souther Communication Journal*, Vol. 75, No. 2, April – June 2010, pp 160 – 170. Available at <http://www.jstor.org>. Accessed Oct, 26, 2016. Web.
- Malcolm X. "The Ballot or the Bullet" Available at <http://www.edchange.org/multicultural/speeches/malcolm> . Retrieved September 28, 2016. Web
- Martin Luther King Jr. *Conscience for Change*. Toronto: CBC Pub. 1967. Print.
- . *A Gift of Love: Sermons from Strength to Love and Other Preachings*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2012. Print.

---. "I Have A Dream". Available at <http://www.archives.gov/press> . Retrieved September 28, 2016. Web.

---. "I Have Been To The Mountaintop" Available at <http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches> . Retrieved September 28, 2016. Web.

---, "the Birth of a Nation" in Carson, Clayborne. & Shepard Kris (eds). *A Call to Conscience: The Landmark Speeches of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.* Atlanta: Warner Books. 2001. Pp 17 – 41. Print.

Mashoba, Deborah. "Testimony before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Human Rights Violations committee, Women's Hearing, Johannesburg, Day 2, 29 June, 1997". Web. Retrieved June 22, 2016.

Mayo, Marjorie. *Culture, Communities, Identities: Cultural Strategies for Participation and Empowerment*. Chapter 3: Race, Racism, Anti-Racism and Identities. New York: Palgrave. 2000. Pp 62-86. Print.

Mermelstein, David (ed). *The Anti-Apartheid Reader: The Struggle against White Racist Rule in South Africa*. New York: Grove Press. 1987. Print.

Murti, Ramana, V.V. (ed). *Gandhi: Essential Writings*. New Delhi: Gandhi Peace Foundation. 1970. Print.

Naipaul Mandira. "How Mandela Betrayed us, says ex-wife Winnie". Evening Standard, March 8, 2010. Available at <http://www.standard.co.uk/.../how-nelson-mandela-betrayed-us> Accessed on March 6, 2018. Web.

- Ndebele, S. Njabulo. "South Africa: Quandaries of Compromise." In UNESCO Courier. Canadian Periodicals Index Quarterly. 52 :12. (Dec :1999). Pg 22. Available at www.jstor.ca. accessed on March 8, 2018. Web.
- Ndlovu, Mxolisi Sifiso. "Mandela's Presidential Years: An Africanist View." in Barnard Rita (ed). *The Cambridge Companion to Nelson Mandela*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2014. Pp 184 – 202. Print.
- Nescolarde-Selva, Antonio Josue, Uso-Domenech, Jose-Luis, and Gash. Hugo. "What Are Ideological Systems?" in MDPI. Basel: Switzerland. 2017. Available at www.mdpi.com/2017. Accessed Sept 16, 2018.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. "On Truth and Lies in the Extra-Moral Sense" In *The Rhetorical Tradition*. Bizzell, Patricia & Herzberg, Bruce (ed). Boston: Bedford Books, 1990. Pp 888-896. Print.
- O'Connor, Flannery. *Mystery and Manners*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux. 1990. Print.
- Pasuerella, Lynn and Killilea, Alfred. "The Ethics of Lying in the Public Interest: Reflections on the "Just Lie." Available in <http://tandfonline.com/doi/>. Accessed on July 25, 2017. Web.
- Pietersen, Willie. "What Mandela Taught the World about Leadership." Available at <https://williepietersen.com/wc-content/uploads>. Accessed Oct 26, 2016. Web.
- Plato. "Gorgias". In *The Rhetorical Tradition*. Bizzell, Patricia & Herzberg, Bruce (ed). Boston: Bedford Books, 1990. Pp 289-320. Print.
- . "Phaedrus". In *The Rhetorical Tradition*. Bizzell, Patricia & Herzberg, Bruce (ed). Boston: Bedford Books, 1990. Boston: Bedford Books, 2001. Pp 289-320. Print.

- Prelli, J. Lawrence. "Stasis and the Problem of Incommensurate Communication: The Case of Spousal Violence Research" in Harris, Allen Randy (ed). *Rhetoric and Incommensurability*. West Lafayette, Indiana: Parlor Press. 2005. Pp 294 – 333. Print.
- Quintillian. *The Orator's Education*. Henderson Jeffrey (ed). Cambridge, Massachusetts, & London: Harvard University Press. 2001. Print.
- Rash Felicity. *The Language of Violence: Adolf Hitler's Mein Kampf*. New York: Peter Lang Pub. 2006. Print.
- Read, H. James. "Leadership and Power in Nelson Mandela's Long Walk to Freedom." In *Journal of Power*. Vol. 3. No. 3. December 2010. Pp 217 – 338. <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed Feb 4, 2018.
- Rebhorn, Wayne A (ed & translated). *Renaissance Debates on Rhetoric*. New York: Cornell University Press. 2000. Print.
- Roberts, Adam. "The Changing Faces of Terrorism". August 27, 2002. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/history>. 2012. Accessed Sept 20, 2017.
- Said Edward. W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books. 1994. Print.
- Saint Augustine. *On Christian Doctrine*. Translated by Robertson, D. W. Indianapolis & New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. Inc. 1956. Print.
- Salazar, Philippe-Joseph. *An African Athens: Rhetoric and the Shaping of Democracy in South Africa*. Mahwah, New Jersey, & London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Pub. 2002. Print.

---. "What "1989"? A Rhetorical Rhumb on the Topic of Date." In *Advance in the History of Rhetoric*, 18, S13 – S29, 2015. Available at <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed Nov, 14, 2016. Web.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Colonialism and Neocolonialism*. Translated by Azzedine Haddour, Steve Brewer, & Terry McWilliams. London & New York: Routledge. 2001. Print.

Satzewich, Vic and Liodakis, Nikolaos. *"Race" and Ethnicity in Canada: A Critical Introduction*. Canada: Oxford University Press. 2013. Print.

Schalkwyk, David. "Mandela, the Emotions, and the Lessons of Prisons". In Barnard Rita (ed). *The Cambridge Companion to Nelson Mandela*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2014. Pp. 50-69. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Merchant of Venice in The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. Hertfordshire: Mackays of Chatham. 1996. Pp 388-415. Print.

Shelby, Tommie. "Two Conceptions of Black Nationalism: Martin Delany on the Meaning of Black Political Solidarity." In *Political Theory*, Vol. 31, No.5, October 2003, pp 664 - 692. Available at www.jstor.ca. Accessed, April 8, 2017. Web.

Sinclair, Murray. "Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Learned from Mandela." In *Indian Life* [1208-1167] yr: 2014, vol. 34. Iss:4, Pg 3. Available at www.jstor.ca. Accessed, March 8, 2018. Web.

Sitze, Adam. "Mandela and the Law". In Barnard Rita (ed). *The Cambridge Companion to Nelson Mandela*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2014. Pp. 134-161. Print.

Smith, Arthur L. "Markings of an African Concept of Rhetoric". *Today's Speech*: Vol 19, No 2. <http://tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01463377109368973> Accessed Oct 23, 2016.

- Smitherman, Geneva and Baugh, John. "The Shot Heard from Ann Arbor: Language Research and Public Policy in African America." In *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 13, 5 – 24, 2002. Available <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed Oct, 26, 2016. Web.
- Snyder, B. Sarah. "American' Human Rights Activism in the Long 1960s" in *European Journal of Human Rights* 2. 2016. Pp 221 – 33. <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed Jan 4, 2017.
- Speroni, Sperone. "From Dialogue on Rhetoric". In Rebhorn, A. Wayne (Ed & Trans) *Renaissance Debates on Rhetoric*. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press. 2000. Pp 111-127. Print.
- Stern, Mark, and Hussain, Khuram. "On the Charter Question: Black Marxism and Black Nationalism". In *Race Ethnicity and Education*. 2015. Vol. 18, No. 1. Pp 61 – 88. <http://www.jstor.org> Accessed Jan 4, 2017.
- United Nations. "Nelson Mandela: In his Own Words." Available at www.un.org/.../mandeladay Accessed on March 7, 2018. Web.
- Van Herpen, H. Marcel. "Marx and Human Rights: Analysis of an Ambivalent Relationship". In Van Herpen, H. Marcel (ed). *Becoming Marx – How the Young Karl Marx became a Marxist*. Maastricht: Cicero Foundation Press. 2016. Pp 2 – 21. Print.
- Villanueva, Victor. "On the Rhetoric and Precedents of Racism." In *Trends and Issues in Postsecondary English Studies*. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English. 2000. Available at www.scholar.google.ca. Accessed on Sept 15, 2108. Web.
- Vives, Juan. "From On the Causes of the Corruption of the Arts" and "From On Teaching the Disciplines". In Rebhorn, A. Wayne (Ed & Trans) *Renaissance Debates on Rhetoric*. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press. 2000. Pp 62-96. Print.

Weaver, M. Richard. "Language is Sermonic". In *The Rhetorical Tradition*. Bizzell, Patricia & Herzberg, Bruce (ed). Boston: Bedford Books, 1990. Boston: Bedford Books, 2001. Pp 1044 - 1054. Print.

---, *The Ethics of Rhetoric*. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co. 1968. Print.

Wilson, Deirdre. "New Directions for Research on Pragmatics and Modularity." *Lingua* 115 (2005) 1129 – 1146. Available at www.sciencedirect.com Accessed Dec 3, 2018. Web.