Inside stories: Oscar Wilde, Jean Améry, Nelson Mandela and Aung San Suu Kyi

Dennis Smith

[in Nicolas Demertsiz (ed), *Emotions in Politics,* London, Palgrave-Macmillan (2013), 60-83]

Abstract

Forced social displacement is an emotional challenge to people and a political challenge to states. Oscar Wilde, Jean Améry, Nelson Mandela and Aang San Suu Kyi each suffered imprisonment at the hands of political establishments that were themselves afraid of being overthrown or pushed aside. This analysis compares the four cases, exploring the formation of each individual *habitus*; its expression in handling fear, sorrow and anger; the management of emotional risk and reward; the interplay of recognition, misrecognition and non-recognition; the implications of publicity as compared to secrecy; and the deployment of strategies for coping with forced social displacement including acceptance, reconciliation, escape, resistance, and revenge. Some implications for contemporary politics are drawn, with particular reference to the destructive potential of resentment and revenge.

Key words: Oscar Wilde, Jean Améry, Nelson Mandela, Aung San Suu Kyi, forced social displacement, fear, sorrow, anger, resentment, revenge, emotion, politics.

A key triangular force field: emotions, actions and politics

This paper seeks to understand forced social displacement both as an emotional challenge to people and a political challenge to states. It focuses on four socio-political activists two of them politicians, two of them writers, who also became famous prisoners. Imprisonment provides a good laboratory for studying the dynamics of forced social displacement in a stark form. That is especially so in these cases where imprisonment was a deliberate attempt to inflict degradation and comprehensively dislocate the prisoner's previous social existence.

All four individuals were working to increase freedom for themselves and others, especially in the political and cultural spheres. Their powerful adversaries were, in turn, deeply anxious about being forcefully displaced themselves, either by internal insurgency or foreign challenges, or both. These adversaries imposed painful and, in some cases, life-threatening personal displacement upon those who troubled them by depriving them of liberty and subjecting them to very harsh treatment.

Oscar Wilde, Jean Améry, Nelson Mandela, and Aung San Suu Kyi have each challenged a powerful socio-political order: Victorian England, Europe under the Nazis, South Africa under apartheid, and Burma/Myanmar under military rule. They have all suffered imprisonment: Wilde in Pentonville, Wandsworth and Reading (1895-7), Améry in concentration camps, including Auschwitz (1943-5), Mandela on Robben Island and elsewhere (1962 -90), and Aung Suu Kyi under house arrest in Rangoon for a total of fifteen years (between 1990 and 2010).[1]

By considering their experiences and the broader geo-political contexts, we can discern links between emotions, human actions and socio-political changes. We can see how, when people experience enormous anger, fear and sorrow, they are driven to transform themselves, their relationships with others and their location within the world. We can also relate these dynamics to long-term processes of socio-political change. In a sentence, our theme is the powerful triangular force field created by the interplay between human emotions, human actions and socio-political change.

Social displacement

The past two hundred years have seen a sequence of shuddering social displacements: first *by* the West (of the East), then *within* the West (as America asserted itself over Europe), and finally, *of* the West (by the East). This last process of geo-political displacement is still in its early stages. It is important to recognise that the term social displacement encompasses not just dislocating geo-political shifts but also emotional turmoil at a personal or group level. The two things are clearly very closely related in many cases.

The most painful – and very common – form of dislocation is *forced* social displacement. It is painful because it is both unavoidable and unacceptable. That is an extremely challenging combination. As a consequence, it demands action: either to change yourself or change the situation you are in. Because it demands action, it is a dynamic condition. It can change people and societies.

A 'displaced person' is not just someone forced to move from a particular geographical location and become a refugee. That narrow definition is far too restrictive for our purposes here. The feeling of being displaced happens to many more people and groups than that. The 'place' you lose might be a social position rather than a geographical location. You can be displaced without moving away from your home, as often happens to people who become unemployed. The discomfort of displacement derives from the disjunction between two things: a person or group's sense of who they are ('this is us') and where they fit in to the world ('we belong here') and, on the other hand, the social identity other people ascribe to them ('but that is not me!') and the social location to which they are consigned ('…and I do not belong there!'). They feel humiliated.

The humiliation of forced social displacement stirs up strong feelings of fear, sorrow and anger. Consider the emotional journey now being made by many ordinary citizens in the West as the neo-liberal system of economic management runs into fundamental difficulties: *fear* that income, savings, property, employment and social position *might be* lost or reduced in worth; followed by *sorrow*, then *anger* when these things *are actually being* lost or reduced in worth. Once fear, sorrow and anger are mobilized in response to current shocks, inner gates may be opened that release buried anxieties, regrets and resentments accumulated over the years from previous moments of traumatic dislocation. A population in such a condition may become politically very interesting - and disturbing – as our four famous prisoners have certainly understood.

Four famous prisoners

Wilde (born 1854), Améry (born 1912), Mandela (born 1918) and Aung San Suu Kyi (born 1945) are all 'celebrities'. Wilde's humiliation was intensified by his international reputation cultivated during the 1880s and early 1890s. Améry became a celebrity, especially in Germany and France, during the 1960s and 1970s. The names of Mandela and Aung San Suu Kyi were promoted throughout the world to advance the causes for which they suffered.

Oscar Wilde, born in 1854, was a sensationally successful playwright, poet and essayist. His mother was a passionate feminist and Irish nationalist. Her son, in turn, mocked the pretensions of Victorian England, combining humour and scholarship. The radical message of Wilde's witty play *The Importance of Being Earnest*, is also conveyed in more serious works such as 'The true function and value of criticism' (1890)[2] and 'The soul of man under socialism' (1891).[3] Wilde was hostile to the private property system. It created poverty and preoccupation with material gain. Oppressive and superficial moral codes diverted both rich and poor from the proper concern of life. This was to contemplate beauty as the basis for a harmonious social existence, giving freedom to all and allowing creativity to flourish.

Wilde became entangled in a homosexual affair with Lord Alfred Douglas, or Bosie as he was known to friends. This was dangerous ground. Homosexual acts were illegal in England at that time. Bosie's father hated Wilde and did not mind creating a scandal. This led to a court case that drew world-wide publicity in the mid 1890s. Wilde was sentenced to two years imprisonment with hard labour. [4] In jail he wrote a long letter to Bosie reflecting on these events. It has become known by the title *De Profundis*.[5]

Our second prisoner, Jean Améry, was an Austrian Jew, born in 1912. Originally called Hans Mayer, he changed his name after the war. In 1943 he was working for the anti-Nazi resistance in Belgium. He was imprisoned, tortured, and sent to various concentration camps, including Auschwitz and Buchenwald. Amazingly, Améry survived the war but found that his wife Régine had disappeared without trace. He discovered six years later she had died of a heart condition while he was imprisoned. Améry gradually rebuilt his life and became a professional journalist. His great ambition during those postwar years was to be a successful writer of existentialist fiction.

Améry did not achieve recognition through his existentialist fiction. However, in the mid-1960s he made some radio broadcasts in West Germany about his experiences during and after the war. After twenty years of near silence, the unspeakable atrocities of the genocide were being spoken about again. Améry's broadcasts were published in *At the Mind's Limits*, (Améry 1980; originally published in 1966). This book made him a well-known literary figure in Germany and France. However, Améry found living difficult and finally committed suicide in 1978.[6]

Next we turn to Nelson Mandela, born 1918, a South African freedom fighter who narrowly avoided the death penalty for undercover work organizing possible armed struggle against white domination. Mandela's great grandfather was king of the Thembu people, although Mandela was not in direct line to this African throne. Mandela's father served as the king's chief counselor. Nelson Mandela was expected to succeed him. Initially raised in an African village, he was sent away to get the good English-style education he would need for this role.

The young Mandela's initial ambition was to be an effective translator between the different groups of Africans and their various European masters. But when the king told Mandela which woman to marry he ran away to Johannesburg. There he was trained as a lawyer and joined the African National Congress, which sought to overthrow *apartheid*. He was eventually arrested and, along with others, faced the threat of the death penalty as violent subversives. In the event, Mandela was given a life sentence and spent many years imprisoned on Robben Island and elsewhere. He was finally released in 1990 after twenty-seven years. In 1994 he became South Africa's president.

Our last prisoner is Aung San Suu Kyi, born in 1945. Like Mandela, she was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. She is named after her father General Aung San, Burma's greatest national hero, who was assassinated when she was two years old. General Aung San created the modern Burmese army and negotiated Burma's political freedom from British rule in 1947, the year of his assassination at the age of thirty-five.[7] His daughter, Suu Kyi, grew up with a strong devotion to his memory, encouraged by her mother, a Burmese diplomat. Her mother's career took her abroad and Suu Kyi went with her. In fact, from the age of fifteen she spent nearly three decades living mainly outside Burma.

Suu Kyi was educated in India, Oxford and London and moved within the transatlantic arena of liberal-minded professionals, civil servants and academics. In 1972 she married a British anthropologist who became an Oxford don. They had two sons and Suu Kyi pursued an academic career of her own, earning a PhD at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London. Everything changed in 1988. Suu Kyi's mother, living in Burma, fell seriously ill. Suu Kyi went back to Burma to care for her mother but soon became involved in politics. She helped to found the National League for Democracy (NLD), an opposition movement campaigning against Burma's autocratic military regime. Half a million people attended her first major speech outside the main Buddhist pagoda in Rangoon. There were confrontations between the NLD and the military on the streets, some involving Suu Kyi. Her party went on to win the general election of 1990 but the military regime did not surrender power. Suu Kyi was kept under house arrest, imprisoned for fifteen of the next twenty years until released in 2010. In 2011 she gave two Reith Lectures for the BBC, talking about her experiences.[8]

Displacement: emotional, personal and geo-political

The lives and careers of these four people trace a long arc through European and world history during the past century and a half. Along that arc, the emotional, personal and geo-political aspects of social displacement intertwine.

Wilde mockingly exposed the hypocritical pretence of late imperial English society. The arrogance of the ruling class disguised widespread anxiety about Britain's capacity to withstand challenges from rivals such as Germany and the United States. In 1893 Charles H. Pearson raised an even more fundamental scare. His book, *National Life and Character. A Forecast* (Pearson 1893), predicted that the 'white races' lacked the 'manly' vigour needed to maintain their rule in the world's tropical climates. Not the most encouraging political climate for Wilde facing trial for sodomy in 1895.

In the event, British anxieties were justified. By the early 1940s three competing political systems, fascist, communist and capitalist, were trying to fill the power vacuum created as the British empire slipped into terminal decline. These systems were championed by Germany, Russia and the United States, respectively. This was the political situation in which Jean Améry, a Jew born in Austria, was struggling to stay alive. Améry fled from Austria to France and then to Belgium where he was picked up by the secret police in July 1943.[9] This was just a few months after the battle of Stalingrad ended in February 1943. The German army's defeat in this battle destroyed the Nazi dream of conquering Russia. It meant Hitler could no longer win the war. Not a good time for a Jewish member of the anti-Nazi resistance to fall into the hands of the Nazi secret police, newly fearful of their own future.

Later in the century Nelson Mandela devoted his adult life to struggling against the racist regime that persisted in postwar South Africa even after fascist racism had been defeated in Europe. The timing of historical events was important for Mandela's fate also. If February 1943 was the date when one could begin to predict the end of the Third Reich, then March 1985, when Mikhail Gorbachev became General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, was the date when one could begin to predict that the Soviet Union would soon cease to be a military threat to the West. The point is that one key to the ultimate success of the African National Congress movement to which Mandela belonged was the collapse of the Soviet Union. This reduced the geo-strategic importance of South Africa to NATO and the Western alliance. It diminished America's fear of political change in Africa. It was no coincidence that shortly after the rise of Gorbachev in 1985 an opening occurred for Mandela to take a political initiative. Five years away from personal freedom, he started to talk to the ruling National Party about the future constitution of a democratic post-apartheid South Africa.[10]

More recently, the meltdown of the Western capitalist system since 2007 has speeded up the global power shift from West to East. The United States remains a mighty military force but Southeast Asia is fast becoming the world's economic powerhouse. Burma borders both India and China and is a key player in the struggle between those nations and the United States for long-term strategic dominance in South-East Asia. Channeling oil and gas through Burma reduces China's reliance on the alternative route through the highly vulnerable Malacca Straits. [11] The Chinese government has supported the Burmese regime, just as the United States backed *apartheid* in South Africa during the Cold War; in both cases for pragmatic geo-political reasons. Aung San Suu Kyi is committed to undermining the Burmese military regime but the chances of success will depend on the outcome of global power games between much bigger players than Burma.

A civilian government was inaugurated in March 2011. It remains close to the army and largely consists of ex-military men. The new government seems determined to broaden its international support, perhaps by releasing political prisoners and relaxing censorship. China's influence has been pushed back slightly by the suspension in September 2011 of a China-backed dam project that would have displaced thousands of Burmese villages. The suspension lasts until 2015. This may help Rangoon's image in 2014 when Burma hopes to assume the chair of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). On August 19th 2011, Suu Kyi held talks with Burma's new president Thein Sein. Both emerged smiling. But we have to wait and see.[12]

Strategies and resources

A person or group's response to forced social displacement will depend upon three things: the intellectual, imaginative and emotional resources they possess; their capacity to evaluate and deploy these resources; and the opportunities presented by their strategic situation.

In respect of 'internal' resources, all four prisoners had the advantage of a complex cultural background. Wilde drew upon both his English and Irish identities, and when young hovered for some time between Anglicanism and Catholicism. After marriage he regularly crossed the boundaries between the homosexual and heterosexual worlds of London and Oxford. Améry identified with both Austria and Belgium, with countryside and city, and with German and French literary culture. Not least, he was the child of a Catholic mother and a Jewish father.

Mandela was a country boy and a city slicker, training first as a traditional counselor and later as a specialist in the legal system of the *apartheid* state. His first vocation was to be a translator between languages and, by implication, cultural traditions. Finally, Aung San Suu Kyi married an anthropologist and studied at SOAS. She has learned how to play between Burmese and Western lifestyles and cultural assumptions, drawing strength from Buddhism while also, understanding the subtleties of Anglo-Saxon Christianity. Like Mandela she was educated at a Methodist high school. She also displays deep sympathy for Japanese life and culture.[13]

Backgrounds such as these provide a rich repertoire of mental resources, including the capacity to exercise self-distancing, and the ability to present a multitude of faces to others, including oppressors. But each prisoner used these resources in distinctive ways.

Both Mandela and Suu Kyi deliberately turned themselves into efficient and effective political instruments. Both have put a high premium on mental and physical fitness, avoiding displays of weakness. Their main concerns have been mechanisms and processes within the political sphere, as they affect the South

African and Burmese states, respectively. For both the self is primarily an agent, acting outwardly upon the political world. They and their supporters factored in the likelihood of imprisonment when they began their campaigns. Mandela and Suu Kyi each deliberately put themselves in danger of being arrested and jailed.

For both, self-control was the key. Mandela complained that the Pan African Congress, a rival organization, tended to think 'not of the advancement of the struggle, but of their own feelings of jealousy and revenge' (Mandela 1995, vol 1, 329). Since leaving prison his message to Black South Africans has been the need for rational resistance to humiliation by cultivating self-pride based on self-development.

For Wilde and Améry also, the self was an agent within the world, capable of bringing into existence new relationships and forms of awareness. However, they were as interested in their own inner turmoil as in the vicissitudes of politics. They both paid great attention to the play of emotions and the workings of the imagination. For them, the self was not just an agent but also an arena, an inner world where struggles occurred, sometimes creative, sometimes destructive and often painful.

These differences between the political activists (Mandela, Suu Kyi) and the *avant-garde* writers (Wilde, Améry) are closely related to how they handled close relationships. On the one hand, we find self-trust and self-sufficiency; on the other, neediness and vulnerability.

Mandela and Suu Kyi each belonged to teams of political comrades that stayed together over many years, providing mutual support. Yet both have shown a certain aloofness. After all, one is the daughter of the modern nation's founder, while the other is the grandson of a king. They are both 'royal', able to dispense friendliness, even warmth, while offering and needing little in the way of close and intimate friendship. Suu Kyi has been able to live apart from her family for many years. Mandela made an explicit decision to give his political work priority over any marriage partner.[14]

For Wilde and Améry things were different. In each case, disastrous events within intense love relationships were closely interwoven with the humiliations of their imprisonment. In Wilde's case, his consuming involvement with Bosie tipped him into the pit of humiliation. In Améry's case, his ardent desire to be reunited with his wife Regine remained strong throughout his months in the camps, providing a positive vision of his future homecoming. Her disappearance and his prolonged ignorance of her fate made it more difficult than otherwise to reorient himself after the war.

Before examining these cases in more detail, let us ask what options for responding to humiliating displacement such as imprisonment might be available to those who suffer this fate.

There are, in principle, five different paths that a person or group in such a situation might follow. Firstly, they might try to *escape*. On Robben Island

Nelson Mandela 'thought about escape the entire time' (Mandela 1995, vol 2, 210) even though it was impossible. Later, Mandela deliberately delayed his release to suit his own political purposes. Similarly, Suu Kyi refused the chance to escape house arrest because the price, which was exile, would mean a radical reduction of her political influence in Burma.

For his part, Wilde ignored pleas that he should avoid prosecution by sailing to France, although he was glad to retreat there after his release from prison. Turning to Améry, in 1938 an old school friend suggested how to escape being identified as a Jew. He would have to divorce his Jewish wife, and claim his Catholic mother had conceived him as a result of rape by his Jewish father. Améry did not follow this up, although he did escape from the Nazi regime in Austria after that country was annexed by Germany in 1938.[15]

Later, by working against the Nazis in Belgium with reckless incaution, Améry guaranteed his own arrest. Such was the price he paid for switching to the second possible response: *resistance*. This term means efforts to parry the assaults of the oppressor while building up the strength and self-confidence of the oppressed. Another possible response is *revenge*. This means showing that the victim can strike back, bringing their oppressor or rival down in some way.

A fourth possible response is *acceptance*, affirming that the forced displacement is a just punishment for a fault the victim now admits and is ashamed of. A fifth possibility is *reconciliation*, or at least a stable compromise, between people previously locked into a humiliating relationship, perhaps involving a prolonged revenge cycle, or systematic abuse. Reconciliation means reconstructing the mode of discourse between the parties concerned, enabling new meanings and identities to emerge that protect 'core' interests while also creating new, shared interests. All these responses are complex and problematic.[16] We will not expect to find neat 'ideal types' as we return to our cases, first the political activists and then the radical writers.

Two political activists: Aung San Suu Kyi and Nelson Mandela

Mandela and Suu Kyi each confronted a double displacement, a two-fold humiliation. One is a matter of family honour. They each had a wronged father to be avenged, a father who in both cases died when they were very young: when Suu Kyi was two years old, and when Mandela was the age of nine. Suu Kyi's mother made their family home the scene of lavish ceremonial remembrance each year on the anniversary of her father's death.[17] Aung San's great legacy, the Burmese national army, was hijacked by unworthy men. By being an almighty nuisance, and perhaps more, Suu Kyi is certainly giving them a severe punishment.

Compare Mandela who wrote that 'Although my mother was the centre of my existence, I defined myself through my father' (Mandela 1995, vol1, 20-1). As with Suu Kyi, Nelson Mandela's father was independent and rebellious. Mandela senior was 'a wealthy nobleman by the standards of his time' (9). In the 1920s the local British magistrate summoned the father to answer a complaint. His father refused to go. The white magistrate responded by depriving him of his chiefly position and the material comforts that went with it. It was a mighty fall. Like Suu Kyi, Mandela carried his father's name: the clan name of Mandiba. Seventy years after his father's humiliation, Mandela junior settled that account, paying back the white man many times over for their lack of respect. [18]

The other dimension of their forced downward displacement has been the sustained attack on their rights and dignity, a fact that links their situation with millions of other people. Mandela has suffered degrading treatment because he is black, Suu Kyi because she is a woman. As her unofficial biographer, Justin Whintle reports, since 1988 the Burmese regime has labeled her, variously, as a 'whore,' a 'Western fashion girl', and a 'political stunt princess' (Wintle 2007, xxix). Before parcels were delivered to her house the regime would open them and photograph their contents. This was followed by newspaper reports such as the one criticizing her for enjoying exercise videos and good quality lipstick while Burmese struggled to eat. Suu Kyi is fighting for all Burmese, not just Burmese women, but she has been recognized as a feminist icon and role model, and in April 2011 was awarded the Feminist Majority Foundation's Eleanor Roosevelt Award for Global Women's Rights.[19]

There is a second similarity between Suu Kyi and Mandela that merits attention. Both Mandela and Suu Kyi had frequent changes of residence when young. From the age of fifteen Suu Kyi lived outside Burma for nearly three decades, in India, Nepal, Oxford, New York, Bhutan, and Japan. She became a denizen of global elite society, a useful asset in her later campaign to keep the world's attention on her struggle.[20] Mandela left his village home at the age of nine, and made successive shifts of residence as he went to boarding school then college, followed by his flight to Johannesburg. ANC work kept him on the move and outside normal society. He became 'the black pimpernel' (Mandela 1995, vol 1, 383), organizing resistance to the regime.

Mandela was inducted into the complexities of South African society, learning how to survive uncertainty, get along with people from other tribes, and 'take the measure' (a favourite Mandela phrase) of people in authority. He became familiar with white people of many kinds. This learning and these skills were bought at a price. Like Suu Kyi, Mandela did not have a settled place during his adolescence and young adult life. After repeated uprooting, Robben Island was Mandela's first place of long-term residence. There he shared many hours of activity with his comrades, not only hard labour and repeated indignities but also debate. When, after eighteen years, the prison authorities suddenly moved Mandela away from his friends to another jail, he felt it keenly: 'while it was never a home…it had become a place where I felt comfortable' (Mandela 1995, vol 2,264).

If Suu Kyi's house arrest turned her home into 'almost a prison', Mandela's prison became 'almost a home'.[21] For both of them enforced immobility followed decades of movement. Imprisonment was an attempt to displace them thoroughly. But the actual effect was twofold: to identify them strongly with a particular place in the eyes of the world; and to provide a stable context where they could develop their inner resources.

There is an important difference between them, however. Imprisonment cut Suu Kyi off from daily informal interaction with people of similar backgrounds and interests after years of joining in the social life of academic circles and professional networks. It was very different for Mandela. After many months as a lone operative working under cover, prison brought him back into society once more, making him the leading member of a group united in affliction. Hence, imprisonment has worked in very different ways for our two activists. Suu Kyi's downtown prison-house became the centre of a highly symbolic political tableau, and sometimes a political theatre, set on the stage of central Rangoon. Crowds have often gathered there or marched nearby in protest and sometimes she has been able to speak to them or send messages. By contrast, Mandela's island prison was an incubator, nurturing his skills of negotiation and mediation far away from publicity, especially during the early years.

Aung San Suu Kyi is often referred to as 'the lady.' This nomenclature is convenient for the military regime because her name contains within it the name of her revered father, Aung San, the great patriotic general (or *bogyoke*) who secured Burmese independence. The charisma of Bogyoke Aung San is reinforced daily as people in Rangoon stream out of the central railway station and take the short walk to Bogyoke Aung San market on Bogyoke Aung San Road which is a few hundred meters from Bogyoke Aung San stadium which is just south of Bogyoke park. To make the most of her father's name, to inherit the respect, authority, and attention it carried, Aung San's daughter knew she needed to be based in Rangoon – at almost any cost.

Fortuitously, Suu Kyi's place of confinement, the family home at 54 University Avenue, was only a few hundred yards from Rangoon's main university and just half an hour's stroll from the forest of pagodas in Shwedagon Taingotra Park. So she was located close to her most active supporters: the student body and the Buddhist monastic orders, both groups strongly wedded to the cause of bringing increased democracy and prosperity to Burma, one of the poorest countries in the world.

Suu Kyi's role has been two-fold. One is to demonstrate fearless and unbending dignity while the students and the monastic body demonstrate fiery anger on the streets. The other is to play a quasi-Gandhian game. Like Gandhi, she adopts a tone of compromise and reconciliation while refusing to budge on fundamentals. Meanwhile, she plays on the desire of the oppressor to be seen as worthy and respectable in the eyes of the world. Thus the regime promises, and eventually permits, parliamentary elections but then, being unable to fix the results, ignores them, and throws its opponents into jail once more.

As her jailer, the regime has always been ready to let her go if she would go into exile.[22] 'The lady' would not leave. As a prisoner, Suu Kyi has always been ready to bargain with the regime if they would put genuine democracy on the table. The regime has not, at least till recently, been ready to negotiate on such terms. As has been seen, negotiations between Aung San Suu Kyi and the new government have opened but it is too early to tell how similar this is to Mandela's opening of contacts with the South African government in 1985.

For Mandela and his comrades, life at Robben Island was an intensified version of the apartheid regime. All the prisoners were black, while all the warders were white and mainly Afrikaans-speaking: 'they demanded a master-servant relationship. They ordered us to call them *baas*, which we refused to do' (Mandela 1995, vol2, 81). From the beginning, Mandela was busy as advocate and mediator, refusing to be bullied and trying to push back the weight of oppression. Gradually, the prisoners won the right to manage their own daily lives within the prison framework. There was an unspoken understanding that the prisoners would be as civil and decent to each warder as he was to them. By the time he went to prison Mandela had taught himself to assess the strengths and weaknesses of people, especially those in authority, regardless of race, and to value his own judgments. He had educated himself to a high level both on the street and in the classroom. He enjoyed taking calculated risks and tried to learn something from every incident. He knew how to deceive but tried not to deceive himself. These were the skills of a negotiator and leader, someone who knew when to strike out on his own and when to play the shepherd, guiding the flock from behind.

Mandela also knew how to play the long game. In 1976 the Minister for Prisons offered him early release if he accepted *apartheid* and the policy of 'separate development' for blacks and whites.[23] Mandela refused. In 1985 during a stay in hospital he got a visit from the Minister of Justice, who just happened to be passing. A few days later, Mandela decided to take the initiative. Without consulting his ANC colleagues, he opened discussions with the South African government. By 1994 he was President of South Africa. It is neither impossible nor predestined that Aang San Suu Kyi might yet follow a similar route in Burma.

Two avant-garde writers: Oscar Wilde and Jean Améry

Wilde and Améry both spent much shorter periods under lock and key than Mandela or Suu Kyi; about two years in each case. Their sentences were much shorter but also much more devastating. Imprisonment had not been 'factored in,' psychologically discounted in advance, so to speak, as in the case of Mandela and Suu Kyi. On the contrary, these disastrous collisions with fate knocked each of them off the road and thoroughly disrupted life's journey.

Wilde began his sentence in Pentonville, spending six hours daily on the treadmill till it broke his health. Later he moved to Wandsworth and, finally, Reading Gaol, where the regime was less draconian.[24] Améry had a very much harder time. He went to Breendonck prison in Belgium, where was tortured and given solitary confinement, to Auschwitz, to Mittelbau-Dora, and finally to Bergen-Belsen. At Auschwitz he was assigned to a work group containing 655 people. 417 of them were immediately killed. Améry was sent to work in the office of a chemical factory, since he was one of the few prisoners able to read German handwriting. 23,000 Jews from Belgium were, like Améry, deported to Auschwitz. Only 615 of them survived the war.[25]

Like Mandela and Suu Kyi, Wilde and Améry confronted a double displacement, a two-fold humiliation. It took a different form in their case. Mandela and Suu Kyi were each penalized for being what they clearly intended to be: dedicated and determined political subversives. This was not the case with Wilde and Améry.

As prisoners, Wilde and Améry had to suffer the misery of being torn out of their place in society and thrown down in the dirt. However, they also experienced the frustration and desolation of being attacked for personal characteristics that were irrelevant to their main social mission. Their captors accorded them an identity that drew attention away from the figure they each wished to cut in the world. In that sense, they suffered the pain of misrecognition. For example, as already seen, Wilde placed himself at the spearhead of a campaign to demonstrate the moral value of aesthetic appreciation. But he was placed in the dock, and attacked in the press, not as a radical social reformer but as a sodomite.

For his part, Améry had co-founded a literary journal *Die Brücke. Kritische Beitråge* [*The Bridge. Critical Essays*), with a friend in 1934, drafted his first novel, *Die Schiffbrüchigen* (*The Shipwrecked*) in 1934-35, and was part of the literary scene in Vienna before the war.[26] Améry wanted a life of engagement and action and saw writing as the main way to do this.

When the Belgian secret police examined Améry's case they saw he was an absolutely useless resistance worker. However, they also noticed that he was Jewish. This was an identity Améry had very little interest in or feeling for. He had not been brought up in the Jewish faith. His half-Jewish mother had converted to Catholicism. However, being a Jew Améry had fled from Austria in 1938 and as a Jew he was sent to Auschwitz. [27]

Which is worse, to be humiliated in public with your name in every newspaper or in secret, behind high walls, reduced to a number? Both are terrible but each man, so to speak, responded by 'playing the same game.' Wilde made sure his side of the story was recorded for posterity in *De Profundis*, which Wilde intended to be published as soon as possible. In 1945 Améry also wrote, in fictional form, an account of what happened to him personally, but he kept it to himself.[28] In fact it was only two decades later that he brought his own experiences before the public. By that time his whole approach to the matter had been transformed.

Returning to Oscar Wilde, in his long letter to his ex-lover, Wilde begins by giving vent to his intense sense of resentment and victimhood. Bosie, he wrote, had dragged him down: 'it was only in the mire we met' (Wilde 1963, 761). His treatment of Wilde was 'revolting in its coarseness and crudity' (767). The resulting trial and imprisonment put him at the mercy of 'a jeering mob' (807). While in prison he lost his mother through death and his wife and children through divorce.

Wilde saw that his predicament was the product of several displacements. His relationship with Bosie was misjudged. Bosie lacked artistic imagination and was not his equal. Furthermore, Bosie had disrupted the correct order of things by attacking his own father in public. As Wilde put it: 'You took domesticity out of its proper sphere'(817). Wilde reflected that 'By the displacement of an atom a world may be shaken' (819).

However, he resisted the temptation to rebel against his fate. Why? Because that would impose a psychological toughening up that reduces emotional sensitivity, deadens the imagination and 'closes up the channels of the soul' (795). It would weaken him as an intellectual, an artist and a human being.

Instead of becoming bitter, Wilde accepted ultimate responsibility for his own predicament, and made himself his own judge. During the trial he had admired the prosecutor's rhetoric and thought: '*How splendid it would be if I was saying all this about myself*' (815; italics in original). By asserting that he was the cause of his own downfall Wilde made himself, once more, the 'captain of (his) soul' (788). In doing so, he turned humiliation, which is the conquest and abasement of the self by outside forces, into shame, which is the discomforting recognition of the self's failure to live up to its own standards. This writer so famous for his arrogant persona, who could crush rivals with sharp and witty retorts, began to 'have moments of submission and acceptance,' and started to recognize that 'In the strangely simple economy of the world people only get what they give.' He forgave Bosie.

For Wilde, self-distancing did not mean loss of self-awareness. On the contrary, Wilde declared: 'I must be far more of an individualist than ever I was' (808). He decided his main task was to learn from his experience of sorrow, 'For the secret of life is suffering. It is what is hidden behind everything' (794). In this way he could improve his practice as an artist, acquiring deeper intensity and 'a greater unity of passion and directness of impulse' (806).

In other words, Wilde wanted to feed his harrowing experiences into his greater mission of showing how to make the world a better place for everyone. At the global level, he wanted to be an educational force, the artist as teacher, making his humility, self-understanding and creative individualism an example for others. At the personal level, he wanted to get together again with Bosie at the earliest opportunity. He did so, having fled to France under a false name. By that time his writing life was practically over. He soon fell ill and died in 1900.

Jean Amery's early responses to his own awful experiences were remarkably similar to Wilde's. He wanted to rise above his suffering and help Germans and Austrians become better by learning from what had happened. He locates himself in the vanguard of this movement, as someone able to absorb the pain and move on, made stronger, not weaker, by it. This is evident in his early fictional treatment of his own torture, composed in 1945.[29] In this story the protagonist triumphs mentally over the torturer, fooling him and giving nothing away.

It is about this time that Améry discovered the work of Sartre with its almost heroic notion of the ability of individuals, including writers, to make – and remake – themselves and the world.[30] This positive spirit pervades an essay

Améry wrote, also in 1945, entitled 'On the psychology of the German people' [78]. He realized that the world would cry for revenge against Germany, but he believes that 'German people are amenable to reasonable social arguments' and will abstain from 'further criminal actions'. He was confident that they could be re-educated: 'if we now ask ourselves whether the German people are responsible for their actions, which in the sense used here means whether they are capable of improvement, then we can confidently say "Yes".' In other words, those who understand the part they played in their own downfall can learn from experience and improve themselves.

This is similar to the approach taken by Wilde in 1897. What Wilde had wanted to do for the English-speaking world, British, Améry now wanted to do for the German-speaking world: educate it. His programme was a tough one. It included banning the works of Nietzsche and all his successors down to Spengler, and physically exterminating all Nazis still alive, including 'the entire staff of the State Secret Police.' Draconian, controversial and unrealistic, perhaps? But, so also, was Wilde's ambition to abolish private property, eliminate poverty and eradicate inequality. It is likely that both Améry and Wilde regarded the executions and expropriations they, respectively, called for as being acts of necessary surgery for the greater good. Whether they would have been prepared to implement their programmes in actuality, with all the unpredictable upheavals that would bring, is a different matter.

If Améry had died, like Wilde, three years after release from imprisonment, we might remember him today as an avant-garde writer who, like Wilde, suffered humiliation but refused to go down the road of destructive revenge. Instead, Améry became the apostle of justified resentment. How did this happen?
In 1966 Améry set out his mature reflections on being a concentration camp prisoner, a Jew, and a victim of torture. Like Wilde's *De Profundis*, *At The Mind's Limit* is 'a personal confession refracted through meditation' and likewise describes in detail 'the state of someone who was overcome' (1980, xiii-xiv). Améry's short book, like Wilde's long letter, was directly addressed to the agent of his humiliation: defined, in Améry's case, as the German people.

Wilde had been able to experience prison with the imagination of an intellectual. Primo Levi, whom Améry met in Auschwitz, also claimed to have done this.[31] Améry was appalled by such talk. He refused to accept that the mind could alleviate the horror endured by the body. It diminished the horror of the experience and gave a false view of the mind's power. For Améry, intellectual life had no survival value at all in the camp and quickly 'trickled away in a feeling of complete indifference' (9). The real heart of the experience was the agony of torture that turned a person into suffering flesh and nothing more. After such an experience, trust in the human world was gone.

Gone also was Améry's immediate post-war optimism. Twenty years on, he is offended that victims are expected to forget the past while 'the generation of the destroyers ...is growing old with honor' (75). Meanwhile, he sees, 'in the Reich: faces of stone. A proud people. A proud people still.' No longer a war machine but a world leader in industrial productivity: 'Still, it is the old pride, and on our side it is the old helplessness. Woe to the conquered' (80-81). After two decades trying to escape his identity as a Jewish victim, Améry finally embraces it. When he committed suicide his Auschwitz prisoner number was engraved on his tombstone.

Améry's feelings of resentment were clearly greater in 1966 than 1945. Instead of an existentialist agent he had become a primordial victim: as a Jew, as an ageing human being, and perhaps, as an author who had failed to make the leap from competent journalist to public recognition as a serious writer. By then Améry had learned to cultivate his feelings of victimhood and accept the intense discomfort they brought.

But what did he want? He recognized the absurdity of demanding that the past should be undone. Instead, his proposed solution was that the perpetrator should 'be forced to confront and experience the atrocity in a way similar to the victim. In this way the perpetrator and victim would finally stand together in suffering and, as a result, the victim would at last be released from the pain caused by his 'extreme *loneliness* ...(and)... abandonment' (70; italics in original).

This was written at a time when many ex-inmates of the camps were still alive, as were many supposedly guilty ex-Nazis, still unprosecuted. Améry's analysis operates at three levels. Firstly, there is a call for formal justice, prosecuting the guilty ones who got away. Secondly, there is a demand that those convicted of involvement in the genocide should be made to experience, in some way, the unacceptable horror they had imposed on others. By inflicting suffering on those whom they accused of causing their own misery the perpetrators would learn something about the agony they had inflicted and, at the same time, the victims could purge their resentment at being abused and then neglected. This begins to look like a call for revenge. But it is not quite that.

At the third level of Améry's analysis, the object of resentment is broadened to include not just 'the generation of the destroyers' but every member of 'the proud people'; in other words, all non-Jewish Germans. Their offense is also broadened so it includes not just torture in the camps but also the refusal to demonstrate care in succeeding decades for Germany's victims. Finally, the category of victims is widened to include not just ex-inmates of camps in the 1940s but all Jews, throughout history: 'on our side it is the old helplessness. Woe to the conquered' (80-81). This begins to look like a call for revenge on a large scale. But again it is not quite that.

As W G Sebald argues, Améry is tormented by the lost historical moment in the early 1940s when he might have battled against the oppressor with a weapon in his hand (Sebald 2004, 171). To put it another way, he was denied the satisfaction of being able to stand his ground and fight. In fact, 'his ground' was taken away when he was forced to leave his native Austria where, like Mandela, he had been a very happy country boy, feeling secure in his village.[32]

Améry's stance is that he renounces violent revenge but insists on expressing publicly his intense resentment, and letting those guilty of crimes against him feel its full force. He wants them to know what he wishes for them and for himself even if he knows it will not happen. Améry lived with his resentment and the enormous tensions it imposed upon him. Expressing his resentment may have brought a degree of alleviation, temporarily at least. But in the end he removed the tension by removing himself.[33]

Conclusion

The historical comparisons made in this paper do not demonstrate a particular theory but explore *in vivo* the workings of certain interconnected processes, mechanisms and distinctions, all related to forced social displacement. These include, for example: the formation of each individual *habitus* (or way of being, thinking and behaving) through a particular social background and set of experiences; the expression of that *habitus* in handling the dynamics of fear, sorrow and anger (perhaps modulated as anxiety, regret and resentment); the management of emotional risk and reward in relationships with family, friends and colleagues; the interplay of recognition, misrecognition and non-recognition; the implications of publicity as compared to secrecy; and the deployment of strategies for coping with forced social displacement including acceptance, reconciliation, escape, resistance, and revenge.

Each of our famous prisoners has taken a particular pathway through this complex matrix of possibilities. Each has sought at some point to reach out beyond the carousel of fear, anger and sorrow towards some kind of dispassionate rationality, either utopian or pragmatic. Let us summarise the differences between them.

Nelson Mandela publicly demonstrated his capacity to overcome fear at the treason trial in 1963 when he declared he was prepared to die for the cause of freedom. Before imprisonment, his skill as an orator had been to increase the level of anger in his audience. After his release, the same skills were used to turn his followers away from angry revenge towards rational self-strengthening through education. Subsequently, Mandela displayed pragmatism in making constructive compromises with the white interests that control South Africa's economy.

Mandela's greatest political triumph came after his release when he was able to control his followers' anger, turning them away from revenge and towards the task of helping him to build a 'new' South Africa. His prison martyrdom and personal stature made that triumph possible. Controlling fear or anger in oneself is an accomplishment but to produce the same result in a massive crowd is much more difficult. Mandela could do it.

For her part, Aung San Suu Kyi's major achievement was to overcome her followers' fear and therefore release their anger against the military regime. She did this by publicly demonstrating that she was prepared to walk through a line of armed police under threat of being shot.[34] By showing her own courage and endurance she increased theirs and gained influence over a powerful political weapon: the insurgent crowd, persistently demanding freedom. After 2011, Suu Kyi's challenge is to play the crowd's anger where necessary, with skill and sensitivity, while also extracting maximum concessions from the new quasi-civilian regime. She has to be both rational and pragmatic without losing her power base.

If Mandela moderated others' anger, and Suu Kyi conquered others' fear, Wilde became the champion of sorrow. As we have seen, in *De Profundis* Wilde discovered sorrow with a kind of joy. He hoped to use it to strengthen his analysis of the world and himself. His ambition was to evoke these insights in others. However, unlike Mandela and Suu Kyi, who could align the crowd's will to their own, Wilde became the victim of the crowd, the finger-pointing public, and was constantly targeted by the press. Sorrow could not dissolve the fear that drove Wilde, once released, over the English Channel and onto the continent where he spent the rest of his life under an assumed name.

So Wilde moved from anger, through sorrow, to fear. Améry made the opposite journey: from fear, through sorrow, to anger. He finally became the siren of resentment. It is not necessary here and indeed may not be possible to evoke the terror produced by a Nazi torture chamber or the apparatus of horror at Auschwitz. Nor to explain how survival brought intense sadness and a deep sense of loss alongside visceral relief. In Améry's case, he also grieved for his missing wife, later discovered to be dead.

In spite of these potentially disabling circumstances, Améry made a recovery after the war: finding a new partner, making a career in journalism, and drafting novels. Like Wilde, as has been seen, he had a moment of optimism about the possibility of rationally restructuring society.

If, after imprisonment, Wilde suffered from 'too much' recognition, Améry felt trapped in a narrow and disregarded literary niche. Annoyance at the lack of personal recognition for his artistic talent gradually turned into resentment at the neglect of camp survivors, and finally flared up as anger at the abuse of Jews by the German nation. It turned out that his anger, put into essay form, found a large and appreciative audience.

Of our four famous prisoners, Améry is the one closest to the ordinary man or woman in the street. Unlike Wilde, Suu Kyi and Mandela, he did not originate from social circles wielding elite cultural capital and high status. He was not royal, did not study at Oxford University and had no friends in lofty political places. He had to fight harder than any of them, and against worse odds, to establish his individual identity, to be 'somebody.' And when he made it, it was, ironically, not as 'himself' but as a representative of a larger category: the Jew or the victim. No wonder he expressed bitterness.[35]

Another way of summarizing the argument made in this paper is as follows. When people have been the victims of forced social displacement, when they have been humiliated, and when they reflect seriously upon their situation, there is a central tension between two things. On the one hand, they are likely to have an urge to take revenge against their enemies or oppressors. On the other hand, they are likely to desire a transformation of the social institutions that oppressed them so that the evil and unjust behaviour that they have suffered from can abolished and eliminated, making lives much better.

In the case of Mandela and Suu Kyi, those two motivations have been held in balance. They have been able to avenge their parents' humiliation while also campaigning for democracy and human rights. It is important that whatever their dynastic concerns and their private motives, they have both been very opposed to revenge as a political strategy. Mandela did not like the way the Pan African Congress or Black Consciousness movements cultivated hatred of white people. For her part, Suu Kyi stands alongside the late Mahtma Gandhi in her own opposition to violent protest; she preaches restraint and dignity. This is not saintliness. On the contrary, it makes good sense because taking revenge invites retaliation and before long you have a feud, a revenge cycle. Then everybody loses. Revenge cycles are impossible to control, and radically unpredictable in their consequences. It makes constructive politics very difficult.

Wilde and Améry are interesting because they veer away from this compromise between revenge and reform but in opposite directions. In *De Profundis*, Wilde, who is a man very well equipped for verbal revenge, puts aside his stiletto with a beatific smile and picks up a shepherd's staff. He is ready to steer his followers towards a socialist utopia in which each person's individual genius may flourish in peace and friendship. This is the path of social reform, refusing revenge.

Compare Améry. By the mid 1960s he has had two decades of trying, and failing, to make his plan to bring enlightenment to the Germans work. Finally, with a mixture of relief and despair, he stops trying to 'do the right thing' and instead decides to tell it exactly like it is in his head. He lets it be known that he feels hurt, abandoned, lonely and resentful and he wishes he were dead, and moreover, the only thing that would reduce his unbearable inner tension would be if his tormenters were made to go through something like what he had suffered. He is not actually calling for anyone to take revenge on the German people, but almost.

These four stories of famous prisoners lead me to the following final thoughts and reflections. Forced social displacement is painful because it treats the victims of this process as being less worthy than they think they are, and denies them the respect and consideration they feel they deserve. People respond by being sorrowful, afraid and angry, to different degrees. All three emotions can be overwhelming and disabling, especially in combination. However, they can also be dynamic, a spur to analysis and action.

Sorrow confronts you with the painful contrast between what was and what is. If you have sufficient self-detachment, sorrow can stimulate reflection on the causes of your misfortune and how society and people could be reformed to stop that sort of thing from happening. Wilde and Améry both exploited their sorrow, and kept it under control, by extracting from it hopeful analyses of the future and their roles within it. Against that background, it is interesting, but perhaps not surprising, to notice how much social, political, and religious analysis was written in prison: from *St Paul's Epistles* and John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*

(Bunyan 2008) through Machiavelli's *The Prince* (Machiavelli 2003), Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, (Hitler 1969), and Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks* (Gramsci 2011), to Mandela's own *Long Walk to Freedom* (Mandela 1994).

Turning to the other two key emotions, fear can lead you to look for escape or for ways to adapt your behaviour and demeanour to avoid being victimized. Anger may make you want to strike back, even if that puts you in even greater danger. So fear and anger can move in opposite directions. How they interact with each other is crucial. There is no formula I know of that can tell us how this will work out in particular circumstances. It is an empirical question requiring further study.

Moreover, we can see that another key factor enters the scene if the person or group that suffers the degradation is well known and has a reputation, good or bad. That key factor is the public, or the crowd, or the mass media, depending on particular circumstances. The followers of Mandela and Suu Kyi were both able to call in aid the world's mass media to counterbalance and contradict the negative verdict of the apartheid regime and Burma's military junta. They became known as heroes and martyrs. Their degradation was transformed into elevation. By contrast, Oscar Wilde was not so well equipped with powerful friends. England's social establishment, the law court and the popular press all lined up against him.

Améry is the most interesting and, I think, the most important case. He belonged, or at least was allocated to, a group that was indeed well known, and it had been given a very bad reputation in Europe, most notoriously in Germany, during the 1920s and 1930s. Much more than Wilde, Améry knew that the crowd was against him. This was because he had been categorized as a Jew. There is no need to repeat his story. But, as he saw it, after the war he was left high and dry, deeply wounded and then abandoned, belonging to a group that was regarded as deserving no consideration, his personal worth and contribution completely ignored by society. The result was deep resentment and an itch for revenge that as an individual person he, Améry, was too decent and too battered by life to put into practice.

But younger, bolder and less sensitive people than Améry are being wounded, abandoned and ignored at the moment as the economic and political systems established in the West and beyond are breaking down. The rights of citizenship are being reduced and it is getting harder to claim them. This means that politicians are more interested than before in identifying groups that can be talked down and, where possible, excluded from proper consideration: immigrants, Moslems, welfare scroungers, travelers, East Europeans, and so on. Even students. This builds up resentment between the included and the excluded, deepening divisions between countries and within societies. Politicians like Hitler were experts at exploiting such feelings. Political and economic breakdown such as we have now gave them their chance.

Améry is interesting not because he is a Jew but because, unlike Mandela, Suu Kyi and Wilde he is outside the upper ranks of society. Wilde, who was a ‘gentleman gambler’ (so to speak), overplayed his hand and lost, but Améry simply did not have enough chips to get into the game. In that respect he is Everyman, resentful Everyman, and his numbers are rapidly increasing. We may not have enough Mandelas and Suu Kyis and Wildes to hold back the tide of revenge if it comes.

The danger is increased by the fact that the credit crunch and sovereign debt crisis coincide with an imminent shortage of energy resources as the world rapidly urbanizes. If that shortage becomes critical, emotions will become even more highly political. The relevant point is that even if all the oil runs out and all the world’s gas fields run dry, those who seek to rule us will still be able to tap a very powerful source of energy: the capacity of human beings to feel slow-burning anger. Politicians, journalists or demagogues speaking the language of betrayal and insult will always be able to harness people’s resentment, unleashing violent revenge cycles within and between societies whose final outcome cannot be predicted.

Bibliography

Améry, J (1980), *At the Mind’s Limit. Contemplations by a survivor on Auschwitz and its realities*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press; translated by Sidney Rosenfeld and Stella P. Rosenfeld; originally published in 1966.
Améry, J (1994), *On Aging. Revolt and resignation*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press; translated by John D Barlow.
Améry, J (1999), *On Suicide. A discourse on voluntary death*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
ASEAN Inter-parliamentary Myanmar Caucus (AIMC), 2005, *Daw Aung San Suu Kyi An Icon, Inspiration and Unifier for Peace A Tribute & Call for Freedom on her 60th Birthday,* Kuala Lumpar, Malaysia: ASEAN
19 June 2005
Aung San Suu Kyi (2010), Letters From Burma, London: Penguin, with an introduction by Fergal Keane; originally published in 1996.
Bunyan, J (2008), Pilgrim’s Progress, Oxford: Oxford University Press; originally 1678.
Elias, N (1997), *The Germans. Power struggles and the development of habitus in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries*, Cambridge: Polity.
Ellman, R (1987), *Oscar Wilde*, London: Hamish Hamilton.
Heidelberger-Leonard, I (2010), *The Philosopher of Auschwitz. Jean Améry and living with the Holocaust*, London: I B Taurus; translated by Anthea Bell.
Gramsci, (2011), Prison Notebooks [1929-35], New York: Columbia University Press.
Hitler, A (1969), *Mein Kampf/My Struggle*, London: Pimlico, translated by Ralph Manheim; originally published in 1925-6.
Holland, M and Hart-Davis, R (2000), *The Complete Letters of Oscar Wilde*, London: Fourth Estate.
Kalekin-Fishman, D and Denis, A (2010), *The Shape of Sociology for the Twentieth Century. Tradition and Renewal*, London: Sage.
Levi, P (1988) *If This is a Man/The Truce*, London: Abacus; translated by S Woolf.
Levi, P (1989), *The Drowned and the Saved*, London: Abacus; translated by R Rosenthall

Machiavelli, N (2003) The Prince, London: Longman; originally published in 1532.
Mandela, N (1995), *Long Walk to Freedom*, 2 vols, London: Abacus; originally published in 1994.
Meredith, M (1997), *Mandela. A Biography*, London: Simon and Shuster
Naw, A (2002), *Aung San and the Struggle for Burmese Independence*, Seattle: University of Washington Press.
Pearson, C H (1893), *National Life and Character. A Forecast*, London: Macmillan.
Remarque, Erich Maria (1970), *All Quiet on the Western Front*, London: Heinemann; originally published in 1929.\
Scheler, M (1994), *Ressentiment*, Ashland, OH: Marquette University Press; originally published in 1913.
Sebald, W G (2004), *On the Natural History of Destruction*, London: Penguin, translated by Anthea Bell; originally published in 1999.
Smith, D (2006), *Globalization. The Hidden Agenda*, Cambridge: Polity
Smith, D (2010), 'Social fluidity and social displacement', *Sociological Review*, 58, 4, December, 680-98.
Smith, D (2012), 'Dimensions of world-making: thoughts from the Caspian Sea' in Kalekin-Fishman and Dennis 2012, 113-33.
Steinberg, D (2010), *Burma/Myanmar. What everyone needs to know,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wilde, O (1963), *The Works of Oscar Wilde,* London: Spring Books
Wintle, J (2007), *Perfect Hostage. Aung San Suu Kyi, Burma and the generals*, London: Arrow

The Author

Dennis Smith is emeritus professor of sociology at Loughborough University and the author of several books including G*lobalization. The Hidden Agenda, The Rise of Historical Sociology, Norbert Elias and Modern Social Theory, Zygmunt Bauman. Prophet of Postmodernity, Conflict and Compromise. Class Formation in English Society 1830-1914, The Chicago School. A Liberal Critique of Capitalism*, and *Barrington Moore. Violence, Morality and Political Change*. He has been editor of *Current Sociology* and co-editor of *Sociological Review*.

---

[1] Main sources to be cited are as follows: Ellmann 1987, Wilde 1963 (for Wilde), Heidelberger-Leonard 2010, Améry 1980 (for Améry), Mandela 1995 (for Mandela), and Aung San Suu Kyi 2010, Wintle 2007 (for Aung San Suu Kyi).
[2] Reprinted in Wilde 1963 as 'The critic as artist', Wilde 1963, 857-898.
[3] Reprinted in Wilde 1963 915-36.
[4] Part of the story can be followed in Holland and Hart-Davis 2000
[5] Reprinted in Wilde 1963, 755-824.
[6] See Améry 1994, Améry 1999.
[7] See, for example, Naw 2002.
[8] See *http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b012402s*
[9] Heidelberger-Leonard 2010, 54-6.
[10] See Mandela 1995, vol 2, 277-87.
[11] In a longer piece it would be possible to go into important topics neglected here such as relations between the Burman majority and Burmese ethnic minorities such as the Karins. For a useful primer, see Steinberg 2010.

---

[12] See 'China behind Myanmar's course shift' by Bertil Lintner, *Asian Times*, 19 October 2011 (at http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Southeast_Asia/MJ19Ae03.html) and 'What Thein Sein promised Suu Kyi' in *Asian Times* 30th September 2011 (at *http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Southeast_Asia/MI30Ae01.html*

[13] For example, her 'letters from Burma' (Aung San Suu Kyi 2010) were originally published in the Japanese newspaper *Mainichi Daily News.*

[14] See, for example, Meredith 1997, 480-94, chapter 6 entitled 'The loneliest man'; also Wintle xxviii-xxix.

[15] Heidelberger-Leonard 2010, 47-9.

[16] These responses are explored in more detail in Smith 2006. See also Smith 2010, Smith 2012.

[17] Wintle 2007, 151-2.

[18] It is worth mentioning that Améry also lost his father at an early age. Paul Maier (1883-1917) was a commercial representative till he joined the Tyrolean Kaiserjåger regiment of the Austrian army. He died in 1917 when Améry was five. Wilde's father, Sir William Wilde, a doctor and a nationalist like his wife, died in 1876 when his son was 22 years old.

[19] For her videoed speech on this occasion, and others, see http://uscampaignforburma.org/speeches-of-daw-aung-san-suu-kyi/

[20] See Wintle 2007, 164-221.

[21] Aung San Suu Kyi did experience prison, as distinct from house arrest, for a short while in 2003. Wintle 2007, 412-7.

[22] 'While the junta had said numerous times she was free to leave the country to "be with her husband and children" it was clear that she would not be allowed to return to Myanmar were she to do so.' AIMC 2005, 11.

[23] Mandela 1995, vol 2, 220-2.

[24] See Ellman 1987, 450-73.

[25] Heidelberger-Leonard 2010, 55-72.

[26] Heidelberger-Leonard 2010, 22-6, 30-40.

[27] See also Améry's essay 'On the necessity and impossibility of being a Jew' in Améry 1980, 82-101.

[28] Heidelberger-Leonard 2010, 43-4, 56-9, 73-8.

[29] Heidelberger-Leonard 2010, 142-3, 150.

[30] Heidelberger-Leonard 2010, 77. The quotations from Améry's in this paragraphs are taken from Heidelberger-Leonard 2010, 80-84.

[31] See Levi 1988, Levi 1989.

[32] See Améry's essay 'How much home does a person need?' in Améry 1989, 41-61.

[33] Améry's 'resentment' seems to stand somewhere between ressentiment (Scheler 1994) and resentment.

[34] See Wintle 2007, 310-14.

[35] See, for example, Améry 1980, 82-101.