

Apartheid. argument against that nelson mandela assignment

[History](#)



There are different historical opinions cause of biasness, personal beliefs, the age, or personal experiences of the writer. In this essay I will discuss two different Interpretations of why apartheid ended. The first I will discuss them. The role of Nelson Mandela, with his leadership of the NC, the 27 years imprisonment in Robber Island. And finally Mandela becoming the first black president of South Africa. The second interpretation is a contrast which challenges the view that it was just Mandela, it says there are other factors such as a political leader Lillian Ongoing, and FEW De Clerk who played a very crucial role.

There is also the pressure of economic sanctions and the political pressure from neighboring countries. And a final factor being the international sporting boycott which was a hard decisive blow to the apartheid era. 89 One source that challenges the view that Mandela was the main factor that ended apartheid was the role of FEW De Clerk. Source 89 starts with a title which says " De Clerk takes apartheid apart" this opening sentence gives credit to De Clerk as it has no mention of Nelson Mandela and it mainly says that De Clerk took " apartheid apart".

As Nelson Mandela could not officially stop apartheid it was up too political deader to do it. As FEW De Clerk was the president at the time he made some controversial decisions which did not please some white people. The source starts off saying that " President FEW De Clerk has knocked out the main props of the racist apartheid system which held white minority in power in South Africa for the last 42 years". This changed history and was a point where blacks could try to be equal, without F. W. De Clerk this would not have happened.

<https://assignbuster.com/apartheid-argument-against-that-nelson-mandela-assignment/>

De Clerk made an “ epoch- making speech” which was a defining historical period which was ended apartheid. As a white politician he was treated with hospitality by the black people. He unbranded the African National Congress, the South African communist party, and other anti-apartheid organizations. He also promised to free Mandela within a fortnight. By him freeing and legalizing opposition groups this gave the black people a fighting chance to end apartheid; this obviously raged a lot of white people.

There were different public reactions as blacks were overjoyed, and whites were not happy and De Clerk was accused of “ betraying his people”. This was written in a book written with historical facts; this makes it unbiased as they are “ historical facts”. It is secondary and balanced, it is written in hindsight and it is reliable. To will write this the author would have had to consider a lot of historical events before making his judgment. This must have been an important event otherwise De Clerk would have not made it into the history of the world, this shows was the serious importance of this event.

The limitation of this source is that its general there is no name, so I can't tell if it could be bias or not. The source seems to be a summary so it would need more detailed to make a judgment. This source challenges the view that it was not only Mandela that ended apartheid as Mandela and would have needed the help of a very powerful politician, and without De Clerk the laws of apartheid could not have been removed. BI Bal 1 also contradicts the view that Mandela's leadership end apartheid. Instead it argues that

economic sanctions and political pressure from other countries helped to end apartheid.

Economic sanctions mean domestic penalties applied by one country on another country. Economic sanctions may include various forms of trade barriers and restrictions on financial transactions. After the asses Thatcher and Reagan effused to enforce economic sanctions, they believed in free trade and wanted South Africa as an ally against communism. Barclay bank sold its largest South African bank network due too British student protest. People refused to buy things from South Africa and in 1986 the common market refused to buy iron and steel from South Africa.

In 1985 more violence was seen in townships and the Chase Manhattan bank in New York stopped its links with South Africa and as a result of that on major financial crisis followed. Many more International Investors began to see South Africa as a poor credit risk and as a result they had the pull out their investments. The worldwide rejection started a growth of economic pressure to end apartheid. In South Africa their movements, one was called the black consciousness movement and Steve Nick was a part of this, who later was killed.

When Robert Manage became prime minister of the independent Zanzibar in 1980 South Africa was left with no white government neighbors, the survival of apartheid “ began to appear more questionable. ” These political pressures helped South Africa lose its buffer zone of likened neighbors. This was written by Tony Worth who is a historian is writing in a school history textbook was called “ the world since 1900” (1982) Tony Worth is a historian

<https://assignbuster.com/apartheid-argument-against-that-nelson-mandela-assignment/>

who is trained to be objective and unbiased. To be allowed to be published in a school textbook it must be factual and historically correct.

The use of this source however is limited as it is a textbook for school students so it will be less informative and less explanatory. A specialist book focusing on apartheid in South Africa would provide more detailed information and discuss different reasons why apartheid ended. The fact that this event was mentioned in 20th century history means it must have been a very important factor that caused apartheid to end, it backs up my point that it was not just Mandela there were more factors to the end of apartheid. 813 disagrees with the viewpoint outlined in the title.

It contends that sporting boycotts were crucial to ending apartheid. Afrikaners were keen on sports especially rugby and cricket these teams were highly successful and very highly rated internationally, but then boycotts were introduced. Some Africans are proud of these teams and were mortified when boycotts were introduced, South Africa did not want e kept out of the national sporting events, and were banned from the Olympic games in the sass's. In 1970 the cricket tour to England was cancelled, and in 1977 commonwealth and sporting contacts and rugby tours such as the lions tour stopped going to South Africa.

Source 812 is someone's view and they say it was a " fundamental blow to apartheid" which means it really meant something to sporting figures in South Africa. The writer describes people as " rugby fanatics" the fact he uses the word " fanatics" means its not just a game to them it really was a hard blow to them. The source then says that " most observers of the

<https://assignbuster.com/apartheid-argument-against-that-nelson-mandela-assignment/>

downfall of apartheid say will say the boycott was an absolutely fundamental body blow to the whole process". Because he did not say the statement himself, it was by "objective observers" this means it was impartial and not the writers own opinion.

When he goes on to say it was a "fundamental body blow" it underlines the importance of the sporting boycott. The source then goes on to say "Most white South African men were far more interested in the sports pages than in the news pages" this implies the sport was an essential part of South African culture. This was written by Peter Hahn an MM for Neat and a leading anti-apartheid campaigner in the asses giving an interview to the Western Mail newspaper. (November 2004). Hahn is bias as he is anti-apartheid, and he could exaggerate importance of the boycott.

It is a primary source as Hahn met Mandela and lived through the apartheid era. This is written in hindsight in 2004; he is retelling and looking back on events. This source could be more trusted if Hahn was a historian but as he is not, it can be bias and probably is. But this source can useful as it retells the events in some detail. This can be useful too historian but not very useful. This is still a factor which could have caused apartheid to end, so nevertheless the source has some use. 15 Many people would argue too much focus has been out on Mandela and not other important black leaders such as Lillian Ongoing. Source 816 shoos but she played a vital role in the anti-apartheid protests and was actively campaigning when Mandela was imprisoned. Source 815 starts with a speech at Ongoing funeral. The first sentence includes her with her male peers " Nelson Mandela, Gavin Embed

and Walter Skull. She's compared to these men who were successful anti-apartheid campaigners. The next paragraph starts with " away liberation waits for mothers like Lillian.

Men will catch the disease of determination from you. Sisters, mothers, women, our liberation is in your hands. " This is including women and shows women playing an important role in the campaign against apartheid.

Ongoing is an inspiration on the women to start where Lillian Ongoing left off. " This source was extracts from speeches made at the funeral of Lillian Ongoing in 1980. She was the first woman elected to the executive committee of the African National Congress and helped launch the Federation of South African women.

The source is biased due to the context as it is funeral and people will exaggerated the achievements and importance of her actual achievements. It's not an objective assessment of her contribution to the anti-apartheid movement. This source could be less bias if there was a historian's view of Lillian achievements. Even though this could be bias she still did help with all these things and was an important factor to the end of apartheid, Proving it was not just Mandela that there were also other main factors that caused apartheid to end.