The South Africa Collection
No.3: Response to 'Black and Gold' by Alan Sampson

The South Africa Collection

is a series of background and position papers written in preparation for and as an outcome of a six-week period of community consultancy in the Western Cape in May and June 1987

By
David Wasdell

Powerful parallels are drawn between the Jew and Nazi, Black and Afrikaner. The emergence of perinatal dynamics in social process is noted at the boundaries of complex racial and political groups suffering resource lack, and external threat. International capitalism drives and reinforces the bifurcation in wealth distribution which cuts even more deeply than apartheid into the South African culture, so calling in question the potential contribution of big business and multi-national corporations. Afrikaner religious ideology justifies a regime which has become an intra-national mirror of inter-national dynamics. Systemic interventions in psychodynamic and ideological levels are likely to have a more profound and long-lasting positive effect than can ever be achieved by revolutionary confrontation.

Response to 'Black and Gold'
by Anthony Sampson
[published by Hodder & Stoughton, 1987]

> "... a remarkable group of descendants of Jewish immigrants who had nearly all been refugees from the same region of Lithuania on the edge of Russia in the late nineteenth century." [p.91]

See also page 187:

> "There were special agonising among the Jewish community whose families had first come to South Africa to escape racial persecution in Tsarist Russia or Nazi Germany. As Mendal Kaplan put it, in his history of Jewish entrepreneurs:
>
> > 'Businessmen as a group, until the second half of 1985, have been often mere spectators in the battle to remove, not only general discriminatory practices, but those specifically affecting the economy of which their companies are a part. If Jewish businessmen, in particular, fail to give leadership in the movement to abolish all discriminatory practices, they will be betraying their heritage in the country which gave the Jewish people their freedom and opportunities.' [Mendel Kaplan, Jewish Roots in the South African Economy, Cape Town, C. Struik, 1986, p.389]"

I think the Jewish community itself might be a very significant yield point in the system, they have been through it all before and can see the racist dynamics, the shift towards a Nazi-style, far right military state. Even the words 'apartheid as the final solution' looks to be some kind of parallel to the extermination of Jews. There is an annihilation of blacks from within the South African consciousness in an attempt to preserve the ethnic purity and affluent wealth retention of the white minority, which is not dissimilar to the Nazi movement in Germany. The question is, although Jews may have the insight they may not have the power to do anything, particularly in view of their racial characteristics as castrated victims and scapegoats within the international dynamics. If the Jews as a community were to take decisive action they have such power in South Africa that it would be quite effective, but I think it would require the unpicking of the ideology of Jewishness which is in a sense right at the root of the Judeo-Christian, Islamic, cultural tradition of which apartheid is simply one dynamic expression. The distinction between Jew and non-Jew, the pushing out of the Palestinian, the purification of the chosen people within the Promised Land, the attitudes to the indigenous residual populations throughout the prophetic literature of the Old Testament, these are fundamentally apartheid-style nationalistic dynamics, underwritten by the construct of a theocracy. I really fundamentally think the Jews may be in ultimate collusion with the apartheid regime and match the system very deeply indeed.

Sampson shows awareness of pre and perinatal dynamics in institutional process :

> "Inside Anglo's spacious womb the white executives could easily believe that their benign expansion was resolving the racial problems, like booming companies in the American Deep South." [p.95]

This is followed by a few key words in the next sentences like: 'radiated, lush, spread out, virgin', which indicate the underlying sexual and prenatal imagery being used in this particular institutional mapping.

Sampson shows awareness of the impingement as limits to growth are met, which I think indicates the potential dynamic of perinatal constriction and impingement emerging again within institutional process.

> ".. the historical analysis, written by an Anglo executive Michael O'Dowd, which insisted that South Africa's political and social development was not abnormal for a country just emerging from the first stage of industrialisation - like contemporary Mexico or like Britain in the 1850s ... He explained that 'a watershed is reached when the supply of unskilled labour ceases to appear inexhaustible and the ruling minority starts to find it actually needs the rest of the population'." [p.95]

Fascinating to see that the watershed occurs not as the unskilled labour pool is exhausted but when it begins to appear exhaustible. In other words when the industrial base begins to perceive limits to growth in the environment, not necessarily when those limits are actually engaged. It is this perception of limitation that triggers off the watershed experience of containment and oppression and so forth. With the myths of eternal exponential expansion blown, the whole growth process begins to decelerate and eventually stabilise and it is that deceleration and stabilising period that is so intensely difficult to live and work through. The patterns of high defendedness and repression which emerge during this period then become endemic within the stable status quo unless qualitative interventions can be made which allow a culture to emerge with freedom and at a stable level instead of attempting to sustain exponential growth at the expense of increasing oppression and exploitation of population base or environment or limited resources or energy or whatever it is.

In the second half of 1985,

> "Botha's main emphasis was on defying foreign pressure: 'Don't push us too far ...'
>
> "The blacks were outraged: 'He has pushed us too far,' said Winnie Mandela: 'He has pushed the rest of the world too far. It's incredible - not even Hitler would have done that. That peculiar Afrikaner tribe, they get themselves into their corner and then ask people to negotiate to get them out of that corner.' [p.188]

Impacted, no exit, does appear to be the position that the Afrikaner group are getting themselves into. Crossed perinatal restimulation would be another way of describing it. Each sees the other as the cervix through which they have to be born. Each group sees the other group as an outside environment, potentially destructive and therefore to be contained, repressed, retaliated against in some way. Repetition of the word push, push, push and pushed too far resonates with this stage of the struggle. We are into transmarginal pressure.

Gavin Relly, executive of Anglo, was one of the businessmen involved in conversations with Oliver Tambo of the ANC.

> "'There are important areas in which one should be able to find fundamental agreement, starting with the recognition that we are all South Africans ...', he said in London soon afterwards. 'All of us in that meeting wanted to see a new coherent society in South Africa based on demonstrable justice and a court-monitored bill of rights.' And he later explained:

> 'Predictably there remained great gaps between us. Businessmen do not embrace the prospects of nationalisation, either in practical or philosophical terms; they know as a matter of fact that economic thinking which derives from the shadowy, incompetent world of worn-out Marxism does not create wealth. On the other hand, who can deny that there are inequities in the generation and distribution of South Africa's wealth? A new society, reformed or revolutionary, would have to apply itself more diligently to the alleviation of deprivation in education, health and feeding.' [Article in the Guardian, London, October 7, 1985]" [p.l95]

What the question really begs is that really fundamental one, 'who is a South African?' and if the answer is given by the people in power as 'those who have white skins' then apartheid follows. You have intra-national boundaries excluding those who are not belonging to the state of South Africa but who happen to live within its territory, so what do you do about them? Now justification for that is very deep and fundamental in the ideology and religious and philosophical and symbolic construct of the white minority. It is historically rooted and psychodynamically reinforced. It seems to me that we have to look at a new definition of 'citizenship' or 'nationhood' which is inclusive as an axiomatic starting point, and that probably requires an international change in the way we view what is meant by 'nation'.

You note also the intense awareness of international capitalism as thriving on, and indeed requiring, exploitative labour policies in order to aggrandise and accumulate wealth in the hands of the entrepreneurial powerful few at the expense of the labour force and the environment, from whom the resources are actually mined. Again we see the use of capital, wealth, money as a symptomatic parameter indicating the dynamics of the power struggle underneath it and in an essentially paranoid culture the most powerful accumulate the most wealth, since the struggle is to aggregate more than one has at the moment, since simply to remain stable and static is to be exposed again to the psychotic anxiety that whatever one has is not enough. Exponential increase and a fairly significant percentage exponential increase is alone sufficient to suppress the emergence of psychotic anxiety - absolutely destructive in terms of national and international, and intra- national and inter-person trading transactions. The dynamics and laws of the market place are indeed the destructive laws of a paranoid jungle warfare and it is only when we recognise the dynamics of the capitalist free market as themselves expression of psychotic human behaviour that we will see significant ideological changes within the transaction base itself. To attempt to conflict at the inter-ideological level is quite inappropriate - one has to dig deeper into the causative and normative matrix out of which the ideology and the trading base is a projectional reification.

By early January 1986:

> "The political pressures were now pulling both sides further apart, as extremists thrived on the confrontation: the ANC dreaded the emergence of a military state, while the businessmen foresaw a black anarchy ruled by a Khmer Rouge of ruthless schoolboys. But they both faced a common nightmare of a chaotic country in which no one could do business." [p.200]

I think you can pick up the stages from prenatal, through perinatal into BPM II/III [see Stanislav Grof: Realms of the Human Unconsciousness] and the myths of descent into the abyss, of ultimate chaos, the splitting apart of left and right, black and white, the anarchic armouring of boundaries and the increased pressure leading to splitting, fragmentation - the schizoid defences of the society emerging as pressures increase. Again, the intuitive reaction of the international community is to increase pressure, rather than to resource a paranoid community in such a way that it can move back off the confrontational catastrophe surface to

a point of renegotiating its axiomatic foundations. No radical rethinking will be done under this level of hyper-stress and the country appears to be condemned to a psychodrama of acting out of the ritual of birth struggle at enormous cost to the fabric of the holding environment.

Comments on the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust and the Rowntree Mackintosh chocolate company:

> "... whose Quaker roots were still evident in the two trusts which were its biggest shareholders, one of which, the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust, was specifically committed to 'promoting peaceful change and development' for blacks in Southern Africa. The company's South African subsidiary in East London, Wilson Rowntree, had a record of low wages and poor labour conditions in the early 'eighties, and left-wing groups in Britain began boycotting their bestselling chocolates, Kit-Kat. Then a security policeman gave evidence in a trial that Wilson Rowntree with other companies had arranged to call in the police if workers threatened to strike; and the Charitable Trust was still more concerned when Wilson Rowntree decided to join Sir Leslie Smith's BICSA and its anti-sanctions campaign. In July 1986 the trust's secretary Steven Burkeman went out to South Africa, and on his return publicly attacked the company's association with BISCA, warning that by apparently aligning itself with Pretoria it would 'make it very much more difficult to operate under majority rule'." [p.207f.]

This kind of information makes it extremely difficult to see how one could operate with integrity if funded by people like the Rowntree Charitable Trusts. My problem is that it looks as if it is not possible to work with integrity if funded by anybody and if funded by nobody it is still impossible to work, so what does one do? It is a Catch 22. Again the self-interest rather than the total system's concern of big business becomes very clear when the only reason that Rowntrees might take some different attitude is that it would be 'difficult to operate under majority rule', and if politically that is about to happen then obviously their economic survival and aggrandisement policies demand a different political alignment, so sub-system business policies of the trans-national corporation have nothing to do with systemic health or wholeness or advancement of the general health of the system. They only have to do with advancing the interests of the sub- system concerned. We can no longer afford this kind of sub-system optimisation drive, which is the heart of capitalism, and is precisely the reified paranoid behaviour of the psychotic resource struggle that is quite unrealistic, yet stems from deep in the roots of the human unconscious.

Perhaps the only significant business challenge to the in-house aggrandisement motif came from the Sullivan initiatives:

> "Sullivan himself was pressed to more open confrontation. In May 1986 he issued a sensational edict: he told the 192 American companies that had signed the Sullivan code that they must now adopt a 'stringent course of corporate civil disobedience to challenge actively all apartheid laws'. He asked them to 'assist blacks in the equal use of all private and public amenities, such as parks, beaches, hospitals, theatres, public transport, schools and housing'; and he warned them again that unless apartheid was completely dismantled by June 1987 he would endorse total economic sanctions." [p.213]

Hardly surprisingly his initiative did not meet with very much implementation and was swept aside in the sheer tide of events of the following months.

Economic titivation is hardly going to make any impact on the underlying mystical ideology of the Afrikaner group, reflected in the speech of President Botha in August 1986:

> "He [Botha] ended his speech by reasserting the mystical role of the Afrikaners to lead the subcontinent: 'I look at the constellations in the sky at night and what are the words I see written there? Southern Africa for Christendom'." [p.244]

The problem here of course is that by 'Christendom' he means 'White, Dutch, Reformed' Christendom and the identification of apartheid as 'the Christian' way of seeing things has now led to an identification of the Afrikaner governing party as the 'Christian' way of ruling and when you have the ideological and theological identification of church and state, with state actually acting as an oppressive nationalistic autocracy, then there is no recourse to criticism of the situation from within, since the axiomatic ideological grounds upon which the policies are formed are already claimed as being 100% on the side of the oppressor. Any questioning of the axiomatic base is therefore treason against the state and to be repressed, on the very basis that the state is the divine rule. Critique of this kind of system has to move to a meta-level of debate and dynamic engagement. Left to itself it is a self-perpetuating, and indeed self-reinforcing, circular tautological ideology.

There is considerable awareness that South Africa is a paradigm of the world situation, so,

> "South Africa was now more than ever the caricature of the world's problems, reviving dormant fears about race and chaos and bringing back the old arguments about poverty and inequality and the conflict between business and morality." [p.247]

I think what we see in South Africa operating at an intra-national level is precisely the international dynamic of the global village. The problem here, of course, is the international dynamic allows the drawing of armed boundaries and immigration control and maximum power/trading relationships in which each nation competes to the death with every other nation, there is no sense of corporate responsibility across national boundaries. In South Africa this dynamic is applied at an intra-national level between ethnic groupings on the same territory, with devastating results. Conversely seeing what is going on in South Africa actual reveals the potential dynamic of the global village as we approach the interface of the holding capacity of Island Earth and the exponential explosion of the human species. In a sense South Africa is a cauldron, a crucible, a learning lab, an experimental situation in which the world can either dump its problems and try to re-repress them and alienate and isolate them and say they don't belong anywhere else, or conversely it can be seen as a creative matrix in which the world is learning how to resolve the problems that it has on a generalised basis across the global surface. My sense is that that is not an either/or polarisation, but that both are actually operative at the same time.

In the light of perceived economic instability in South Africa and increased consumer pressure and attitudinal deterioration at home we have certain movements of disinvestment which were purely economically motivated by the companies concerned, without any sense of an attempt to intervene in the system to change it for the better. Again we have the unacceptable face of capitalism, supremely illustrated by the reference to Barclays Bank:

> "The most far-reaching of all disinvestments came from Britain, when the chairman of Barclays Sir Tim Bevan, after visiting Johannesburg, announced on November 24 that Barclays was selling out the whole of its 40 per cent interest in its South African subsidiary Barclays National, to Anglo-American, together with De Beers and the Insurance group Southern Life. Sir Tim still publicly insisted that it was primarily a commercial decision that 'it was not the job of businessmen to get involved in politics', and that the bank was neither for nor against sanctions. The directors had in fact decided to sell out at a board meeting the

> previous May, largely because they had been losing business from protesting depositors in Britain: the anti-apartheid campaigners and students in Britain could rightly claim a victory after sixteen years of campaigning. Barclays' disinvestment, like General Motors', caused no immediate economic damage: the London board had to sell its 40 percent interest for about £82 million, at the low exchange rate of the financial rand; the new owners would be glad to maintain the profitable network of branches, still keeping a 'working relationship' with London; and the London board was still saddled with its billion dollars of South African debt. But the Barclays withdrawal, following its decision a year earlier to stop all lending - and coming in the same week as the disinvestment by two more North American groups, Kodak and Bata shoes - was the most significant of all the West's gestures of its dissociation from apartheid policies. For it marked a withdrawal not so much of technology or management but of confidence and credit, in the literal sense of trust, which is the bankers' life blood: it discouraged other foreign corporations, including Barclays' many clients; and it left the remaining British companies, including the rival bank Standard, more exposed to attack. The argument continued about the political impact: Chris Ball of BarNat was worried that it 'would remove the leverage of foreigners' and that 'creeping strangulation' would only change perceptions slowly. But if Western capitalists had wished to show that they had finally written off Pretoria, they could hardly have made it plainer, after sixty years of investment and lending, than by selling their stake in the biggest bank in the country." [p.255]

However, in no way were Barclays operating in a disinterested fashion. The decision was taken purely on economic grounds. Secondly, it was a one-day wonder and the situation in South Africa restabilised almost instantaneously, as a complex social system always does under multidimensional stable dynamics. It was like the tweak of one parameter in a multidimensional stability, which is a stable equilibrium, and the equilibrium returns to base very quickly indeed, after the transitional disturbance. So one of the Barclays staff said to me in a telephone interview that he was surprised how little effect the Barclays disinvestment had had in South Africa itself. Another point that must be made here is that Barclays has now stopped making any money available whatsoever for work in South Africa of any kind and I see disinvestment as a 'pilate scheme', a kind of hand washing which says when the blood bath comes we have no responsibility for it. All they are doing at the moment is making certain that they are recouping their £1 billion owed them by South Africa and being renegotiated by NatWest and the other banking consortia, which have already managed to reduce the outstanding debt to £780 million. Barclays has no intentional desire to do anything about the situation in South Africa, only to look after its own skin.

> "Many Afrikaners were now depicting themselves as 'a first world inside a third world' and liked to believe that their white islands could survive securely and prosperously, while drawing their labour and servants from townships which could be fenced-off in their own separate world of anarchy, repression and black-on-black violence. But could these white bastions remain immune from black-on-white violence, when their factories and homes depended on them? The Afrikaners still clung to the mythology of their tribe, in the midst of their industrialisation: and many conservatives abroad liked to admire the toughness of this 'white tribe of Africa' and to predict that, in a continent of tribes, the strongest would win. But South Africa's unique industrial development had already forged a much more integrated economic system than anywhere in Africa, which was drawing both blacks and whites away from their tribes; and no amount of fencing off could remove their basic interdependence." [p.261]

The Afrikaner ideology of islands of sanity in a sea of black insanity is so close to the Islamic ideology: the company of the saved have a boundary between themselves and the sons of the devil. There is the task of purifying the internal, dumping into the outside all the impurities and the maintenance of the boundary with whatever armour is needed to stop the implosion from the externalised badness. These are archetypal patterns of human behaviour - they have nothing at all to do with Afrikanerism. They are there at all times and in all societies,

validated by all the major world religions. If these symptoms of behaviour are intolerable, then we have to intervene in the system at a level far deeper than simply the socio-economic or political problems of South Africa. The movement towards collaborative global interdependence requires an integration at an intrapersonal level which is at a far deeper point than that reached by religion and ideology. We can no longer afford the acting out of psychotic defences in social systems. Unfortunately change in the theological or ideological and symbolic constructs underlying social process takes an awful long time to bring about, particularly when the fundamental dynamics which generate and reify those constructs are still in place and uninterpreted. Even so there has been a certain amount of shift within the Dutch Reformed Church which is worth noting:

> "The theological basis for apartheid was itself crumbling under both internal and external pressure. In October 1986 the Dutch Reformed Church, which still claimed 38 percent of South Africa's whites among its members, reached a muddled compromise by which they would admit all races to membership, while still not merging with black or coloured reformed churches; and they also accepted a policy document announcing 'racism is a sin, which no person may defend or practice' which effectively undermined the religious basis for all past apartheid laws." [p.262]

If Karl Marx commented that religious criticism was the sine qua non of all social criticism then it seems to me that one does have to mount a fundamental critique of the religious ideology which undergirds apartheid, the actual symbolic structures, the theology that generates a world view that operates in this particular way - that needs doing in much greater depth. However, there is also the issue that such a working through even up to the levels of major theological declaration by ruling bodies in churches does not change the dynamic significantly at a national level. What it does is remove the sanctions and the symbol structure, to a certain extent, leaving exposed the dynamics in all their naked barbarity, so it is not surprising that Sampson goes on:

> "The whites no longer have any grand design to maintain white supremacy over a fast-growing black majority, no new blueprints to replace the tattered schemes for tribal homelands; while Botha has discredited his own tri-cameral parliament by overruling it to declare the emergency. Pretoria still clings to the strategy of dividing black tribes, which enables Afrikaners to argue that there is no real black majority; but the revolts within the homelands and the defection of their leaders are already undermining those assumptions. The Afrikaners' special language of power-sharing, group rights and consultation looks more obviously bogus as the government becomes more desperately pragmatic, determined to maintain its power with brute force like any other police state." [p.262f.]

Paranoia, power and the emergence of police-state tactics at an intra-national level as the Jihad begins to show its ugly head at the boundary of an ethnic group, deemed by those in power to be a threatening out-group. These are feedback loops operating both sides of the boundary, so that the system as a whole moves to confrontational chaos. Again it is vital to look at the systemic variables rather than the sub-system variables of an idealised side of a boundary. So fairly clear progression of DeMause's tracing from the condition of national politics within the happy womb, towards placental failure, strangulation, cracking apart, fragmentation, pressure, whirlpool, war, followed by the reassertion of boundaries, for the victor at any rate, and the recovery of some stability within which the regression to an idealised womb can be regenerated, before the next level of political breakdown and conflict breaks out. I think within South Africa you can see this kind of progression, through idealised intrauterine regression, with exponential growth, to the watershed of limits to growth, boundaries of power, conflict, pressure, increased pressure, crumbling of the

ideology, conflict across the boundaries, splitting apart, fragmentation, and then the feedback loop of the vortex as each side arms against the other. What makes the difference in this situation, of course, is that one side actually has very little military power, and the other side is very, very militarily armed, so that the power is unbalanced in favour of the minority. I do not think increasing the armour of the majority would solve the problem, but I do think decreasing the defensive splitting and projection into the boundary from both parties, i.e. a systemic understanding of the dynamics involved, is absolutely crucial. That is a sentiment which appears to echo the warning of Keppel-Jones about 40 years ago.

> ""The salvation of this country can lie only in a reversal of historic tendencies so thorough as to constitute a revolution' [Arthur Keppel-Jones, When Smuts Goes, Pietermairtzburg, Shuter and Shooter, 1950, p.xii]. The interest of the West must lie in making that revolution as bloodless and manageable as possible: in preserving the continuity of human rights, the respect for the law and civilised values; and in making their own links with a future non-racial or black government." [p.263f.]

It is as if we are inevitably moving into a perinatal convulsion, so that 'salvation' is the next word to be mentioned, and since we would argue that salvation is precisely that which is applied to the foetal unconscious as it approaches intolerable stress at BPM II/III, I think it is probably absolutely right. The problem there, of course, is that salvation represents a retreat, a re-containment, a moving back into the safety of idealised known space, rather than a movement through the compression into a new world beyond it. Salvation is not a solution - it is an avoidance of the solution, a distribution of the pain to other areas at the boundary and a displacement of certain victim areas to handle the stress on our behalf so that we can feel better. That is not a solution. And I think it is quite significant that Keppel-Jones talks about the salvation lying in a 'reversal of historic tendencies' - unconsciously he understands that salvation has to do with a time reversal at a boundary. The reversal of historic tendencies - a moving backwards into a condition before the problem was met, as if that itself represents a solution to the problem. This time reversal, mirroring, or bounce at the perinatal boundary is absolutely clear here in the construct. And again in Keppel's wording, that reversal constitutes a 'revolution' - another word I presume for going full circle back to the beginning and starting all over again. Revolutionary society goes round in circles, it does not get anywhere. Conversely a revolution represents an engagement with a primal psychodrama at the intra-national level, whereas war represents an engagement with the primal psychodrama at the national boundary - international level (see DeMause). Sampsom himself appears to be in opposition to the quoted author' s tendency to reverse in the second part of that paragraph, noting that the West's interests probably lie in making the revolution as bloodless and manageable as possible. It is fairly obvious that there is a birth to go through, but that the medical management of the birth must make certain that there is as little damage to the mother and the new-born child as possible. In other words what is required is a non-traumatic transition, preserving continuity, human dignity, human rights, respect for law, civilisation, a transition without instability, a non-discontinuity. In other words precisely not a movement through a catastrophe surface. The problem is that I question Sampson's motivation here and wonder whether underlying these might still be the selfish interests of Western capitalist business institutions, requiring to stay in touch with the resources of South Africa and to go on bleeding the tip of that continent dry without redeploying the resources of international capital within the global system.

The next paragraph is also quite crucial.

> "To achieve that, Western governments must follow their own road-map and ignore Pretoria's dead end. Western businessmen and diplomats talk about the precipice and the abyss, but prefer not to contemplate how they might cross over them: with all their protestation against apartheid, they try to avoid the question of 'one man, one vote', or who will hold power in the end. Yet the character of the future black government, and its relationships with Western governments and corporations, will depend crucially on the nature of the transition, and on the bridges that the West can build across the ravine. The longer the West refuses to face up to a future black majority, the more anti-Western it is likely to be. The complaints that the black opposition is communist can all too easily be self-fulfilling, if the West refuses to provide its own support; but the evidence inside South Africa suggests that it is the home-grown nationalism and anti-capitalism which present a much greater force than external communism." [p.264)

Again, the underlying load carriers at this particular point in the argument are so clearly perinatal. There is a ' dead-end' - no exit, the cosmic bottom. Pretoria reaching the 'end of the road'. Others talking about the 'precipice', the 'abyss', which is 'not able to be contemplated', they try to ' avoid the question', ' bridges', ' ravines', 'refuse to face up', indicating that the 'home-grown' content in South Africa can 'present a much greater force than external communism' and so you have this container/contained, inside/outside, home-grownness, moving to some kind of irresistible force moving across the boundary which generates images of abyss and catastrophic descent into the void. Again, in the dynamics there is no way of defusing this apparently, the only way to handle it is to build a bridge, to by-pass and here again you get the impossibility of dealing with what are seen to be instinctive or just inevitable elements of human behaviour. As soon as you include the psychodynamic of pre and perinatal projection into social systems you have a whole new way of looking at this kind of transition.

Picking up the emotional load carriers in the next few paragraphs is a fascinating exercise. For instance: 'decisive actors', 'crucially threatened', 'act decisively and quickly', 'disinvest', 'endure attacks', 'unpromising future inside', 'disinvestment preferable to passive playing-in', 'writing off of the future', 'undermining future by assuming political impotence', 'not daring to pursue long-term interests', 'breaking down', 'fear of reprisals', 'white backlash', 'necessity', 'urgent', 'need to distance from short term pressures which push them towards Pretoria', 'need to look ahead to future black government'.

These sort of words indicate the primal saga being worked out, certainly in Sampson's unconscious as he writes this section of his book. The options are 'to disinvest' - to back off, to get out of the situation - passivity and simply impotent being done to, which is the essence of being traumatised in the situation by the pressure of the environment - rendered impotent. The alternative is to produce an active participant role inside it as the pressure 'pushes you towards' Pretoria. I think there is some sense of movement for the active participant going through this tunnel effect. Then come the schizoid defences of public dissociating, 'distancing', 'looking ahead' - as if the actual trauma itself has to be undergone with anaesthesia and schizoid tunnel through to the outside and then a looking on the other side as if the trauma has not actually happened. There is very little continuity in Sampson's projection. But then again, there is only the continuity afforded by 'catastrophic impingement' within the primal psychodrama, as he rightly indicates in his next paragraph:

> "With South Africa the military political offensive and the polarisation on both sides will lead to a still more ferocious confrontation, which will make it harder for companies to change sides ... becomes more difficult ... more ruthless action." [p.265]

As the pressures build up to some kind of climactic confrontation you then get the massive containment that refuses to allow birth, since all boundaries are an actual denial of perinatal movement and an attempt to sustain the dynamics of the foetal unconscious in the intra-national dynamic. So the containing ring reacts violently:

> "The government is once again determined ... to permanently crush the opposition with their counter- revolutionary offensive ... the severity of emergency laws ... effective clampdown on news ... the government's military obsession." (p.265]

So highly armoured sphincter control emerges as the crisis approaches. Again if we are looking at it in primal terms as a psychodrama then what is required is the dilation of the cervix, the widening and easing and lubricating of the orifice, the birth canal, and the emergence of the new through the resistance of the old in such a way that both mother and child can be said to be 'doing well' without hyper-stress and death to one or the other. It is not a life or death situation, it is not a win/lose, or a lose/lose, it can be a win/win confrontation. Unless you allow that interpretation of the dynamic, it seems to me, you rule out the possibility of collaborative creativity in the construction of a new way of being, the integration into the post-natal, adult family of persons, of citizens of a world village, a global society, of those who have left behind the repetitive fixated dynamics of the primal psychodrama.

The ripples of the confrontation, of course, spread outwards, so he notes that:

> "The context of the conflict is now rapidly extending to the neighbouring countries as Pretoria takes reprisals against them: ... the two ex-Portuguese states, Angola and Mozambique, are rent by civil wars in which the rebels are supported by South Africa." [p.265]

There is a destabilising and a rendering impotent of other areas around South Africa to prevent South Africa itself becoming impinged by an encircling black horde which is on the outside of the white encirclement of the black enclaves within South Africa, so you have this inside/outside/inside restatement of the primal psychodrama.

Sampson's final statements are worth quoting in full:

> "No one should underestimate Pretoria's scope for destabilizing the whole region, thus both extending their influence and appearing to prove their point that blacks are incapable of self-government. But the wider conflict presents an opportunity as well as a danger for the western governments and corporations: for the solution to many deadlocks can be found by changing the context (as Jean Monnet insisted when he overcame the deadlock between France and Germany in 1950 by taking the first steps towards a European Community). The western nations can only begin to resolve the South African deadlock, and to intervene effectively to reach a peaceful solution, in the wider context of the surrounding states which are beyond the reach of the apartheid system: and they will have to pick up this challenge in the most positive way. For the front-line states will become the real bases of opposition, through which the West can maintain its presence and continuity untainted by Pretoria; and they will desperately need to build up their alternative infrastructure of air, rail and road links independent of Pretoria's control, if they are not to become dragged further into the South African disaster. Only by providing support in this wider region can the western governments and companies break away more completely from the fatal associations with apartheid which have so seriously damaged their future prospects of maintaining their influence in a black South Africa." [p.265f.]

This issue of the wider ring around South Africa is now becoming quite crucial and the national boundary is beginning to reflect the intra-national boundary in its dynamic armour. Just as the intra-national boundaries are starting to invade the homelands and the coloured townships and actually work destructively to destabilise and disempower the black enclaves in South Africa, so also at the international level the national boundaries of South Africa are being armoured and crossed by armour into the surrounding states. This invasive and explosive pattern is reached as the construct breaks down and moves towards the culmination of the psychodrama in outright armed conflict.

Sampson's comment "that the solution to many deadlocks can be found by changing the context" is a very important clue. It is important in terms of moving one's perception of systemic variables up level so that one actually includes within the system under intervention the parameters which can mobilise change which are often not accessible from the subsystem level at which normal analysis takes place. Secondly I would see the application of catastrophe theory here absolutely crucial, that you can change the context by looking at other solutions to the problem other than simply a flip-flop of power from one set to another. Thirdly, also changing of the context from the politico-socio-economic to the psychodynamic and ideological matrix which underlies the dynamics in place. I wonder if it would be possible for, say, the Institute of Psycho-History in the States and ourselves to mount a joint exercise with the University of the Western Cape or something like that to monitor the psychodynamic parameters within the South African context and to reflect back and interpret and bring to global attention that kind of interpretation of international behaviour, which could then become a paradigm study for intervention within the world system itself.

Sadly, right on the end of the book, the bottom line shows again. It is only by providing support in the wider region that the western governments and the companies can get rid of the fatal associations with apartheid which have "seriously damaged their future prospects of maintaining their influence in a black South Africa". I think what he means by 'influence' is profitability, trading relationships and the ability to go on bleeding out of a very rich area of the world resources which leave it poorer, but leave the international companies and the powerful western capitalist trading nations in a richer position at the expense of the South African continent. That dynamic is not adequate as a raison d'être for action and represents a perseveration of precisely the dynamics which set up the problem in the first place and will therefore reintroduce the same conflict but at a different level, at a later date. Sampsori's task is not to pull down the pillars of the temple, but to reinforce them. Great is Diana of the Ephesians!

David Wasdell
l6th March, 1987