

amnesty for political prisoners and exiles. To no one of these demands did Mr Vorster give a clear answer. Instead of freehold title for urban Africans he will look into the possibility of giving leasehold; a committee will be set up to see if the hardships of influx control can be eased; it may be possible to do something about traders' rights in towns; a meeting should be arranged with the Minister of Labour to talk about trade unions; he might consider allowing some exiles to return if they had committed no crime and their particular homeland leaders guaranteed their good conduct.

We are halfway through Mr Vorster's 'give-us-six-months' period. What sign is there, judging by these three meetings, that the Prime Minister is coming to grips in any sense of urgency with the problem of producing a response to the changing circumstances of Southern Africa which is going to satisfy the aspirations of people here and give African leaders like Dr Kaunda something to show for their willingness to talk to us again after all these years? Precious little. And the reaction of Black leaders to the talks? Is the Labour Party not right to regard the new powers promised to the CRC as mere window-dressing? Is Chief Buthelezi not justified in his angry frustration at the ox-like pace at which things are moving? Was he not right to say to Mr Vorster "We think it would be a betrayal of our people's cause to come here and not ascertain . . . whether we can go back to our people and tell them that Blacks are now

going to share power and decision-making with their White countrymen in a new and meaningful way . . . If this road (separate development) is leading to a cul-de-sac then our only alternative is to seek fulfilment—not in the unreal separate freedoms—but in one South Africa and in the only seat of power—Parliament"?

The truth of the matter is that rights in urban areas—freehold, leasehold, trading, trade union, whatever you like—are meaningless unless those who have them have also the political power to prevent them being taken away from them. Anyone who used to live in Sophiatown or Cato Manor or District Six knows that. Mr Vorster's main problem remains that of devising a system for real power-sharing between all South Africans, and particularly those living in **White** South Africa. He cannot do this alone. Nor will he ever do it on the basis of the kind of talks he had in Cape Town—where a few concessions are graciously given. What are needed are talks on a basis of complete equality at which the future realities of Black and White power are recognised and in which plans are worked out to get both pulling together in one society. This means a new National Convention. No doubt Mr Vorster is neither willing nor ready to call such a thing yet, and his Party even less so. But that such a Convention will be called one day, who can doubt? The trouble is that the longer it is put off the more intractable become the problems with which it will have to deal.□

2 A MEAN ACT

The decision of the Government to expropriate the land and buildings of the Federal Seminary at Alice, is a mean act. It compares with the same Government's decision to abolish School feeding for African children, and its present decision not to allow Mr Bram Fischer to end his days outside the prison walls. In all three cases the meanness of the decision is accompanied by that mercilessness of which the Government is readily capable. Perhaps mercilessness is too strong a word. It would be more correct to say that the Government's understanding of mercy is minimal. It is not in fact a governmental word.

Does the University of Fort Hare need the 94 hectares of land on which the Seminary is built? It has 180 hectares of its own, it owns the Honeydale Farm of 582 hectares, and it would certainly be able to purchase 184 hectares from the Bantu Presbyterian Church and 158 hectares of Lovedale Mission land. The answer to this question is that Fort Hare does not need the land.

Why then has the land been expropriated? The real reasons are these.

1. The Seminary stands for an alien religious culture. Its culture is ecumenical and not Calvinist. This is a further example of the apparently total incompatibility between South African Calvinism and the rest of the Churches.
2. The Seminary stands for an alien racial culture. Its culture is non-racial and anti-apartheid. It is therefore offensive, not to the students of Fort Hare, and not to many of the faculty, but to the rulers of Fort Hare and of South Africa.
3. The Seminary stands for an alien academic culture. It allows freedom of discussion. It permits the organisation on campus of student bodies which are anathema to the rulers of Fort Hare and of South Africa. Its influence on Fort Hare students must be destroyed.

Let us ask a last question. If this had been a Dutch Reformed Seminary, would Fort Hare have needed the land? The answer to this question is that it would not have needed the land.

We are witnessing detente in Southern Africa. But of detente in South Africa itself there are as yet few signs. Indeed this

act of expropriation is irreconcilable with national detente. This alien culture of the Seminary is as indigenous as the Afrikaner culture. It is not only as indigenous, it is also as tough. It cannot be destroyed, therefore it must be re-

moved to somewhere else. If this is the best the Government can show, its efforts in Southern Africa are doomed to fail.

After this editorial was written, the Rector of Fort Hare, exercising his government-given rights, announced that he would immediately take over the Anglican and Presbyterian buildings from the Seminary, including of course the student accommodation. Presumably he had decided that the Anglican and Presbyterian students could be accommodated by the other two constituent colleges. So the dispossessed must learn to live with the dispossessors. Surely the Seminary could have been spared that. The Rector's action makes the expropriation seem a meaner act than ever. □

STRESS OR BAD FAITH

The Professional Role in a Therapeutic Society

by John M. Raftery

The undeniable direction of most social and psychological research, during this century, has been in perfecting techniques of social control. In the private sphere, institutionalized psychology has emerged, according to Peter Berger "as one of the agencies supplying a population of anxious consumers with a variety of services for the construction, maintenance and repair of identities. In the public sphere, it lends itself with equal success to the different economic and political bureaucracies in need of non-violent techniques of social control." And in "Law, Liberty and Psychiatry" (1963) Thomas Szasz has noted how the U.S.A. has become a 'therapeutic state'. Psychologism has permeated welfare and educational organizations, personnel and business administration, and has become firmly entrenched as an orthodoxy of veiled psycho-manipulation. This makes it very easy to define away "social problems" as "anti-social behaviour" or "maladjustment", implying that the individual rather than the society is sick, and of course, a battery of therapeutic techniques are available to "readjust" the individual.

This new impersonal authority of the therapeutic state, with its apparent reasonableness and its repressive tolerance, is simply an up-to-date variant of the paternalistic authority described by Oscar Wilde in 1891: "When it is used with a certain amount of kindness, and accompanied by prizes and rewards, it is dreadfully demoralizing. People . . . are less conscious of the horrible pressure that is being put on them, and so go through their lives in a sort of coarse comfort, like

petted animals, without ever realizing that they are probably thinking other people's thoughts, living by other people's standards . . ."

In present-day Britain, where 12 million barbiturate and 16 million tranquillizer prescriptions are issued each year¹, it cannot be denied that pharmacotherapy provides "a sort of coarse comfort" of adjustment. The magnitude of this medication into submission and benign chemical euphoria (benign, that is, from the "social stability" point of view), shows us that probably thousands of creative people are sedated prematurely into oblivion. The disillusioned victims of unjust social systems, when they are fearful, dependent and tranquillized, find rebellion or indeed any political initiative-taking, most unpalatable. It is easier to allow the social defects to fester, and to step up the dosage.

The therapy gospel has become international in recent years, and it may be a short step from the therapeutic state, to the therapeutic globe. In the words of Howard P. Rome: "Actually no less than the entire world is a proper catchment area for present-day psychiatry, and psychiatry need not be appalled by the magnitude of this task"². He does not mention the magnitude of the profits, power and prestige which will accrue to

1 Figures taken from an article by Professor S. Rose, in the Times Higher Education Supplement, of 23rd November, 1973.

2 "Psychiatry and foreign affairs: the expanding competence of psychiatry." American Journal of Psychiatry, 1968, Vol. 125.