

History Without the Humbug

Countering the Re-Writing of History

Lest We Forget: The Truth about Nelson Mandela

(Various articles by Aida Parker and others)

Karl Marx said: *“The first battlefield is the re-writing of history.”* This is an age when, very rapidly, the truth about the past is being “revised” by Marxists, liberals and others, and unless this wicked revisionism is resisted, people will be thoroughly indoctrinated with lies and myths presented as “truth”. Already vast damage has been done, and even many who lived through more recent historical events have been so well indoctrinated, and conditioned to think along the “party” line, that they actually believe the lies and myths they have been fed. Very few people think critically anymore. They do not even know how to do so. They simply swallow whatever they are told by their Red, almost-Red, and religious-Red heroes and masters.

The purpose of these articles is to counter the deliberate re-writing of history with those stubborn things called facts, and that wonderful thing called truth. *“Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil” (Isaiah 5:20).*

Introduction

by Shaun Willcock

The ugly truth about the world’s favourite terrorist-turned-politician, Nelson Mandela, has been buried deep beneath the media-created myth of the man, who for decades has been given such a whitewashing by the liberal/Socialist media that the *real* Mandela disappeared from the world’s eyes, and in his place appeared a messiah, a saviour, a demigod, whose only resemblance to the real Mandela was the outer shell. The man who emerged from prison and became president of South Africa was at heart the same man who had gone into prison so many years before, a Communist revolutionary, much older but just as committed to the ideology and the revolution as he had been when the prison gates slammed shut on him. Yet by the time he emerged from prison, the worldwide liberal/leftist media had repackaged him, presenting him to the world as a wise, big-hearted, moderate, decent man, who had been unjustly imprisoned for his stand against apartheid, and who would, when he became president of South Africa, govern this complex and diverse country with wisdom and magnanimity, creating a wonderful earthly paradise where all would live happily ever after.

The real Nelson Mandela was vastly different from the media-created myth. But this was the deliberately-constructed image which the international Communist movement, and Mandela’s own organisation, the African National Congress (ANC), wanted the world to believe; and the media, so enamoured with Communism and the ANC, ensured the dissemination of this myth. As the saying goes, tell a lie, tell it often enough, and the people will believe it. They did. In their millions.

And this media-created, lying image of Mandela the wise, Mandela the magnanimous, Mandela the elderly statesman, Mandela the Great, indeed Mandela the Messiah, continued to be fed in the years that followed, until he had been transformed into a man so great that in the eyes of multiplied millions he deserved to be placed higher than virtually all others, even on an equality with, or perhaps greater than, the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. He had become a Christ-figure.

Alas, if only South Africa's blacks, and the world in general, had looked beyond the myth to see the truth about this man! Their failure to do so meant that Mandela became South Africa's president, and led this once-great country down the slippery path of Socialism. Today, South Africa is just another self-imploding African Socialist wreck, and this tragic state of affairs is the *true* legacy of Nelson Mandela and his vile organisation, the ANC. Yet incredibly, such is the Mandela myth that even as SA continued to spiral downwards, year after year, multiplied millions throughout South Africa and the world continued to gaze with loving, star-struck adoration at Mandela himself; and this idolatry will continue long after his death. No matter how bad things get in SA, "the people" will continue to separate the myth of Mandela from the organisation he so faithfully served, the atrocious ANC, and will continue to view him, in their hearts and minds, as having been somehow above it and beyond it and in some mysterious way disconnected from it. In truth, as the articles below show, he was a lifelong, loyal servant of the African National Congress/South African Communist Party (ANC/SACP) alliance. But such is the power of an image, and SA's tragedy is that the lying image has taken on a life of its own, and will live on long beyond his death.

This series of articles by conservative South African journalist, Aida Parker, stand as a record for all time of the *truth* about Nelson Mandela, and deserve to be made as widely-known as possible, which is why we are re-publishing them in this format; for she wrote them before the internet age, and their readership was therefore of necessity much more limited than it will be today. Most were written before Mandela became SA president in 1994. She did what she could to prevent the SA tragedy of a Mandela presidency and an ANC/SACP government, which was 100% more than 99% of those who, like her, knew the truth, but did nothing. How true the saying, "All that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing." The masses did not heed her, very few supported her, and her voice was drowned out by the noise of the massive global media avalanche of nauseating, idolatrous Mandelamania. But she was right all the same. Here, then, is the cold, hard truth. The articles below are reproduced chronologically.

Mandela... Political Rip van Winkle

by Aida Parker

(Published in *The Aida Parker Newsletter*, Issue No. 134, First Quarter 1990. This article was written soon after Mandela was freed from prison and four years before the ANC came to power and Mandela became president of South Africa)

When discussing Mr Nelson Mandela, it is important to get the time frame right. The prison gates slammed on him in June, 1964. This was the year British socialist leader Harold Wilson first took up residence at No 10 Downing Street; when Lyndon Baines Johnson was in the White House – and the US was getting deeper into the Vietnam War. It was the year when Khrushchev was kicked out of the Kremlin, to be replaced by Alexei Kosygin.

How many, other than historians and political scientists, have any distinct memory of those men today? An entire generation has grown up who knew them not at all. In consequence, how many can claim to have any true picture of the real-life Nelson Mandela?

Let's be brutally frank. The problem with Mandela is that he long ago ceased to be a human being. His incarceration worked miracles for his reputation. Here we have hagiolatry (worship of saints) personified. A man who in his time was a pretty run-of-the-mill revolutionary has over the years become the epitome of everything good that the international Left reveres.

After 25 years behind bars he has been propagandised into a fantasy figure, mythologised into a "Black Messiah." As far as the anti-apartheid legions are concerned, merely being associated with his name means that they, and their cause too, are similarly canonised. They, too, become saintly because

he is there. He has much the same magic, the same mystique, as did that other hero of media fiction, Che Guevara. He is a poster image, one you hang on the wall; of whom pop songs are written; roads named; statues erected; films are made.

Yet the most transient examination of Mandela's history proves that this man never set out to be a "saint." He is everywhere portrayed as a man of peace, yet it was he who played a central role in the launch of the ANC's armed terror wing, *Umkhonto we Sizwe*, who became its first Commander-in-Chief. And even then he made it clear that *Umkhonto's* main purpose was "to direct and control the violence of the people."

Globally, with careful guidance from the vast international Communist network, politicians and the media have tended to exaggerate Mandela's importance to SA Blacks: this, to no small degree, because his is the only Black SA political name they know.

Because it is an offence in SA to publish a photograph of a serving prisoner, the pictures we saw of Mandela presented him as he was 25 years ago, at his physical peak. The minute this mythological individual stepped forth, a free man, he became Mandela, thin, aged, slightly stooped, grey-haired. Further, exactly what Mandela believes in has received substantially less publicity than the man himself.

His previously last publicly spoken words were his celebrated: "I Am Prepared to Die" speech, made from the dock at the conclusion of the Rivonia trial in the Pretoria Supreme Court, April 20, 1964. That speech (or excerpts from it) has been used worldwide over the years to typify Mandela's nobility, his readiness to sacrifice in "freedom's" cause. Yet Nelson had never before been noted as a great natural orator.

So who wrote, or at the very least, revised that speech? After many years of conjecture that he was the author, the bitterly anti-South African journalist, Oxford-educated Anthony Sampson, former editor of *Drum* and close friend of Archbishop Huddleston, confessed some time ago to having "partly edited and re-written the famous speech."

His version: that after a day in court, he gave Mandela a slight salute – "as one friend to another." That evening Sampson was contacted by Braam Fischer, Mandela's counsel and later leader of the SA Communist Party. Fischer told Sampson that he had been expressly requested by Mandela to help him with the speech. "He obviously wanted it to be perfect: to have an international impact. The work was obviously a joint effort by all the accused... and probably their attorneys as well." So Sampson knocked the rough words and sentiments into shape, producing a speech which made history and has often been used as a stick with which to beat SA.

There are plenty of other questions (and hot air) about the Mandela legend. Often asked is how he became SA's most prominent Black leader. After all, till then his highest ANC rank had been Transvaal provincial ANC president, his status no higher than that of his prison companions, Walter Sisulu and Govan Mbeki. According to those on the inside, it was in 1976 that a conscious decision was made to "personalise" the struggle.

Three Mistakes

A meeting was held where it was decided to promote one prisoner as the ultimate martyr: the choice – Mandela. One reason for the choice, perhaps the ultimate reason: that Winnie Mandela was young, attractive, with a much sharper dress sense than the modest, kindly but admittedly dowdy Albertina Sisulu. Most political scientists agree that in his time Mandela made three deadly blunders – and his marriage was the worst.

His three great mistakes are listed: 1. *To allow the SA Communist Party to infiltrate and finally dominate the ANC.* 2. *To endorse violence, a recipe for defeat.* 3. *To marry Winnie.* Of this British journalist Bruce Anderson wrote in the *London Sunday Telegraph*: "Silly, empty-headed, frivolous and irresponsible, she was the worst possible consort. His imprisonment gave her opportunity to develop ridiculous pretensions as 'the Mother of the Nation.'"

Planned Violence

Why was Mandela sent to prison? What were his “crimes”? It is very popular to present him as a “political” prisoner, to transform him from a mere terrorist into a prisoner-of-conscience. This is by no means the case.

He went to prison for crimes that would have earned him a stiff sentence, if not execution, in any country in the world. At his trial he freely acknowledged that “I planned sabotage... I planned it as a result of calm and sober assessment of the political situation that had arisen after many years of tyranny, exploitation and oppression of my people by the Whites.”

The planning Mandela was discussing involved four stages of violence: sabotage, guerilla warfare, terrorism and open revolution, all this intended to lead to chaos and civil war. It was because of his admission and the planning involved that even so liberal a group as Amnesty International refused to classify him a “prisoner-of-conscience.” Any further argument about Mandela’s role as terrorist chieftain was answered years later by one of his main fellow conspirators. He wrote:

“That sabotage was to form only the opening phase in the unfolding of armed struggle is revealed by other steps which were taken at the same time. Before Umkhonto was formed, leading personalities had been sent out of the country to be trained in the art of guerilla struggle; an underground railway had been set up which carried hundreds of recruits abroad for guerilla-type instruction. Early in 1962, almost immediately after the beginning of sabotage, Nelson Mandela had toured Africa and Europe to obtain support for the armed struggle and training facilities for guerillas.”

That is a passage from “South Africa – No Middle Road,” a chapter of *South Africa – the New Politics of Revolution* (Pelican Books, 1976). The author? Joe Slovo, former “chief of staff” of *Umkhonto*, member of the ANC Revolutionary Council, secretary general of the SA Communist Party and an awardee of the Order of Lenin. If anyone should know about events leading to the Rivonia trial, that man is Slovo. Unfortunately, his book was banned in SA, so few in this country know of his disclosures: and the Government, with rare exceptions, has done little to propagate the true facts concerning the Rivonia treason trial; the background reports on why Mandela is in jail or what the ANC/SACP alliance really represents.

No Renunciation

As for Mandela’s release, it is no secret that the Government has agonised and agonised over this. In 1984 there was serious discussion on releasing him, but the revolutionary climate that exploded on SA at that time put paid to that effort. His continued incarceration was an acute embarrassment to the Government, giving SA’s critics the opportunity to pretend that nothing had changed.

One sticking point earlier was that he would not renounce violence. People ask: “Why could he not do this?” The answer is simple. The point was not that Pretoria was asking him to renounce violence – we all have to do that, or face prosecution – but to repudiate the ANC policy decision which led to the formation of *Umkhonto we Sizwe*. Many have urged that he, or the ANC, declare a temporary moratorium on violence, but seemingly even that is unacceptable.

The ANC, with the ready connivance of the world media, have built up these Messianic expectations of Mandela’s Second Coming. After all the hype and the build-up, there is a very real danger that his release will yet prove a morale-sapping anti-climax.

“The Penalty Would Have Been Death”

(Written by Bruce Anderson, writing in the London *Sunday Telegraph* on the occasion of Mandela’s 70th birthday, and reproduced in *The Aida Parker Newsletter*, Issue No. 134, First Quarter 1990)

The imprisonment of Nelson Mandela was neither a human rights issue nor an injustice. There was no question of trumped-up charges, as sometimes alleged. Mandela pleaded guilty to planning explosions and was sentenced after a scrupulously fair hearing. In Britain, similar offences would have

carried the same sentence: life imprisonment. But in Britain, as no one was actually killed – Mandela and his co-conspirators were arrested before the bombings were properly underway – he would have been released by now.

Not in other countries. In Russia, or Cuba, or almost anywhere in Black Africa, he would have been executed. Throughout the USSR, thousands of prisoners have served sentences as long or longer than Mandela's, either for trifling offences or for no crime at all, in infinitely worse conditions – but the great moral conscience of the pop world remained unmoved.

Mr Mandela is obviously an impressive human being. But his decision to resort to violence was unjustified and resulted in a serious setback to the struggle for Black political rights in South Africa. As a result of his endorsement of armed conflict South African White liberalism was demoralised, and Black radicalism crushed. At the same time the ANC, which had been a broadly based nationalist movement, fell largely under the direction of the SA Communist Party and accepted a political agenda which could be achieved only by violent revolution.

Getting to Grips with Mandela

by Aida Parker

(Published in *The Aida Parker Newsletter*, Spring 1990, Issue No. 138. This article was written after Mandela, who had been released earlier that year, went on a tour of various countries to drum up support. This was four years before his terrorist outfit, the ANC, came to power in SA and he became SA president)

For SA, it is an immense political tragedy that we are so isolated from world opinion; that our media generally, and SABC-TV in particular, is so terrified of offending ANC/SACP susceptibilities. Let's do a post mortem on Mandela's recent long overseas tour. Most South Africans, especially Blacks, believe this to have been a runaway success.

The popular press did indeed have a ball. Others were by no means so enthralled – notably now, when the early euphoria has evaporated and the inevitable reaction to over-exposure has set in. Examples:

Writing in the London *Sunday Telegraph*, Geoffrey Wheatcroft urged his readers to ignore Mandela's style and look at the substance of what he said: "American Mandelamania is so hysterical and uncritical that Mr Mandela could almost praise Stalin as the world's greatest statesman before indecently assaulting Mrs Bush on the White House lawn and no word of criticism would be uttered. (*The New York Times* would not report it)."

He added: "He might have noticed, but hasn't, that what passes for socialism has produced peculiarly gross inequities in Russia and its former satrapies, and has pauperised the peoples of dozens of African countries. Travel is said to broaden the mind. If only Mr Mandela's travels had taught him that there must be a better hope for his people than discredited dogma."

Time Warp

Editorial, London *Daily Mail*: "After his long years in captivity his (Mandela's) view of the world outside Southern Africa seems to be caught in some kind of time warp. Castro, the aging Communist dictator of Cuba, is still a hero to him. Mr Mandela still seems to see all the world's terrorists and their backers through a sentimental time haze."

Editorial, London *Daily Star*: "Many well-meaning, decent people have been drawn to the Nelson Mandela bandwagon. They are misguided. For Mandela and his African National Congress are terrorists. They are hell-bent on violence. Why was Mandela jailed all those years ago? It was because he plotted to bathe his nation in blood. *Has the leopard changed his spots?*" (Their italics).

Editorial comment, *Washington Times*, on Mandela's call for intensified anti-SA sanctions: "Has it occurred to Mr Mandela (or others in the sanctions lobby) that to level sanctions against a government simply for the purpose of dictating internal political and social change is as much an act of aggression as launching a military invasion? Nowhere can we find evidence that he or his friends have spoken out against the ideologically-inspired slaughter of tens of thousands of Blacks in Ethiopia and Sudan. It is difficult not to get the impression from his statements that he regards some Blacks – those of socialist leanings – as more equal than others.

Torture?

"In trying to discover the real Mandela, consistency leaps out. Mr Mandela, a revolutionary and lifelong supporter of Marxist causes, seeks power for the ANC and the ruinous ideological superstitions it harbours. What needs (to be decided) is whether he is a noble democrat or a 'freedom fighter' who feels justified in torturing political foes as well as the language and logic of liberty."

US Congressman Dan Burton, vice-chairman of the House Sub-Committee on Africa, in a letter to *The New York Times*: "Questions relating to Mr Mandela's political, economic and social tendencies must be answered. None is more important than this: Given Mr Mandela's avowed admiration and strong words of praise for Castro, Arafat, Gaddafi and Ethiopia's Col Mengistu Haile Mariam and his consent to appear in public with the convicted Puerto Rican who shot up the US Capitol in 1954, and given some of the anti-democratic, violent history of the ANC, along what lines would Mr Mandela and his colleagues like to structure a future South Africa? The fate of South Africa and the well-being of its citizens – Black and White – depend in large measure on the answer."

Preposterous

Bill Buckley, American syndicated columnist: "It was in Angola that Mr Mandela pronounced his estimate of Fidel Castro most comprehensibly: 'There's one thing where (Castro's Cuba) stands out head and shoulders above the rest – that is in love for human rights and liberty.' That statement was of course analytically preposterous and morally incompetent."

Buckley continued: "Just before arriving in the US, Mr Mandela was awarded the Lenin Peace Prize (the Soviet Union, present or past, is not criticised by Mr Mandela, whose support of communist doctrines has been explicit). The question, so painful to ask, arises: Is leadership by such a man in the interest of the people he seeks so ardently to serve?"

Political columnist Mike Royco in his syndicated column: "Appearing on a TV forum with Ted Koppel... a guest said he was disappointed in Mandela's expressed admiration for Castro, Gaddafi and Arafat. The question was naturally expressed with appropriate deference. You don't just ask a world-class hero: '*Hey, Nelson, we're talking about terrorists and dictators. Can't you find any chums who don't go in for blowing people up, standing them in front of firing squads or tossing old tourists over the side of boats?*'"

"After (saying these people had helped the ANC in the struggle) Mandela replied: 'We have no time to be looking into the internal affairs of other countries. It is unreasonable for anybody to think that is our role.' For some reason – probably out of respect for his heroic stature – nobody asked the obvious question: '*Mr Mandela, if you have no time to be looking into the internal affairs of other countries, and it is unreasonable for anybody to think that is your role, why is the US expected to be looking into the internal affairs of SA: what are we doing, imposing sanctions and boycotts?*'"

And even the *Toronto Sun*: "When Mandela spoke to Toronto schoolchildren... they were asked to give money to help the education of SA schoolchildren. What he didn't tell them was that for years the ANC had instructed the children to boycott their schools. Mulroney has said: 'SA has the only viable economy in Africa.' True. So why does he try to break it with sanctions?"

"Let us not forget a Canadian called Louis Riel who was convicted in Canada of the same acts with which Mandela was charged: sabotage, treason and conspiracy to overthrow the government. We hanged him! Let us not forget that revolution is not the moral path to a just society. Reform is."

Finally, from France, syndicated writer Nicholas Rowe: “The 14-country, multi-million trek was undoubtedly an exploit for an elderly man, not in the best of health. There were questions. After Mandela steered his way through the papal panoply in Rome, some wondered who, after Yasser Arafat and Nelson Mandela, will be next on the Pope’s invitation list... Gaddafi, Castro?”

Of events in SA, Rowe added: “Perhaps even more dangerous to the chances of peaceful evolution towards a non-racial multi-party democracy is the projected return from camps in East Africa of 20 000 ANC exiles. Of this number some 15000 are trained guerilla fighters, well-armed and even better conditioned in Stalin-think. Mr Mandela has been fund-raising for their repatriation and the money will certainly be forthcoming: if from no one else, the ANC can always count on UN bounty.”

Fit... for What?

(from the London *Sunday Independent*, 29.4.90, and reproduced in *The Aida Parker Newsletter*, Spring 1990, Issue No. 138)

Many Africans have been struck by the fact that Nelson Mandela could emerge fit and healthy from a South African jail after 27 years, knowing that radical opponents of their own governments could never emulate such a feat.

The Mandela Mirage

by Aida Parker

(Published in *The Aida Parker Newsletter*, Issue No. 139, September/October 1990. Mandela had been out of prison for some months, and it was four years before his ANC came to power in SA and he became SA president)

Had SA’s “liberal” (really leftwing) media – and this indictment includes SABC-TV – played fair with information; had they done their journalistic duty and done an honest job of reporting on Mandela and the ANC in recent months, South Africans would have had due warning that serious storm signals were flashing, that grisly violence was being deliberately fomented in Johannesburg’s Black townships.

Instead, via reporting that was variously euphoric, partial, indulgent, misleading and not infrequently downright dishonest, a Munich-type gullibility was built up. With the honourable exceptions of *The Citizen* and *Business Day*, idolatrous praise for Mandela has been pervasive throughout most of the SA media this year.

Intent on maintaining his image as The Great Conciliator, it has been consistently argued that Mandela is a man of moderation and reason, eager to come to terms with SA’s Whites, to help build the “New South Africa” into a land of peace, prosperity and stability for all. What has been conspicuously omitted from the very day of his release from Cape Town’s Victor Verster Prison, 11.2.90, is that Mandela has been sternly urging his troops to rev up confrontation.

His more extreme statements, and those of his henchmen, have been largely cloaked, softened or explained away. What we have seen, most notably on SABC-TV, has been a full flowering of “Don’t Criticise the ANC or Mandela.” At one time it was so bad on SABC-TV that many suspected some sort of deal had been struck with the ANC. If Mandela or other ANC chieftains said anything which showed them in bad light, it proved extremely difficult to find out about it. It was as if criticism would somehow jinx the marvellous unfolding of the “New South Africa.”

War Declared

But where is this famous Mandela moderation? It might, here, be salutary to look back at his opening salvo in the memorable speech in Cape Town on February 11 [the day he was released – *Editor*]. In this he declared war, not peace, on the SA Government. He opened that speech with the high-octane phrase: “*Amandla! Amandla! I-Africa, mayibuye!*” – Xhosa for “Power! Power! Africa is ours!”

I found very few references to that in either the SA or international coverage of the event. On violence, he said: “The factors which necessitated the armed struggle still exist today. We have no option but to continue...” Slice it as you like, those words could only be construed as a stunning challenge to the man who had just sanctioned his release... State President FW de Klerk.

Yet, thanks to skewed media coverage, how many South Africans fully understood what was being implied? Those remarks were heavily played down. Surely, for someone who is the subject of international hero worship to advocate political violence, is that fact not newsworthy, deserving of careful analysis and comment? The respected British intelligence journal, *Special Office Brief*, thought so, anyway. It was quick to warn that euphoria over Mandela was premature. As early as March 6 it issued this caveat:

“The world is being led to believe that... South Africa is on the verge of democratic evolution, under Nelson Mandela. Factually, South Africa is on the brink of a bloodbath of Black against Black. The terrorist Mandela is not a majority leader and will not be accepted by the Zulus. The conventional make-believers are at it yet again. World opinion is now offered yet another great illusion...”

The *Washington Post*, which has invariably denigrated the SA Government while boosting the ANC and Mandela, also on this occasion proved editorially disturbed: “We think we were not the only listeners who found it passing uncomfortable to hear Nelson Mandela, in his first public words upon release from prison, salute the SA Communist Party for its sterling contribution to the struggle for democracy; and go on to hail some of the party faithful by name, including Secretary General Joe Slovo.”

Mandela on Violence

In a manifesto published by the Cape Town-based publication, *South*, one week before Mr de Klerk’s monumental February 2 speech [announcing Mandela would be released – *Editor*], Mandela made clear that his revolutionary socialist fervour still burnt bright, despite his 71 years of age and 10 000 days in prison.

In this *South* statement, he pledged strong support for the ANC, stressed that the ANC would not abandon its close alliance with the SA Communist Party and emphasised that the ANC “must not surrender its right to perpetuate violence, even during negotiations.” His exact words:

“White South Africa must accept the plain fact that the ANC will not suspend, to say nothing of abandoning, the armed struggle until the government shows its willingness to surrender the monopoly of political power and to negotiate directly and in good faith with the acknowledged Black leaders. The renunciation of violence by either the government or the ANC should not be a precondition to, but the result of, negotiation.”

And again: “The position of the ANC on the question of violence is therefore very clear. A government which used violence against Blacks many years before we took arms has no right whatsoever to call on us to lay down arms.”

Mandela denied – as he has always done – that the ANC is dominated by the SA Communist Party or its ideology. However, he candidly acknowledged that the ANC and SACP were still intricately bound together in a so-far “unshakeable alliance.” He explained: “Co-operation between the ANC and SACP goes back to the early ’20s and has always been, and still is, strictly limited to the struggle against racial oppression and for a just society... *No dedicated ANC member will ever heed the call to break with the SACP.* We regard such a demand as purely divisive government strategy.” (Italics added).

And his own political views? “My political beliefs have been explained in the course of several political trials in which I was charged, in the policy documents of the ANC and in my autobiography,

The Struggle is My Life, which I wrote in prison in 1975. I stated in these trials and publications that I did not belong to any organisation apart from the ANC.”

His Marxism

“In my address to the court which sentenced me to life imprisonment in June 1964, I said: ‘Today I am attracted by the idea of a classless society, *an attraction which springs in part from my Marxist reading.*’ It is true, as I have already stated, that I have been influenced by Marxist thought.

“But this is also true of many of the leaders of (Africa’s) early independent states. Such widely different persons as Gandhi, Nehru, Nkrumah and Nasser all... accepted the need for some form of socialism to enable our people to catch up with the advanced countries of the world, and to overcome their legacy of poverty. My views are still the same.”

We all know what socialism has brought to Africa. On this, the Washington-based political journal, *Human Events*, commented: “The danger (in South Africa) is that this most productive country on the African continent, where Blacks themselves are freer and more prosperous than their neighbours, will not wind up in the hands of those devoted to the cause of freedom, but in the grip of the still very potent revolutionary left.”

The failure of our media to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth about Mandela and the ANC, obviously very much accentuates that danger.

Prisoner of the Past

by Aida Parker

(Published in *The Aida Parker Newsletter*, Issue No. 139, September/October 1990. Mandela had been out of prison for some months)

When Nelson Mandela walked to freedom in February [1990], he carried with him a heavy burden: worldwide fantasies about his supposedly marvellous statesmanlike qualities crafted during his 27 years in prison. The mythology continued. He was presented as virtual co-president of SA: the ANC as being in *de facto* coalition government with the National Party.

Today, the halo is shrinking fast. And nowhere more so than in Britain. Much-feared London *Daily Express* columnist Jean Rook described Mandela as having “the small, grasping mind of an increasingly wealthy tribal headman in a Rolls Royce... a prideful, awkward old man of 72 who has, in a mere six months of freedom, brought South Africa to the brink of a bloody Black war.”

Truth: Stranger than Fiction

by Aida Parker

(Published in *The Aida Parker Newsletter*, Issue No. 139, September/October 1990. Mandela had been out of prison for some months)

Of all publications, it has taken a rabidly leftwing US publication, *The Nation*, to point out the “contemptible hypocrisy” of official US attitudes to Nelson Mandela. Entitled “Out of Africa” and authored by Andrew Kopkind, the writer makes his point by presenting Mandela’s real record and intentions. This was done by introducing the editorial with an imaginary phone call from an immigration official to the White House:

“*This is Immigration,*” the caller said to the White House liaison, with a hint of perplexity in his voice. “*We’ve got an African revolutionary here who’s been in jail for 27 years for sabotage and*

terrorism. We helped to lock him up in the first place. He's in league with the Communists and he says he embraces Gaddafi, Castro and Arafat as comrades-in-arms. He's waging a violent struggle to take over his country, and if he wins he'll nationalise the banks, mines and heavy industry and redistribute land and wealth. And he says he wants to see the president in the Oval Office and address a joint session of Congress. Shall we let him in?"

The unbelievable did, of course, happen. The African revolutionary was admitted and he did spend three hours in the Oval Office with the American President. He also addressed a joint session of Congress, receiving several standing ovations. Truth, as *The Nation* pointed out, is indeed stranger than fiction.

Foreign Force Manipulates Mandela

by the British Intelligence Digest

(This article was published in August 1992, and reproduced in *The Aida Parker Newsletter*, Issue No. 156, August 1992. Mandela became president under two years later)

With the De Klerk government having virtually dismantled SA's once-powerful intelligence services, far too little is known about new threats which rise and expand almost every day. One of these is the rise – and rise – of Islamic fundamentalism, both as a political and religious force, in this country. British Intelligence Digest, 29.7.92, does our work for us:

A new and sinister development for South Africa is the increasing role being played by Islamic countries in its domestic affairs. SA has a Muslim population of 400 000, and while some of them are politically moderate, some of their leaders share the views of Muslim fundamentalists. In recent weeks, Nelson Mandela visited a number of Islamic states, including Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates and Iran, all of which have supported the ANC and its affiliates both financially and politically since the late 1970s.

In a ceremony at Teheran University on July 22, Mandela became the first person to receive an honorary doctorate since Ayatollah Khomeini's 1979 Islamic revolution. Mandela's remarks on that occasion should be taken seriously by Western leaders still supporting the ANC. He said: *'The people of Africa will make Iran's Islamic revolution a model for their revolutionary moves.'* A crowd of students, professors and officials at the graduation ceremony chanted 'Salute to Africa! Salute to Mandela!'

The day before receiving his doctorate, Mandela laid a wreath at Khomeini's tomb outside Teheran and met President Rafsanjani, who urged SA Blacks to become involved in an armed struggle against the De Klerk Government. Mandela later met Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei.

Mandela was first introduced to the basic tenets of Islam by a fellow activist Maulvi Cachalia before he was sent to prison on Robben Island. Later, while in prison, he was often visited by Imam Abdurahman Bessler with whom he had long conversations. Meanwhile, Mandela's continuing strength and appeal abroad is not matched by his position at home, where his views are progressively being ignored by the White and Indian communist cabal running the ANC/SACP alliance. It was on the advice of this cabal that he broke negotiations with the government.

APN comment: This journal has repeatedly warned over the years that Pretoria was giving insufficient attention to the vast surge of Islam in Africa... or to the unlimited potential for mischief inherent in militant Islam. Further, it is illuminating to note that Mandela is once again being used by a radical foreign pressure group for its own ends and in pursuit of its own objectives.

Trying to Decipher Mandela

by Aida Parker

(Published in *The Aida Parker Newsletter*, Issue No. 157, September 1992. This was just over 18 months before Mandela became president of SA in a massively rigged election)

The ANC and its well-oiled SA Communist Party-controlled propaganda machine would have the world accept Nelson Mandela as a “statesman,” the equal, if not better, of Martin Luther King. At the time of his release from Pollsmoor, State President De Klerk argued that he was “a man of moderation,” eager to “come to decent terms with all South Africans.” The *New York Times* welcomed his release as “Sunrise in South Africa,” predicting that he would be “an inspired leader,” a “decisive, dynamic man of vision.” Mandela was, opined the *NYT*, SA’s “last, best chance of peaceful change.”

To say anything contrary to this common wisdom became almost sacrilege. Unfortunately, Mandela’s claims of moderation and sainthood have not been borne out by either his actions or declarations over the past 32 months. His problem: he appears to suffer from some sort of time warp, an incurable jail lag. Today there is a distinct air of unreality in what he says.

Mandela’s world is one where diplomats, especially US diplomats, and businessmen, all seemingly living in the same world of fantasy, delude themselves that the ANC can deliver a democratic, free-market SA, ensuring prosperity for all. Yet all the signals are that Mandela’s walk to freedom has turned sour; that far from sunrise, the glow of his authority wanes like the setting sun.

The media generally, and for its own purposes, largely cloaks Mandela’s more extreme statements, his many contradictions and inconsistencies. That became clear from the start, from the handling of his very first post-release speech in Cape Town, 11.2.90. Surprising those who expected he would strike a note of reconciliation, he instead eagerly embraced the same cause of revolutionary socialism he held when standing in the dock in Pretoria in 1964.

“Power, Power”

Showing very little of the famous Mandela moderation, he declared not peace but war on SA. Not only did he laud the policy of vengeance, but he again stressed that the SA Communist Party, which he praised for its “sterling contribution to the struggle for democracy,” remained the ANC’s “unshakeable friend.” Though very few of the vast throng of journos present that day chose to report this, he opened his speech with the high-octane phrase: “Amandla! Amandla! I’Africa, Mayibuye” – the Xhosa words for “Power! Power! Africa, It is Ours!”

He stressed that there was “no option” but the “armed struggle”... “now is the time to intensify the struggle on all fronts.” Nowhere did he yield an inch in the views he has held since he helped Joe Slovo found the ANC’s armed terrorist wing, *Umkhonto we Sizwe*, in 1961.

In other areas too there is an uncanny similarity between what he was saying so long ago and what he says today. Speaking from the dock in 1964, he said: “I do not deny that I planned sabotage. I planned it as a result of a calm and sober assessment of the political situation... attacks on the economic lifeline of the country were to be linked with sabotage of government buildings and other symbols of apartheid... I started to study war and revolution...” Since his release, he has of course been totally committed to the destruction of the SA economy via sanctions and divestment. And, speaking on the BBC, 14.2.90, he said: “South African Government installations are still legitimate targets for the armed struggle.”

His Approach to Violence

The “Great Conciliator” seems mixed up in his approach to violence:

“Mandela... said the youth of today were carrying on the struggle launched by their grandfathers. The youth had given the struggle fresh impetus, not a new direction.” – *Sowetan*, 11.2.90.

“Now is the time to intensify the struggle on all fronts... the sight of freedom looming on the horizon should encourage us to redouble our efforts.” – *Citizen*, 12.2.90.

“He paid tribute to Black South African youth and said they had been fearless in the struggle.” – *Sowetan*, 28.3.90.

“The transformation of SA into a non-racial democracy would become reality only as a result of struggle, including the struggle represented by the international sanctions campaign. All of us must therefore refuse to be demobilised.” – *London Guardian*, 17.4.90.

“He (Mandela) said ANC president Oliver Tambo, whom he saw recently in Sweden, joined in the call to ‘intensify the offensive’ to end the Bantustan system. ‘Bury the stinking Bantustan’ corpse is the message for all the homelands.” – *Citizen*, 26.3.90.

“And this is what he said to the *London Daily Telegraph*: “The ANC will take force by power if it failed to reach agreement with the SA Government.”

Now the other side of the coin:

“Any form of violence or coercion is against the policy of the ANC. If you are not disciplined, you cannot hope to win our confidence.” – *Christian Science Monitor*, 16.4.90.

“We, the ANC, will do our best to find a solution for peace as soon as possible.” – *Citizen*, 29.4.90.

“We have never supported coercion, nor will we tolerate it now, no matter who employs it.” – *Sunday Star*, 25.3.90.

“Any form of violence, coercion and harassment is against the policy of the ANC.” – *Sowetan*, 17.4.91.

“Throw your weapons into the sea.” – Call to Durban rally.

Overseas, too, Mandela has often seemed to go out of his way to make quite clear that he is not a man of moderation. He has lovingly allied himself with the world’s leading exporters of terrorism – Castro, Gaddafi and Arafat – and earlier, before this became very unfashionable indeed, spoke well of Erich Honecker.

Speaking in Teheran on his way to the UN in July, he declared: “The people of Africa will make Iran’s Islamic revolution a model for their own revolutionary moves.” He went on to lay a wreath on the tomb of Ayatollah Khomeini, the old monster who unleashed one of the most obscene excesses of revolutionary violence in modern history.

Just what do we make of such a man?

The Mandela Hoax

by Aida Parker

(Published in *The Aida Parker Newsletter*, Issue No. 168, October/November 1993. This was just months before Nelson Mandela swept to victory as president of SA, after years of intimidation and murder and terrorism committed by his ANC, and a massively rigged election)

If ever we needed proof that the world is suffering from some form of collective dementia, the (shared) award of the Nobel Peace Prize to Nelson Mandela is it. Oh, yes. We fully accept that this was a natural, coming as it did from the Scandinavians who, along with the Americans, have laboured long and hard to force revolutionary socialism on SA. They, Norway and Sweden alike, have invested hundreds of millions in the ANC/SACP: inevitably, they wanted to make sure their investment paid off... that, come next May, their candidate would become SA’s first Black President.

Like many others among his international admirers, the liberals in Oslo obviously did not want to be troubled with any of the less admirable facts about their hero. But this is *our* future we are talking about, so it behoves us to study the ANC’s No 1 very carefully indeed, to take some of the stern realities about the one-sided worship into sober account.

Persistent Folk Hero

Mandela is presented to the world as a “man of reconciliation,” as “essentially moderate,” a man of “special discernment,” a “courageous freedom fighter.” He has been variously compared to Moses, George Washington, Martin Luther King: even, by the fatuous Jesse Jackson, to Jesus Christ. Well, is he the historic figure so widely advertised?

Okay. We do agree that Mandela, one of the most persistent folk heroes of our time, projects pretty well, far better indeed than his White co-Laureate. Sartorially, he is impeccable. Personable and glib, he undoubtedly has style. A consummate actor, he has like many other former African terrorist leaders before him assumed the grand air of an old-style British gentleman. The Americans, not exactly kings of social discernment, invariably depict him as “tall and stately,” of “patrician bearing.” Maybe he is: until you look into his machine gun eyes.

In a world hungry for heroes, few men in all history have been so mythologised, myth heaped on myth. Still, at some time in our lives we have to look into a cold mirror and see the hard facts. It is time that someone called Mandela’s bluff, that we take note of the alarming facts... facts which our Scandinavian friends chose to ignore when awarding what is hyped as “one of the world’s highest honours.”

Mandela long ago made some very serious mistakes: tactical mistakes, and never mind the morality. First and most important was his early decision to ally the ANC with the tiny, Stalinist, unrepresentative and dogmatic SA Communist Party, a move guaranteed sooner or later to sink this country into self-destruction. The SACP’s goal has never been democracy or human rights. It has always sought to exploit Black nationalism in order to create revolution in SA. Joe Slovo knows that, and said so in Luanda in 1985: that the Marxist/Leninist revolution could “only be won under the banner of the ANC.”

Led by the Nose

Mandela has consistently denied that he is, or ever was, a card-carrying member of the SACP. However, if he has not accepted SACP membership, then all we can say is that he has served them very satisfactorily. The ANC – and Mandela – have been led by the nose by the SACP for decades. So incestuous is the relationship that even the *New York Times* has on occasion suggested that the ANC is no more than a Communist front. To this day, as is proved by its dominance on the ANC National Executive, the SACP continues to be the guiding force behind the ANC.

Mandela’s support for the SACP has been explicit. He has made no bones whatsoever about the interlock between the two organisations. In his first speech after his release from Pollsmoor, he described his old friend and comrade-at-arms, Comrade Joe [Slovo], as “one of our finest patriots.”

Second major blunder was the espousal of violence, a seriously bad idea, regardless of the morality of terrorism. Nelson Mandela is not a man who has ever believed in peaceful solutions. He believes, and has always believed, in violent nationalism. He has always believed in, and sought, the forcible overthrow of the SA state through terror-imposed revolution.

The ANC’s dedication to violence is an unsavoury fact that the media, here and overseas, prefer to ignore, an omission that, as is only too plainly demonstrated today, has done the people of SA a most cruel disservice. Throughout this present period of extreme violence, it has been ANC strategy to mobilise the township youth. Only recently Mandela advised these violent young thugs: “If you want guns, join MK [*Mkhonto we Sizwe*, the ANC’s armed wing].” With his foolish, frequently reiterated and utterly irresponsible statements about “the armed struggle,” Mandela must accept a large portion of the blame for the genocidal violence of the past four years. Surely all this effectively destroys his carefully cultivated posture as a “moderate”?

Millions of young Blacks have been led to believe that the only way forward is through violence. Deny this as he may, Mandela has sent an emphatic message to “the masses” – primarily young, Black and angry – that revolutionary violence remains an acceptable means to an end. Compassion or feeling for the human condition have seldom if ever played any role in his actions. Stripped of its emotive language, the “armed struggle” was a licence for anarchy. Moreover, through violent intimidation, the

ANC has told Blacks that either they support the ANC – or die. A strange “conciliator,” indeed.

Has Mandela now become a disciple of peace and non-violence? Evidence suggests that if he has, his message of peace still comes through an AK-47. In published statements made after the announcement of the Peace Prize, the ANC went on record as saying that Mandela “has in the past contributed generously to the ANC military wing, MK,” and “might give a substantial amount of his share of the R3,1 million to MK.” So much for Oslo!

Ill Omen

Mandela’s famed “walk to freedom” from Pollsmoor Prison was an ill omen of things to come. In his first post-imprisonment speech in Cape Town on February 11, 1990, he not only lauded the policy of violence, but once again embraced the SACP. In typically confused fashion, he followed this up with the remarkable statement that “there is not a single political organisation in this country, inside or outside Parliament, which can even compare with the ANC in its commitment to peace.” He reiterated this highly ambiguous statement at a press conference the next day. He was allowed to get away with it. So great is the propaganda wall built around him that no one dared challenge him. His “untouchable” status seems to render him immune to any serious criticism.

Reinforcing the mantle of martyrdom, he is monotonously described as a “political prisoner,” the inference being that here was an innocent man railroaded by a “racist” government. As recently as May this year the London *Independent* had this to say: “Nelson Mandela is a noble man... imprisoned for 27 years for his dedication to the cause of Black majority rule in South Africa.” The writer surely knew that to be an out-and-out lie. Mandela himself claims to have been a “political prisoner,” convicted on “technical violations.” Another lie.

Mandela was not a political prisoner, or a prisoner of conscience. He was a convicted saboteur. No human rights organisation was ever prepared to list him as a political prisoner. In a letter to the Finnish newspaper, *Helsingin Sanomat*, 13.9.85, Amnesty International pointed out that, as Mandela “had participated in planning acts of sabotage and violence... he could no longer fulfil the criteria for the classification of political prisoner. At the end of his trial, Mandela delivered a speech. He said that... he had concluded that the only choice for change in South Africa was through violence.”

While men of violence are not these days considered with any particular revulsion, not even by the sponsors of the Nobel Peace Prize, the facts show Mandela to be neither a saint nor a political genius, but a terrorist tactician with a great number of provenly unworkable and dangerous ideas.

His imprisonment was neither a human rights issue nor an injustice. There was no question of trumped-up charges. He was not detained for his political views. He was sentenced, in open court and after a scrupulously fair hearing, in which it was proved beyond all reasonable doubt that he had helped initiate and been intimately involved in plans to launch violent revolution in SA.

Many have lamented Mandela’s “wasted years” in prison, from 1964 to 1990. Conveniently forgotten is that he was first offered “freedom in exile” by John Vorster as far back as 1976: the proposal that he be released to the Transkei, then led by Kaiser Matanzima, his brother-in-law. Mandela refused. Later, he refused to be traded to the Marxist MPLA in Angola, in exchange for a SADF [SA Defence Force] major captured in the Cabinda enclave.

Of his 27 years in prison, therefore, he was in effect for 14 of these jailing himself. Said PW Botha, who was known to be eager to get him out: “The moment he renounces violence and undertakes to come to the conference table in a friendly and peaceful way, he will be out of jail.” But that was not the way Mandela wanted it. Throughout his years inside, he emphasised his dedication to violence, refused to reject it as a political instrument.

In January 1985 Lord Nicholas Bethell, vice-chairman of the European Parliament’s Human Rights Committee, became the first foreigner authorised to visit Mandela. He quoted him: “Personally, I still support the armed struggle. I am a socialist...”

Recruiting Ground

Mandela joined the ANC in 1944, helping to form the ANC Youth League, a militant group intended

to serve as a recruiting ground for potential communists and which became part of the pro-Soviet World Federation of Democratic Youth. In 1961, under the banner of the SACP, he and Slovo launched *Umkhonto we Sizwe*, designed to serve as a terrorist strike force and act as the primary instrument to achieve Communist revolution in SA. A “high command” was set up to control MK, with Mandela as its first “Commander-in-Chief.”

By the end of 1962, the ANC/SACP – largely under Mandela’s direction – had sent hundreds of ANC youths for training in revolutionary terrorism, killing and destruction, in Cuba, Algeria, Egypt, Ethiopia, North Korea, the USSR, East Germany, Red China and Czechoslovakia. Those going into African states were instructed never to disclose the fact that they were Communists.

On July 16, 1963, after an investigative break, the police raided the farm Lilliesleaf, Rivonia. Mountains of documents were recovered. One document provided in the most minute detail the plans for MK’s “Operation Mayibuye,” a blueprint for seizing control of the country by means of sabotage, terrorism, revolution and guerilla war.

These plans closely paralleled the actions used in the bloody Algerian revolution: scarcely surprising, seeing that Mandela had previously travelled to Algeria for personal instruction in revolutionary tactics, his tutors some of the worst killers of the 20th Century, men such as Ait Hamouda, whose advice was to drive the masses into the extremist camp by trapping them in a “sandwich of terror.” Moderates on all sides should be eliminated, as brutally as possible. “One mutilated corpse in a suit is always worth more than 20 in uniform.”

Mandela learnt his odious lessons well. One of the captured papers was a 94-page tract on revolution, in his own writing, declaring that “traitors and informers should be ruthlessly eliminated.” He advocated “cutting off their noses... *pour encourager les autres*”... to encourage the others.

Marxist Philosophy

Another document, also in Mandela’s own handwriting, *How To Be a Good Communist*, held that only “revolution and not the slow change or reforms the reactionaries and liberals often advise,” could bring about “the transition from capitalism to socialism. One therefore must be a revolutionary, not a reformist.” Further: “The aim of studying Marxist philosophy is to enable us to direct more effectively revolutionary mass struggles... the Communist movement still faces powerful enemies which must be completely crushed and wiped from the face of the earth before a Communist world can be realised.”

In recent years it has been argued that Mandela, with this, was simply copying the text of a Chinese revolutionary document. Experts in this field have compared the two documents and challenge this explanation, saying that the Mandela document is an original bearing little resemblance to the Chinese manuscript.

At no time during the trial did the defence challenge the authenticity or authorship of the documents submitted. On the contrary, counsel for the defence stated that “in the face of the overwhelming bulk of evidence” against his clients, it would be “futile to refute any of the charges.” So incriminating were the documents that the prosecution believed it could have obtained convictions on these alone.

The court found that Mandela, Govan Mbeki, Walter Sisulu and Slovo planned to overthrow the SA Government as early as 1964 or 1965, using the Algerian revolution as their model. For reasons never satisfactorily explained, the men were not arraigned on the capital charge of high treason. Had that been done, and had they been executed, SA’s later history would have been very different.

Media Evasiveness

The deliberate media evasiveness about Mandela’s well-documented past does not augur well for the future. Against that background, could Mandela really be entrusted with the future of the “New SA”? Cantankerous and not very astute, often (as with his attacks on De Klerk) mean and petty, could he be expected to produce lasting and realistic solutions to the immense problems of this deeply troubled country? With his particular record, would it be logical to expect him to achieve an enduring settlement and reconciliation?

Frankly, we very much doubt it. We believe that those – Big Business in particular – who delude themselves that the ANC/SACP alliance can deliver a democratic, free market, prosperous SA, a

thriving multi-party democracy, are riding for a very hard fall indeed. Rather than producing a stable, productive and safe SA for members of all races, it today looks more and more as though the New SA, under any ANC government, would be built on the lines laid down by Operation Mayibuye in 1964.

We think this because we believe that Mandela, with his lingering socialism, his push for votes for 14-year-olds, his antique notions of a “People’s Democracy,” his fond embrace of his “brothers” in Terrorist International, Arafat, Gaddafi and Castro, simply does not possess the substance needed to deliver the goods.

We look, too, at the gross incompetence of his organisation. The myth persists that the ANC is a united and comprehensively representative body of Black aspirations. In hard fact, the ANC is a chaotic organisation split between Marxist/Leninists, Stalinists, Trotskyites, Black nationalists, the township elders and the township “comrades” – now totally out of control – and a substantial proportion of venal, third-rate characters whose sole aim for themselves is an affluent lifestyle.

We do not believe that Mandela is any more representative of SA Blacks than we are. The ANC, with its unbridled violence, its intimidation, its communist links, is cordially detested by millions of Black South Africans. As for Mandela, they have little use for a lifelong fellow traveller now enjoying a lifestyle the vast majority of his followers cannot even attempt to envisage.

Summing up, we believe that SA Blacks need and deserve a much, much better way of life: and that the chances of the ANC delivering on that are exactly zero. For confirmation you have only to look north to see what a hash their ideological comrade, Robert Mugabe, has made of “democracy” in Zimbabwe, let alone the appalling bloodletting in Angola under the US-supported, Marxist MPLA. Is it necessary that we repeat the mistakes of Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe and Namibia? Obviously Mandela – and the Nobel Peace Prize Selection Committee – say yes, it is.

In our opinion, the granting of this year’s “Peace” is a shame and a sham.

A True Messiah of Peace?

by Aida Parker

(Published in *The Aida Parker Newsletter*, Issue No. 168, October/November 1993. This was just months before Mandela swept to victory as president of SA)

Every concerned South African should acquaint themselves with the true facts concerning the Rivonia trial and draw correct conclusions from them. The problem here is that the name of Mandela is so familiar that very few any longer remember who he really is or why he went to prison for life. From the very beginning of the trial Mandela, Accused No 1, was made the centre of a worldwide propaganda campaign: a great deal of this, as with so much of the mystique surrounding him, built on myth.

Mandela declined to take the oath and therefore did not enter the witness box, which meant he could not be cross-examined. At the conclusion of the trial, he made his historic speech from the dock. It was eloquent, moving, appeared spontaneous and explained why he was “prepared to die for freedom.” Only problem here was, as many suspected from the start, that it was not his own work. In a 1990 interview with Jeremy Brooks in London, British journalist Anthony Sampson, former editor of *Drum* magazine, confirmed that he prepared the speech on the basis of a few rough notes scribbled by Mandela.

Mandela “Incompetent”

Last year, further questions about Mandela’s famed defence in the trial came with the release of official papers by the British Foreign Office. These included a report compiled at the time by Viscount Dunrossil, First Secretary at the British Embassy in Pretoria. Writing to Mr Peter Foster, head of the West and Central Africa Department at the Foreign Office, he suggested that the trial showed Mandela

as “incompetent.”

Dunrossil reported how Mandela was in danger of ruining his own defence. He was doing so badly, he said, that at one point the prosecuting counsel broke precedent and came to his rescue. He added: “Mandela is determined to extract the maximum political advantage from the trial. Thus yesterday several witnesses were little more than pegs on which, during cross-examination, he was able to hang long political speeches of his own.”

Dissecting Mandela’s effect on the court, Dunrossil wrote: “Practically none of his cross examinations were of a technical nature related to his actual legal case. His technique of cross examination is noticeably weak and he has twice been helped by the prosecuting counsel who, on one occasion, pointed out that Mandela had forgotten to comment on the second of two letters about which he wanted to examine a witness.”

The report concluded: “He clearly has reckoned that the political advantage to be gained from defending himself outweighs his own technical lack of ability.” On the trial itself, even the liberal, now defunct, *Rand Daily Mail*, for many years the main SA media voice against apartheid, found no fault with the manner in which it was conducted. In an editorial, 17.6.64, it said:

“Wise and Just”

“The sentences pronounced by Mr Justice de Wet yesterday at the conclusion of the Rivonia trial were both wise and just. The Law is seen at its best where there is firmness tinged with mercy, and this was the case yesterday. The sentences could not have been less severe than those imposed. The men found guilty had organised sabotage on a wide scale and had plotted armed revolution. As the judge pointed out, the crime of which they were found guilty was essentially high treason.” Other editorial comment was that the “convictions would have been obtained in any civilised Western country.”

Of the summing up by the Judge-President, the *Rand Daily Mail* in its front page report said: “The judge said he had heard much from the accused and their counsel of the disabilities under which the non-Whites suffered in this country, but he doubted very much whether the motives for their crimes were as altruistic as they would have the court believe. *Those who planned to overthrow governments by revolution almost inevitably contemplated replacing those governments themselves.*”

It was striking that nowhere in his defence statement did Mandela refer to himself as a nationalist. Which brings us to a very important point. When the ANC began in 1912, as a Black self-help organisation, it had not the slightest hint of communism. Its stated purpose was to secure better treatment for Blacks, and its membership consisted of Black intellectuals, mostly teachers, lawyers and clergy.

By 1928, the USSR had targeted the ANC for takeover. The Sixth Congress of Communist International in Moscow resolved: “The Communist Party of SA should pay particular attention to the ANC. Our aim should be to transform the ANC into a fighting nationalist revolutionary organisation against the White bourgeoisie...” (*Umsebenzi*. SACP journal, Vol 2, No 1, 1986).

Dr Igor Glagolev, who defected from the USSR in 1976 after being closely involved for many years in Soviet support for Southern Africa terrorism, declared: “The decision to begin an offensive for the conquest of Southern Africa was taken by the Politburo of the USSR near the end of the 1950s. The Soviet leadership controls (through Yusuf Dadu, chairman of the SACP) not only the SACP but the ANC as well.”

Till that time, Southern Africa had probably been the most peaceful part of the entire world. That all changed with the outbreak of the Soviet-sponsored civil war in Angola in 1962, followed by similar wars in Mozambique, Rhodesia, Namibia and, eventually, by mass terrorist action in SA. Today the US is the main sponsor of revolutionary action in SA, with ANC/SACP funding coming now almost entirely from the West. It is the Americans and the Scandinavians who have most actively promoted Mandela as “the man who will save SA.” It is this concentrated Western support for the ANC that explains the eerie absence of any criticism of its campaign of violence.

So: what about Mandela? Does he believe in the democratic process? Could he produce a government which allows diversity, freedom of expression, opportunity, a return to peaceful change?

Most important of all, is he a genuine nationalist, or a Marxist masquerading as such? Has he changed from a man of violence to a messiah of peace? Those are immensely urgent questions. Put them to Mandela and you will never get a direct reply. It is the greatest tragedy that the media shows so little interest in getting truthful answers.

Lest We Forget

(by Peter Simple, London *Daily Telegraph*, and reproduced in *The Aida Parker Newsletter*, Issue No. 168, October/November 1993)

So long as you ignore what he says, Mr Mandela seems a very courteous and reasonable old gentleman. At a press conference in Cape Town he said: 'Whites are fellow South Africans and we want them to feel safe and to know that we appreciate the contribution they have made towards the development of this country.' That was very kind of him. But – contribution?

Everything in the 'development' of South Africa is the 'contribution' of the whites. They have contributed its cities, its farmlands, its roads, its harbours, its schools, its hospitals, its power stations. They have contributed the cars and aeroplanes in which Mr Mandela travels.

They have contributed the means of printing the newspapers in which his words are reported and the means of distributing them. They have contributed the microphones through which he speaks at press conferences and the means by which what he says is transmitted to the world.

They have contributed the education without which he could not have become a modern political leader. They have even contributed the concepts of 'equality', of 'one-man-one-vote democracy' and of 'majority rule' which fill his mind and proceed continually from his mouth. They have also contributed (though they probably cannot claim the 'necklacing' technique as theirs) the petrol, tyres and matches with which Winnie Mandela once declared her people would liberate the country.

Without the contribution of the whites, there would be no South Africa. True, South Africa has not been created without great injustice (what country has?). But only those who created it can preside over the process of making amends, of creating a South Africa in which all its various and still unequal peoples may take their rightful place.

In such a wicked world as ours there is no more than a small chance that such an ideal South Africa – it would be a kind of African Switzerland – will come into existence. But because the odds against it are so great (and the alternative so dire), we who are not, after all, risking anything ourselves, should do nothing to make them greater. Instead of abuse, suspicion and malicious interference, the white South Africans deserve the world's sympathy – and indeed its active help.

Mandela Gets Hammered

by Aida Parker

(Published in *The Aida Parker Newsletter*, Issue No. 213, January 1998. This article was published after Mandela had been president of South Africa for almost four years, and after he formally relinquished political command to his deputy, Thabo Mbeki.)

Sic transit gloria mundi... Thus the glory of the world passes away.

In 1976 the ANC had to decide which of two men – Mandela or Walter Sisulu – should be built up as their main international face. Mandela won the trophy, largely because his wife, Winnie, was overwhelmingly more photogenic than the more worthy but distinctly more homely Albertina Sisulu. So is political history made.

The propaganda mills ground into action: and the world, desperate for heroes, for a decent man to

love, fell for it, hook, line and sinker. Mandela's image was given a high gloss. He was anointed a saint, a giant among men, "the most important man after Jesus Christ." Today angry disillusion has set in. In recent weeks, especially after Mandela's White-bashing tirade at the ANC triennial convention, I have received dozens of clippings from the local and international media, berating him as a fraud and a phoney.

Writing in *Finance Week*, 15/21.1.98, R.C. Lockwood of Tableview sails into the ANC, all guns blazing: "The world is at last waking up to the true 'Mandela Magic.' The facade of a tolerant martyr now lies in tatters. In its place we see a paranoid old man.... spewing out vitriol against anyone who dares to question the performance of the ANC government.

"It would be interesting indeed to hear the ANC explain exactly how its rhetoric aids the cause of reconciliation. South Africa is technically the most advanced country on the continent of Africa. It holds this distinction because of the skills and expertise contributed by the [White] population it now seeks to vilify. The world looks on at these antics. It listens to the language of the ANC leaders.

"It watches the unending catalogue of murder and animalistic violence paraded daily through the media. It notes the strikes, the primitive 'toyi-toyi' dancing in the streets and the daily destruction of property. Worst of all, it listens to the endless excuses put up by the government. These excuses have the same tired and dreary pattern running throughout. Firstly, deny anything is wrong, then blame the 'previous apartheid regime' and then wildly fling out accusations of racism.

"It comes as no surprise, except perhaps to the ANC, that the world does not rush to make meaningful investment in South Africa. SA's First World infrastructure is now collapsing around its ears. If it continues on the present course, this country will indeed be returned to the Africans as it was found about 400 years ago."

In Britain, the London *Independent* dismissed much of Mandela's 53-page ramblings as "antiquated garbage," warned that the frustrations of the Black masses "cannot be appeased by Marxist jargon." The *Daily Telegraph* declared that "in Mafikeng he presented an ugly, divisive face he has not shown in public before."

In Germany, the mass circulation *Suddeutsche Zeitung* dealt with the speech under the headline, "The Good Man Plays the Racial Card – Mandela's Farewell Speech a Manifesto of Intolerance." Translated, this read: "On December 16, 1997, Mandela took the first step towards leading SA right back to racial discrimination. What induced Mandela to 'run amok' in his speech, turning the Day of Reconciliation into the darkest hour of the New South Africa? After his speech, the real question is: Who is Mandela? A statesman, who invited the widow of the architect of apartheid to tea? Or the demagogue who branded the White opposition once and for all?"

In the US, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has been taken to task for her theatrical praise of Mandela on her recent visit here. *The New American*, 16.1.98, wrote: "A giant of this century? South African President Nelson Mandela supposedly dismayed Washington policy makers this autumn when he paid two visits to the terrorist state of Libya and presented an award to mass murderer Muammar Qaddafi. Of course, no one familiar with the background of the Marxist Mandela should have been surprised. During his 1990 tour of the US, he publicly praised not only Qaddafi but Fidel Castro of Cuba and Yasir Arafat of the Palestine Liberation Organisation.

"Such statements do not seem to bother US policy makers. US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright gushed after meeting Mandela in Pretoria: 'I stand in the presence of one of the giants of our century.' Indeed, she said, 'It's a great honour for me to meet with a man of such incredible wisdom.'"

After the Party is Over...

by Aida Parker

(Published in *The Aida Parker Newsletter*, Issue No. 219, July 1998. It was published after President Nelson Mandela turned 80 and married Graca Machel, widow of the late Mozambican Marxist dictator, Samora Machel)

SA is a dangerously self-deluding country, one in sore need of a sharp dose of reality. Much as he may enjoy public affection, the sooner Nelson Mandela bows out, allowing us at last to bury all the fantasy and fairy tales, the better for all concerned. That is the hardnosed market reaction to the hugely pretentious, Hollywood glitz extravaganza staged this month in celebration of Nelson's 80th birthday and synchronised marriage to Graca Machel. The different approaches of the SA media reflected the fantasy and the reality.

The Johannesburg *Star*, a publication where sound judgment has never been king, devoted no less than 23 mind-numbing pages, including a 20-page commemorative issue, to Mandela, his life and times. The glorification was excruciating, the rapturous adulation and soggy sentimentality ominously reminiscent of the superhuman status conferred on "Uncle Joe" Stalin, Ceausescu, Castro and Kim Il-sung (not to mention Bokassa and Idi Amin).

Opposed to that *The Financial Mail*, in a single short leader, deplored the overkill, describing this latest bout of Mandela mania as "embarrassing." Unquestionably, the ANC's sharp-suited PR people did go overboard. What's worse, we've been here a good many times before.

Who will forget when our martyr-hero was released from Victor Verster Prison on February 11, 1990? Though some of us White troglodytes had grave reservations, for most South Africans the freeing of Mandela was an intensely-exciting, long-sought historic event. Measured against the gigantic global furore, the exultation created almost equated with the Second Coming, with Mandela himself about to descend from the Pearly Gates.

For a while, SA was a nation delirious with joy and relief. Arising from his many and earlier private discussions with De Klerk and other Nat [National Party] cabinet ministers, it was predicted that Mandela would be a decisive force in promoting reconciliation and constructive dialogue. Then, as now, he was universally delineated as a man of peace.

Effectively, on that all-important day, in his opening salvo, Nelson did not declare peace, but war. Almost the very first words he uttered were a high-octane, anti-apartheid chant, not in English, but in Xhosa: "*Amandla! Amandla! I-Africa mayibuye!*"... "*Power! Power! Africa is ours!*" Not a very convincing display of moderation, if one understands the sub-text: "And the Whites must take their chances."

Even more disturbing, he continued: "I salute the SA Communist Party for its steady contribution to the struggle for democracy. I salute General Secretary Joe Slovo, one of our finest patriots. We are heartened by the fact that the alliance between ourselves and the party remains as strong as it always was." Hardly a declaration that what he had in mind for the coming "New SA" was a Periclean democracy. Certainly, he has built no Parthenons for us.

Undeterred, De Klerk and a psychopathic media continued to assert that Mandela's sole platform was indeed love and peace, that what our saintly crusader envisioned and sought was a stable, productive and safe SA, a reign of justice, prosperity and multi-racial harmony. In other words, universal suffrage in a unitary state, a halo for Mr Mandela and we would all live happily ever after. Peace and prosperity? It was an offer SA could not refuse.

Of such illusions (dubbed, without irony, "miracles") tragedies are born. In the event, Mr Mandela's "New SA" is that tragedy. No country ever entered the community of nations to such international jubilation. Sadly, as the ruinous state of our economy testifies, we have blown it. But – a tribute to the incredible power of sustained propaganda – Mandela himself remains, probably permanently, one of the most persistent media-manufactured folk heroes of our day.

Let's put him under the spotlight. He is universally presented as the supreme statesman, abounding with intelligence, wisdom and sagacity. Measured against all reasonable criteria, he projects more as a satyr than as a saint, more as a sublime political opportunist than a political genius. His engaging cherubic smile notwithstanding, he seems caught in an antique world of "liberation movements" and "African socialism," as much out of his time as the Nats were out of theirs.

It is one thing to bask in the glory of exaggerated global idolatry. It is quite another to change a nation and create a peaceful, just union of some 43 to 62 million people (no one knows the real size of SA's population) where all, Whites, Blacks, Asians and Coloureds, enjoy freedom, prosperity and equal opportunity.

Well might we today ask: Has he measured up to the legend? Has he repaid the vast faith invested in him? To that, we might answer: Was it ever realistic to suppose that a single man, one moreover in jail from his 40s to his 70s (and suffering a bad case of Karl Marx disease), could deliver a democratic, free market society enjoying harmonious multicultural democracy, even supposing he had so wished?

There is little merit in accepting the PR version and not looking at the historical record. If someone is the subject of hero worship on an intercontinental scale, his record of achievement must be critically evaluated. On that basis, we cannot disguise that Mandela and the ANC have failed, a failure terrible in its character and terrible in its consequences. To suggest anything else is analytically preposterous.

The raw reality is that SA today is a broken country, trapped in a vicious cycle of massively declining State capability. Their skills and managerial genius properly harnessed, the Whites could have played a felicitous role in helping create a viable post-apartheid society. Their help was spurned. Crudely applied affirmative action and renewed, blatantly racist policies blocked it, to the point where Whites now are a frightened, heavily marginalised people, their numbers declining all the time through brutal murder and migration.

To repeat, we are today a corrupt, sick and increasingly dirt-poor society. No hype or hoopla can change that. The ANC's performance has been so inadequate to its great task that SA society is now fraying at 1000 edges. A very different picture to that *The Star* presents. Unfortunately, a huge part of the blame for the disaster rests with Mandela and his communist connections.

Is he himself a card-carrying communist? That has always been denied, but slice it as you like and despite all the compendious published material on him, no one really knows what he is or what he stands for. All we know for sure is that for most of his adult life he has been a committed communist fellow traveller. And, as such, made a variety of stupendously damaging decisions.

In the late 1950s/early 1960s it was Mandela who agreed to join forces with the old Communist Party of SA (CPSA), something Stalin had long sought. In Moscow in 1928 Communist International (the Comintern) directed: "The CPSA should pay particular attention to the ANC. Our aim should be to transform the ANC into a fighting national revolutionary organisation." Mandela was the man who finally made that possible, his first big sell-out of his own Black brothers: a classic case of what Lenin termed "revolutionary defeatism," which means that, to facilitate the revolution, the proletariat must defeat and destroy their own country.

From then on the communists, led by Joe Slovo, long-fingered as "Moscow's man in Africa," virtually hijacked the entire ANC organisation, linking it formally to Moscow's star. Despite the window dressing assumed for Western benefit, that situation – the SACP jockey riding the ANC steed – obtains to this day. The communists never made any secret of the fact that they were using the ANC for their own purposes.

The December 1982 edition of the Soviet journal, *World Marxist Review*, stated: "The national liberation movement in South Africa owes its present scope and clarity of purpose to our party's tireless activity in the organisation's political and ideological structures."

Slovo himself admitted the parasitical relationship when he said in Angola in 1985 that his communist revolution could "only be won under the banner of the ANC." In September 1985 the ANC's official magazine, *Sechaba*, described how the SACP and ANC were "two hands in the same body."

Mandela's next great mistake was to endorse violence, which in the end meant terrorism: a seriously bad idea. Together with Slovo he founded *Umkhonto we Sizwe* (MK) in 1961, this to act as an armed revolutionary group to foment violent, nation-wide insurrection. Mandela was commander-in-chief, Slovo a deputy commander.

It was the communist conspiracy to overthrow the SA government of the day via violent revolution that eventually brought Mandela (on a CIA tip-off) into the Pretoria Supreme Court as Accused No 1 in the Rivonia trial. The chief prosecutor, Dr Percy Yutar, produced ten documents, all in Mandela's own writing. These presented some pretty arresting statements and concepts: in particular, his preference for communism. At no time did the defence challenge the authenticity or authorship of the documentation submitted.

In one 62-page document, *How To Be a Good Communist*, Mandela declared: "In our country, the struggle of the oppressed people is guided by the SA Communist Party and inspired by its policies. We communist party members are the most advanced revolutionaries in modern history. The people of South Africa, led by the communist party, will destroy capitalist society and build in its place socialism. One must be a revolutionary... not a reformist." Is that what inspired him to assist Joe Slovo in founding *Umkhonto*?

Some years earlier Mandela had spent time in North Africa, studying terrorism and revolutionary insurrection. He paid particular attention to the bloody Algerian underground movement, its structures and tactics. These lessons he incorporated in war plans for SA. In conformity with the Algerian practice, he advocated that "traitors and informers" have their noses cut off.

At the end of the protracted Rivonia proceedings, Mandela made a four-and-three-quarter hour address from the dock, ever since hailed as one of the great political testaments of the 20th century: and a major plank on which his formidable reputation was founded.

But, contrary to the propaganda, it was neither spontaneous nor all his own work. Only many years later did Anthony Sampson, a former editor of *Drum*, disclose that the speech was in fact a carefully contrived document which he himself edited and polished at the request of Mandela's counsel, Braam Fischer, an Afrikaner and probably the most fanatical communist ideologue this country has ever known.

In his book, *Rivonia: Operation Mayibuye*, H.H.W. de Williers concluded that the Rivonia conspiracy was not caused by apartheid: "the revolt was inspired by communists. The pattern was copybook communist strategy to create chaos by sabotage, riots... to manipulate the indigenous population."

It is the still-largely untold story of the ANC's communist connections that remains the greatest threat to SA. Even here a passionately partisan media has twisted things. The more the communists gained a stranglehold on the ANC, the more it was presented as a "nationalist" movement concerned only with justice and advancing the cause of SA's Black people.

Of course there are and always have been many in the ANC with no Marxist/socialist aspirations whatsoever and who, knowingly, would have nothing to do with communism. But, on the whole, the more prominent of these got short shrift. Mandela, in an interview with the Cape-based journal, *South*, just before his release from prison, made that adequately clear:

"Co-operation between the ANC and the SACP goes back to the early 1920s... even within the ranks of the ANC there have been at one time or other, people – and some of them were highly respected and influential individuals – who were against this co-operation and who wanted SACP members expelled from the organisation. *Those who persisted in these activities were themselves expelled, or they broke away in despair.*" (APN emphasis). Which tells the whole sad story.

Politicians who fall from grace leave only a bitter harvest behind them. When the Mandela legend is finally exposed to the gaze of a less adulatory public, he will join the likes of Nkrumah, Nyerere, Kaunda and Mugabe. The smouldering ruins of the nations which fell to their tender mercies will speak more poignantly than the practised hacks of *The Star* and its gauche sisters.

The hoopla surrounding Mandela says more about the tragedy of modern SA than is comfortable. Had things gone the way so many hoped in 1994, this sentimental orgy would not have been necessary. As things stand, Mandela is all that is left of the many illusions generated during the heady days of the

transition to full democracy. Gone is the belief that post-apartheid SA would be peaceful, strong and prosperous. Gone is the belief that the new government would be honest and wise. Gone is the illusion that the race issue would vanish forever and that race quotas would be finally buried. All gone except the myth of Mandela's magic, which could never have dissolved in the harsh light of dawn because it was never really there. In heaping such mountains of undeserved praise on Mandela, both SA and the world are whispering in the dark, straining to keep up the vain pretence that the miracle is holding its own against the depredations of the multitude of evil impulses inherent in the SA predicament.

The praise songs for Mandela are, in truth, a lament for what might have been.

Republished July 2013

Aida Parker was a highly articulate, knowledgeable, conservative South African journalist, whose *Aida Parker Newsletter* was read around the world before she passed away in 2002. Her excellent writings should not be forgotten. Consent was granted for the use of this material, providing acknowledgment was made of the name of the copyright holder: Aida Parker Newsletter (Pty) Ltd., Auckland Park, Johannesburg, South Africa. These articles have been slightly edited for publication here.

Bible Based Ministries

info@biblebasedministries.co.uk

www.biblebasedministries.co.uk

WORLDWIDE CONTACT FOR BIBLE BASED MINISTRIES:

Contending for the Faith Ministries

42055 Crest land Drive

Lancaster, CA 93536

United States of America

BBMOrders@aol.com