International Journal of Enhanced Research in Educational Development (IJERED)
ISSN: 2320-8708, Vol. 14 Issue 5, September-October, 2026

From Treason Trial to Rivonia: Rhetoric and Resistance in Nelson Mandela's Courtroom Speeches

Aezaz Ahamed

Research Scholar, Department of English, Karnatak University Dharwad

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55948/IJERED.2026.0934

ABSTRACT

This article discusses Nelson Mandela's courtroom rhetoric across two defining moments in his legal history: which are very relevant to his activism, such as the Treason Trial of 1956 to 1961 and the Rivonia Trial of 1963 to 1964. It argues that Nelson Mandela's use of the courtroom changed over this period, moving from a defence built on constitutional argument toward a declaration of political conviction. Here the main emphasise is given to Nelson Mandela's statement from the dock at the Rivonia Trial, popularly remembered by its closing phrase, "I am prepared to die." This speech is read here as a rhetorical performance that transformed a legal proceeding into an act of public declaration. In this research article, here are used Subaltern Studies, Critical Race Theory, and Resistance Literature as interpretive perspectives, and the article shows how Nelson Mandela reclaimed the courtroom; an institution built to enforce apartheid laws, and turned it into a platform for anti-colonial witness. The present analysis contributes to the wider study of Nelson Mandela's socio-cultural writing by treating legal speech as literary, socio-cultural and activism text that needs close reading.

Keywords: Rivonia Trial; courtroom rhetoric; apartheid; resistance literature; subaltern, anti-colonial

INTRODUCTION

Nelson Mandela was presented before South African courts twice in the decade before his long imprisonment. The first appearance, the Treason Trial which began in 1956 and ended in acquittal in 1961. The second, the Rivonia Trial, began in 1963 and concluded in June 1964 with a sentence of life imprisonment. These two trials mark a shift in Nelson Mandela's relationship to the colonial legal system and apartheid laws.

In the Treason Trial, Nelson Mandela and his co-accused worked largely within the logic of the law, contesting the charge of treason through constitutional and procedural argument. In the Rivonia Trial, Nelson Mandela chose a different course. Rather than testify and submit to cross-examination, he read a prepared powerful statement from the dock, a rare procedural option under South African law that allowed a defendant to speak without being questioned (Nick Dall, qtd. in Al Jazeera). That statement, now popularly known as "I Am Prepared to Die," is widely regarded as one of the most significant political speeches of the twentieth century.

The present article explains that the movement from the Treason Trial to the Rivonia Trial represents a rhetorical evolution: from legal defence to political declaration, and from a plea for acquittal to an acceptance of possible martyrdom. The broader argument that Nelson Mandela's writing as well as speeches records the socio-cultural experience of colonized people reclaiming voice within institutions designed to silence them. The analysis draws on Subaltern Studies, Critical Race Theory, and Resistance Literature to examine how Nelson Mandela used the courtroom, a space of colonial authority, as a stage for resistance.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Three theoretical ideas inform this reading of Nelson Mandela's courtroom speeches. The first is Subaltern Studies, associated with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's influential question of whether the subaltern can speak within structures that were built to exclude that speech (Spivak). Spivak's argument suggests that when a colonized subject does gain a public hearing, that speech is always shaped and constrained by the institutions through which it must pass. Nelson Mandela's courtroom statements are a useful test case for this idea, since he spoke only within the narrow procedural space that apartheid law allowed him, yet used that space to address an audience far larger than the court itself.

The second framework is Critical Race Theory, which treats law not as a neutral system but as an instrument that has historically encoded racial hierarchy (Crenshaw). Apartheid law was explicit in this regard, and the courtroom in which Nelson Mandela stood was itself an expression of racial power. While analysing Nelson Mandela's speeches through this view draws attention to the way he named and challenged the racial assumptions built into the charges against him, rather than accepting the court's framing of the case.

The third framework is Resistance Literature, a term developed in postcolonial criticism to describe writing produced by colonized peoples that directly opposes colonial rule (Fanon; Said). Barbara Harlow's foundational work *Resistance Literature* on the genre treats courtroom declaration or speech, prison writing, and autobiography as forms of resistance literature alongside more conventional literary forms. Nelson Mandela's statement from the dock situates this category closely. Besides, these three critical frameworks support a critical reading of Nelson Mandela's courtroom rhetoric as a form of subaltern declaration that used the tools of a racially structured legal system to resist that same system.

The Treason Trial 1956 to 1961: Testing the Rhetoric of Legality

The Treason Trial began in December 1956, when 156 anti-apartheid activists, including Nelson Mandela, were arrested and charged with high treason for their involvement in the Congress Alliance and its 1955 Freedom Charter. The trial dragged on for nearly five years, and the state's case gradually collapsed as charges against most defendants were dropped. All remaining accused, including Nelson Mandela, were acquitted in March 1961.

During this period, Nelson Mandela's rhetorical strategy remained largely inside the boundaries of legal argument. He and his co-accused, working with a defence team that included prominent civil rights lawyers, argued that the Freedom Charter and the activities of the Congress Alliance were constitutional expressions of political dissent rather than acts of treason. This strategy accepted the premise that the court could be persuaded through evidence and legal reasoning.

Nelson Mandela's own writing about the period, collected in *Long Walk to Freedom*, describes the trial less as a moment of defiance and more as a long test of endurance, in which the defendants used the proceedings to organize politically even as the case against them wore on (Nelson Mandela, *Long Walk* 235-40). From Critical Race Theory perspective, the Treason Trial shows Nelson Mandela and his co-defendants engaging the legal system on its own terms, attempting to expose the gap between the state's stated commitment to legal process and the racial motivations underlying the prosecution.

Besides, through Resistance Literature, the trial functioned as a form of collective political theatre, in which the courtroom became a meeting place for activists who might otherwise have been separated by the apartheid state's restrictions on assembly. Yet the rhetoric of this period remained largely defensive. Nelson Mandela sought acquittal, not confrontation, and the trial's long, procedural character limited the space for the kind of direct political address that would later define the Rivonia Trial.

The Rivonia Trial (1963 to 1964): "From Defence to Declaration"

The Rivonia Trial began in October 1963, after police raided a farm in Rivonia, near Johannesburg, and arrested leaders of Umkhonto we Sizwe, the armed wing of the African National Congress that Nelson Mandela had helped to establish. Unlike the Treason Trial, the Rivonia case carried the possibility of a death sentence, and the accused faced overwhelming physical evidence linking them to a campaign of planned sabotage. It was in this context, with acquittal unlikely, that Nelson Mandela made the rhetorical decision that distinguishes the Rivonia Trial from his earlier appearance in court.

At the opening of the defence case on 20 April 1964, Nelson Mandela chose to make an unsworn statement from the dock rather than give sworn declaration subject to cross-examination. This choice was itself a rhetorical act. By speaking from the dock, Nelson Mandela avoided the state's ability to interrogate and discredit him through cross-examination, and he retained control over the shape and content of his address. The statement lasted more than four hours and moved through a detailed account of his political development an activism against apartheid laws, his reasons for turning to sabotage after decades of nonviolent resistance had failed, and his understanding of Marxism, African nationalism, and democracy.

The speech's structure reflects a shift from legal defence to political declaration. Nelson Mandela devoted much of the address to explaining, rather than denying, his role in founding Umkhonto we Sizwe, describing sabotage as a considered response to the closing of every peaceful avenue for opposing apartheid ("I Am Prepared to Die"). This is a markedly different rhetorical posture from the Treason Trial, where the defence sought to show that the accused had not committed the acts alleged.

At Rivonia, Nelson Mandela largely accepted the state's account of his actions and instead argued for their political legitimacy. In Subaltern Studies terms, this can be read as a moment in which the subaltern subject refuses the terms on which the dominant legal order has agreed to let him speak, choosing instead to redefine those terms from within the same platform.

The speech closes with the passage that has given it its popular title. Nelson Mandela stated that he had cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons could live together in harmony, and that this was an ideal for which he was prepared, if necessary, to die ("I Am Prepared to Die"). Several features of this closing passage needs close attention. First its brevity and plain diction stand in contrast to the length and legal detail of the rest of the statement, giving the final lines the rhetorical weight of a summation.

Second, the passage reframes Nelson Mandela's own possible execution not as a legal outcome to be feared but as a personal choice made in service of a political ideal, a move that shifts the moral register of the trial from questions of guilt and innocence to questions of justice and history. Third, by naming both white domination and Black domination as forms of injustice he opposed, Nelson Mandela positioned his politics as a vision of shared democratic belonging rather than a demand for racial reversal, a rhetorical choice that Critical Race Theory would identify as a direct answer to the state's attempt to frame the trial as a racial threat.

Various details of the trial describe a courtroom that had grown accustomed to Nelson Mandela's lengthy address falling silent as he approached these final lines, with the presiding judge, Quartus de Wet, reportedly avoiding eye contact with Nelson Mandela for much of the speech (Nick Dall, qtd. in Al Jazeera). This reported reaction suggests that the speech achieved its rhetorical aim: it addressed itself past the immediate legal question of guilt toward a broader audience, including the international press present in the courtroom and, implicitly, future readers of the transcript. In this sense, the Rivonia statement operates less as courtroom defence and more as what resistance literature would classify as declaration literature, a mode of writing or speech that bears witness to political oppression for an audience beyond the immediate scene of address.

Nelson Mandela was sentenced to life imprisonment rather than death, a verdict handed down in June 1964. Whatever role the speech played in that outcome, its significance for this study lies less in its legal effect than in its rhetorical achievement: the transformation of a courtroom defence into a declaration that has continued to shape South African political memory long after apartheid ended.

Comparative Analysis of the Speeches: Legal, Rhetoric as Resistance Strategy

If it is placed side by side, the Treason Trial and the Rivonia Trial reveal a clear rhetorical arc in Nelson Mandela's engagement with the apartheid legal system. In the Treason Trial, Nelson Mandela's rhetoric worked within the assumption that the court could be persuaded on its own terms, and the defence strategy aimed at acquittal through legal argument. In the case of Rivonia Trial, that assumption had largely broken down. The evidence against the accused was extensive, and a not-guilty verdict was unlikely. In this changed context, Nelson Mandela's rhetorical goal shifted from persuading the court to addressing history.

This shift can be described using the distinction between defence and declaration. A defence seeks to negate the state's version of events; a declaration accepts significant elements of that version but reframes their meaning. Nelson Mandela's statement from the dock accepted his role in founding Umkhonto we Sizwe while denying that this made him a criminal in any morally meaningful sense. This rhetorical move depends on separating legal guilt from political legitimacy, a strategy long associated with resistance movements' use of courtroom declaration to attack the legitimacy of the very laws under which they are being tried (Fanon).

The two trials also differ in their treatment of audience. The Treason Trial, stretched across nearly five years and many of accused, addressed itself primarily to the court and to the domestic anti-apartheid movement. The Rivonia statement, delivered in a single extended address at a moment of intense international attention on South Africa, spoke more directly to a global audience, positioning the South African freedom struggle within a wider twentieth-century narrative of decolonization (Said). This widening of audience helps explain why "I Am Prepared to Die" has endured as a text studied

well beyond the field of South African legal history, while the Treason Trial is remembered chiefly as a matter of historical record.

CONCLUSION

Eventually, Nelson Mandela's Treason Trial defence and his Rivonia Trial statement create a movement from constitutional argument to political declaration. In the earlier trial, Nelson Mandela worked to demonstrate his innocence within the framework of apartheid law. In the later trial, he used the same institutional space to declare the legitimacy of his resistance and to accept the risk of death for the ideal of a free, non-racial society. The courtroom, designed as an instrument of apartheid authority, became in Nelson Mandela's hands a stage from which resistance could be spoken directly into historical memory.

WORKS CITED

1. Crenshaw, Kimberle. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics."*University of Chicago Legal Forum*, vol. 1989, no. 1, 1989, pp. 139-67.
2. Dall, Nick. "'I Am Prepared to Die': Mandela's Speech Which Shook Apartheid." Al Jazeera, 20 Apr. 2024, www.aljazeera.com/features/2024/4/20/i-am-prepared-to-die-when-mandela-shook-apartheid-changed-south-africa.
3. Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington, Grove Press, 1963.
4. Mandela, Nelson. *Long Walk to Freedom: The Autobiography of Nelson Nelson Mandela*. Little, Brown, 1994.
5. Nelson Mandela Foundation. "I Am Prepared to Die."*Nelson Nelson Mandela Foundation*, 20 Apr. 2011, www.nelsonNelson Mandela.org/news/entry/i-am-prepared-to-die.
6. Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. Knopf, 1993.
7. Sampson, Anthony. *Mandela: The Authorised Biography*. HarperCollins, 2000.
8. Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?"*Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, University of Illinois Press, 1988, pp. 271-313.
9. Thompson, Leonard. *A History of South Africa*. 3rd ed., Yale University Press, 2001.