

Ganhi, king, and mandela: what made non-violence work?

[Sociology](#), [Violence](#)



Ferdinand Magellan was a Portuguese explorer who started his voyage in Spain and was the first explorer to circumnavigate, meaning to travel all the way around the world. He was killed on April 27, 1521 by the natives on the island of Cebu in the Philippines while many of his own men stayed on the boat despite knowing their captain was in trouble. The question being asked was whether or not this captain was worth defending. This question could be answered either way but in this essay we are going to argue that Magellan was not worth defending.

Ferdinand Magellan was not worth defending because he was unorganized, he forced and threatened natives in the Philippines to convert to his religion of Catholicism and lastly, he was bossy and could care less about the crewmembers needs. Magellan wasn't organized as a leader because during their voyage after they had crossed the Atlantic Ocean and had sailed down the coast of what we now call the countries of Brazil and Argentina, he noticed that the supplies might not last them the rest of their trip. Because of this Magellan put each crewmember on a limited amount of food that they could have each day.

Many of the men grew ill, were very unhappy with this decision and wanted to return home, but Magellan refused to listen to any of their needs. This shows that Magellan was not a very organized leader because he didn't bring enough food and supplies that could last for each and every crewmember during their many long years on sea. A mutiny was also organized against Magellan, and in self-defense he killed everyone who was against him including leaders and captains on the other ships. This shows he was not

organized because if he was, his own men would not have gone against him and tried to kill him.

The decision that Magellan made that changed his life was also a very important reason that could support the argument that he was not worth defending. Magellan was killed in the Philippines after he forced all the natives to convert to Catholicism. Those who didn't were threatened just like the village on Mactan that he burned down after they did not convert. If Magellan did not make that horrible decision he could have been with his remaining men as they completed the voyage. This decision he made shows he was probably not a very good leader, it also supports the reason he was norganized. Magellan should have made a better decision, which was to leave the natives alone in their home and try to accomplish his goal, which was to reach the Spice Islands. The fact that when the natives went up against Magellan and his men stayed in the ship knowing he was in danger shows his men disliked him and that he may of done other horrible things to them that we are not aware of. The last explanation that can support the argument on whether or not Magellan was worth defending was that he was very bossy, and careless of his men's need.

The men on board played a very important role and greatly helped him become the first leader to circumnavigate. Without the men, this might have not been possible. In the documents there is no evidence that shows he was ever thankful for them. We are also not given much information on the men who liked him and thought of him as a great leader. The documents just explain to us how he was bossy and didn't care about them. In Document D

we are told how many of the men got very sick and their gums swelled up causing them to be unable to eat.

In these documents we are not told Magellan was ever starving or sick, that gives evidence that makes us predict he was selfish and kept the good food for himself and tried to keep only himself as healthy as possible. In conclusion, Ferdinand Magellan was once again, not worth defending. He was unorganized, made horrible decisions and was a very inconsiderate and selfish leader. The reasons explained above give evidence that can answer the question of whether or not Magellan worth defending.