

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Trauma and Ethical Infractions: Interrogating Kapinsky in Christiaan Barnard's the *Donor*

Omobowale, E.B.

Professor, Department of Literature and Medical Humanities,
University of Ibadan, Nigeria

Adeniranye, A.C.

Postgraduate Student, Department of Literature and Medicine,
University of Ibadan, Nigeria

Abstract:

At the foundation of all human action are psychic structures, pleasant and unpleasant, that determine the actions of individuals. Trauma is a reality of the psychological content of many and could be suffered by both the perpetrator and victim of traumatising actions. Barnard presents the connection between trauma and professional ethical infraction through the character of Kapinsky in The Donor. The traumatic experiences of Kapinsky are rooted in the fear of the loss of intimacy and the death drive arising from the death of his parents, his helplessness and powerlessness at the moment of the occurrence, the defeat of Adolf Hitler and the German nation and the self-imposed guilt that Kapinsky encumbered himself with. Through the knowledge he gained as a medical doctor with specialty in biomedical research, he flouted ethical principles governing research by creating a half human, half ape in a clandestine move to pour his rage on the world through which he intends to avenge his parents and complete the German project. Dr. Barnes, his research mate also committed ethical infraction occasioned by motivated blindness and their inability of their 'should' selves to put their 'want' selves in check. This study presents a critical analysis of the work of one of the most important cardiothoracic surgeons and also physician-writer who has literary works have not enjoyed much critical attention.

Keyword: Trauma, psychoanalysis, ethical infraction, motivated blindness

1. Introduction

Traumatic experiences in childhood and even adulthood do have far-reaching effects on the psyche of individuals. They control their perception of life and shape their reactions to future occurrences. This has devastating outcomes both on the personal psyche of sufferers or on the society. It leads sufferers who are professional medical personnel to commit unethical practices. This has formed the focus of many literary works and has enjoyed scholarly reviews and critical analysis. However, the works of physician-writers who represent their first-hand experiences which these clinical issues in their works have not enjoyed much scholarly attention, especially those from the African continent. This study will examine the representations of traumatic experiences and how it led to unethical practices in the character of Kapinsky as portrayed by Christiaan Barnard in *The Donor*. Kapinsky is a traumatised character in the text who committed professionally unethical practices as a result of his experiences; this informed the choice of Kapinsky for the analysis. In order to achieve this, the study will rely on Freudian psychoanalysis with some insight from Tyson Lois (2006). The study will interrogate the source of Kapinsky's trauma, the manifestations of his traumatic experiences, the unethical infractions these experiences birth among others. Data will be gathered from the text and be subjected to literary analysis as a means of providing answers to the questions that this study aims to answer.

2. Trauma

Understanding the modes of operation of the human brain, even with years of researches, still leaves dark areas that the minds of psychologist are yet to come to terms with fully. The human psyche or the mind is unfathomably deep being the seat of both the conscious and unconscious content of the human psyche; it is also the foundation of conflict both intra and interpersonal because even inter-personal conflicts arise as a result of the physical interactions of man which have their roots in the mental processes of the persons involved in the conflict. Psychologist have identified that the human mind is in a constant flux; in a constant state of conflict arising from the mental disagreement caused by his desires to do things which society or the 'symbolic order' forbid because they are considered as either anti-social and against the social or cultural norms of the society. Another avenue for conflict to seethe into the psyche is through the hurt caused by some unpleasant experiences in the past. This usually leads to some forms of traumatic experiences for the person having such childhood or adult experiences.

The American Psychological Association defined trauma as being the psychological response, of an emotional form, which a person has to an event which his/her psyche interprets and accepts as being extremely negative and which

leaves him/her with feeling of hurt. Though trauma is normal, it can severely tamper with the ability of anyone experiencing it to live a normal life or integrate into the society in ways that are considered acceptable. Such mental state can lead people having them to become social or mental rebels. It can lead to other psychic imbalances which may require professional attention or death in the extreme. Common events that lead to trauma in people include injury, death, rape, loss of a loved one, and experiencing an act of violence, either as a victim or as a forced participant. Emotions of anger, denial, sadness, mood swings, anxiety and disorientation are symptomatic of traumatised person. Events leading to trauma happen consciously but the human mind can unconsciously slide into a state of trauma even when the one that experienced it has not consciously planned to be in the state. Once a mind is in this state, the human psyche, based on the nature of the person experiencing it develops strategy for handling the traumatic experiences in ways compatible with the psychological realities of the person's mind. Esther Giller (1999) defines trauma from this personal angle. She notes that 'an individual's *subjective experience* determines whether an event is or is not traumatic' (emphasis in original). This means that an event, an accident may be traumatic for a person while another may not consider an accident to be traumatic. She also pointed out that for the experience to be termed traumatic, it must overwhelm the individual's ability to integrate his/her emotional experiences and, relying on Pearlman and Saaktvitne (1995), it must threaten his/her life and constitute harm to sanity of mind.

In this part of the study, the experiences of Dr. Louis Kapinsky would be examined with a view to interrogating his traumatic experiences, its cause(s) and how he negotiated through the traumatic experiences using his medical knowledge as researchers. He was involved in a joint with Dr. Barnes research aimed at discovering methods of fighting organ rejection and achieving tissue compatibility when organs are transplanted into humans through their works on genetic engineering, some forms of cloning and other frontiers of medical knowledge.

3. Psychological Reading of the Donor

Christiaan Neethling Barnard is a South African physician-writer and cardiothoracic surgeon. He performed the world's first successful human-human heart transplant operation on 3rd December, 1967. This gave him a universal celebrity status. He brings his professional knowledge to bare on his literary practice in his novels like his autobiography *One Life*, *The Unwanted* and others. He was born in 1922 and died on 2nd September, 2001. *The Donor* is the story of Dr Barnes and Dr. Kapinsky, two brilliant medical doctors with research interest in biomedicine. Dr. Kapinsky has secret research in his laboratory. He injected his sperm into a baboon which he calls Mrs. Kapinsky. The aim of his research is to create a superhuman race in line with the objective of Adolf Hitler which led to Holocaust. Kapinsky's father, a German soldier worked at the concentration camp so he too 'worked' there for a while. Mrs. Kapinsky is later delivered of Josef the half human, half ape baby through caesarean section which was carried out by the black laboratory attendant. Kapinsky later killed him in order to maintain the secrecy of 'the project.' He developed a father-son relationship with Josef and Josef to murder a man. Kapinsky got extra fund for his research from his sado-masochistic sexual escapade and died during one of the orgies. Josef witnessed the scene and thinking that the woman was trying to kill his 'father', he kills her and also his father as the chain around Kapinsky's neck tightened. Josef did not understand that his father derives pleasure from it.

At the beginning of the story, the omniscient narrator brought the reader into contact with Dr. Barnes at the prison where he had gone to remove the heart of a prisoner who had been sentenced to death by hanging. Dr. Kapinsky was introduced to the reader after Barnes returned with the heart. Barnes will remove the heart and bring it to the hospital where it will be transplanted into a baboon to see if the animal's immune system will fight the newly transplanted organ, leading to a rejection or if it will accept it. In specific terms, the research was meant, primarily, to create more donor hearts (Donor, 36) in order to solve the problem of insufficient heart donor which usually leads to the death of patients who die before getting donor. Another problem this will solve is the problem of rejection (Donor, 32) which was a major problem in the temporal setting of the text. The research will discover ways by which organs could be kept alive and healthy even in cases of long-term storage. The donor hearts which they have secured necessary authorisation will be sourced from convicted prisoner after they would have been pronounced both legally and mentally dead. Their work is to keep the organs of the dead prisoners alive till it will be transplanted into a recipient. Barnes's interest in the influence of the nervous system and particularly the brain was ignited by Kapinsky's work. He had grafted a second head on a dog and after the operation, both heads functioned and were quite 'conscious of their environment.' Barnes knew that there was 'no scientific base for the experiment but Kapinsky had persuaded him that it was important to know if it's technically possible to transplant a second head onto a healthy dog without damage to the donor animal's brain' (Donor, 25).

This is the first inkling the readers gets about the kind of mind or scientist that Kapinsky might be or would be. A dog with two heads, created just to satisfy his curiosity sounds odd and must have looked very strange as evidenced by the reaction of the head of Medical School's Division of Surgery, JJ Kemble when they showed him the animal. He does not 'share their enthusiasm' about the two-headed dog and advised Barnes, as the one in charge to stop it. If Kemble covertly endorsed the experiment, Prof. Thomas was unrepentantly and clearly against whatever it was they were doing and did not mince words in telling them. However, apart from this, every other information about Kapinsky is professional but in carrying out his professional duties, Kapinsky always betrays some emotions and these became pointers to some probably deep psychological issues he was battling. Prof. Thomas threatened to stop them from doing whatever they were doing: 'Mark my words. One of these days you'll see female baboons giving birth to God knows what, perhaps even human babies. Whatever they're doing, I'll stop them. *I'll stop them.*' He had said this to JJ who he accused of keeping quiet while Barnes and Kapinsky commit their evils in the name of research. The unveiled and emphatic threat did not sit well with Kapinsky. When Thomas confronted Kapinsky with some information that he considers too specific about his sensitive and highly classified research, the narrator informed that Kapinsky cursed him under his breath and 'for a moment, Kapinsky was

'shocked back to childhood expletives.' He marked Thomas as 'dangerous' and spoke to himself, almost in a whisper, 'I have killed before. If you get in the way you bastard, I will kill you. Nothing and nobody get in the way of the project' (Donor, 69). Kapinsky reported Thomas to Barnes and threatened to 'put the bugger down' if he had to. Even Barnes was shocked because he confessed that he had never seen him that upset. Kapinsky's utterance throws up some questions in the mind of the reader. When did he kill? He had not killed anyone up to that time in the story. Why did he kill? Who did he kill? And what is 'the project' that nobody must get in its way? What is the project that he was ready to kill for? This incident also underscores some form of rebellion on the part of Kapinsky but why could this be?

Since the killing is not in the present, the only place to search for it is in the past. During one of the sessions to map out the plan for their research ward for the 'living dead' (their term for the dead people they hope to keep alive in order to preserve their organs as Donors), Barnes said, 'these patients will be nothing more than living corpses' (Donor, 107). The phrase 'living corpses' must have sparked some memories and immediately, Kapinsky had a flashback to his childhood. Lois Tyson in *Critical Theory Today* (2006) opines, in line with Freudian psychoanalysis, that every human has individual psychological history that forms the background of his actions as an adult. She believes that this history has its foundations in experiences of the child in the family. For Tyson, this is the foundation of the human unconscious in the opinions of Sigmund Freud and other psychoanalyst. Kapinsky's father was Wilhelm Kapsius, a Nazi doctor who worked in the annihilation camp in Auschwitz. He took part in the Nazi experiments and also in the 'healing by killing.' Kapinsky was 14 then. He would spend time listening to his father's narration of how they kill people and 'he was proud of his father' (Donor, 108). These stories made their marks on his teenage mind. Even when he was at home, he saw the smoke from the chimney of the crematorium. In a psychoanalytical sense, the smoke for him was a sign not only of his father's hardwork and commitment to the German agenda but also a sign of German conquest. The flames became symbols of the purification of the German soul. He was told, and believed, that some races are not fit to live. This was the basis upon which he related with blacks who worked with him in the laboratory as cleaners. He loved the whole German project and was proud of his father for being in the forefront of this. His father has become his object of admiration. Arising from this, he asked his father to allow him visit the camp. Wilhelm must have seen this as sign of readiness to join the project. He did not object; he sought and got the permission to bring his son to visit.

At this stage, Kapinsky became a metaphor for the next generation of German conquerors. He conceived himself as one of the people to carry on the German project after the generation of his father. This was the intention of those who granted the permission and his father's. If there was any doubt about this intention at this time, what he was made to do afterwards clear all doubts, he was allowed to select those to die, as a teenager! He suddenly had the power to determine life and death. This childhood experience must have unconsciously conditioned his choice of profession a field that allowed him to continue to do what he had a sense of loss about. Those chosen to die were given pills to take after which they died. Lodewick was allowed to see them die and he enjoyed it. For four years, he was allowed to play God at that level. His choice of career also reconnects him with that loss he felt. With his specialization in his profession, he could not only create babies but also determine the type. It allowed him to experiment with different forms of life. In 1945 when the Russian overran the camp, his parents were rounded up with others and hanged without trials. His father's last words always echo inside him, 'I die as a German officer who served his fatherland, *Heil Hitler*.' His parent's death was very tragic and traumatic for him but as painful as it was what heightened his sadness, sense of loss and his traumatic experience was the way they died, not only in the practical sense but in that they died without achieving the goal, without winning. He believed that winning is the difference between being a victor and a criminal. Unfortunately, his parents became 'criminals because they didn't win' (Donor, 110; emphasis mine). During his visit to the camp where he lived his childhood, he saw no physical monument to his parents, no grave, no tombstone. There were no German names on the plaques because they were 'criminals.' He knew things would have been different if they had won. He cuts the picture of a lonely man here and even the narrator described him as, 'the man standing alone as he relived his childhood days with secrets deep in his heart turned round and walked away' (Donor, 111). This sense of guilt he felt at the death of his parents was renewed and his trauma, relived. Jay B. Frankel quoting Ferenczi (1932: 171) agrees with Ferenczi's opinion that 'What is traumatic is the unforeseen, the unfathomable, the incalculable...Unexpected, external threat, the sense of which one cannot grasp, is unbearable.' Kapinsky witnessed the height of the German rule and could not have envisaged the fall of the Fuhrer or his father who determines who lives or dies in the concentration camp could be killed by hanging. The helplessness of his parents in death and his own powerlessness heightened his trauma. Ferenczi argues that a traumatised child will find an escape route from his unexpressed emotions which could be of anger by displaying stupidity on defiance and may seek revenge on the perceived aggressor. Kapinsky's choice was muffled aggression as a young boy while he gathers knowledge and power to avenge his parents and nation until he could display his social and professional defiance which comes to a peak at the height of success of 'the project' and at the point he started unleashing Josef, his superhuman creation. Through the character of Kapinsky, Barnard present trauma from the perspective of the perpetrator which Kapinsky is, considering his acts in the camp. StepanianSevana (2019: 6) quoting McGlothlin (2010) noted that scholars are divided on whether the perspective of the perpetrator should be portrayed especially on the holocaust. While some feel it should not be because it, they should not be given a voice on the ground that have imposed voicelessness on their victims, others argue that by not examining their views, they are made 'mythical figures' and this makes it difficult to account for their torturous escapades. Sevana concludes that by overlooking the perpetrator's trauma, we miss the foundation of their present violence. This lends credence to the focus on Kapinsky's trauma in this present study.

Tyson refers to the fear of intimacy as one of the core issues in psychoanalytic criticism. It can function as a defence and a motivator. Fear of intimacy is an overwhelming feeling that being emotional close to people will adversely affect us and what we stand for. It also gives the conviction that keeping an emotional or mental distance from others is the

best way to be safe and focused. This is the golden rule for Kapinsky, he was a lonely man and was only physically and emotionally close to those he needs to achieve the project: Barnes for his professional experiences and Susan Bates because he sees her as a conduit for him to raise the money needed for the project but what is 'the project?' The project took off from his childhood traumatic experience from the loss of both parents by hanging. On his visit discussed above and after concluding that his parent status, as a criminal, was because they did not win, the narrator informs us of his intentions, 'I must be successful, vowed Kapinsky. I must be a winner in memory of my father and mother, and of the German race' (Donor, 112). That is 'the project' he had referred to many times in the text; the project for which he was ready to kill and eventually killed; the project which nothing must stand in its way but how was he going to achieve such a monumental task?

In one of his many intra-personal discussions where he strategizes and re-strategizes on what he has to do, he thought about how upset Barnes would be if any of his cleaners got to discover what he was doing and he had to kill him. 'Barnes would be bloody upset, of course, but he was determined to let nothing stand in the way of his ultimate goal. To create a super race? That had been the Fuhrer's goal before he was thwarted by the communist monster' (Donor, 168). His goal and the mention of 'the Fuhrer' in one breathe reveals how deep seated Kapinsky's childhood memories and fantasies are in him and how they are the driving force behind all his actions, his loneliness, his death drive and his opinion of people. His was a highly racially prejudiced man, the blacks were vermins of the earth. His hatred for the communist also stems from this cauldron of childhood experiences. 'The Fuhrer' is another referent for Adolf Hitler who wanted to create a 'super race.' Everything Kapinsky and his father did in the camp was in a bid to help achieve Hitler's goal. However, his father's failure, and by extension his own as a child, haunted him and created a sense of guilt in him. His determination to carry on with the goal and achieve it becomes an avenue for him to readdress this and ensures he succeeds at it for the sake of his parents. It was also the drive to clear his parents name as criminals, specifically to himself. Winning changes things, even referents. If he wins, his parents become winners and Hitler's failed goal of creating a super German race would have been achieved. The mental weight of 'the project' on Kapinsky could not have broken him more. The weight was paternal and maternal, personal, generational and racial.

An enormous and rebellious task like this requires stealth, tact, and focus. Consequently, when an uncle smuggled him into London where he was educated as a Polish refugee, LodewickKapsius changed his name to Louis Kapinsky and he never discussed his background with even his friends. A comparative analysis of his name and his father's reveals that the change of name was not done randomly or haphazardly; it was meticulously and carefully thought out. His choice of name reveals his zeal to psychologically reconnect with his father and the ideals he stood and died for. It was designed to be a constant reminder of a task ahead. 'Kapinsky' is more of a pun on Kapsius and Lodewick and Louis start with the letter 'L'. The name Lodewick is of German origin and mean 'famous warrior.' This even reveals that unconsciously, his father knew that the gauntlet was going to fall on Kapinsky going by this name. This must have also informed his readiness to allow him into the camp where he witnessed, participated and enjoyed the mass murder of men, women and children in the name of some form of ethnic cleansing. The name 'Louis' also is of French and German origins and it also means 'famous warrior.' So, in changing his name, Kapinsky ensured that he was able to fly below the radar without changing the essence of the name. The choice of 'Kapinsky' also helps to veil his sadness and loneliness in his trauma, at least for someone who doesn't know him well. The name sounds funky and cool but these words only stand in the opposite side of what he represents. With the choice of these new names, his initials still remained 'L.K.' The new nomenclature serves Kapinsky's purposes in several ways: he was able to hide his identity as a German but of utmost importance to him was that it became a constant reminder of his father such that each time anyone calls him, it became a reminder of his father's goals, and by extension, the German project. It also provided some answer to why he behaves the way he did as an adult.

Another pointer to Kapinsky's trauma is his death drive which is founded on his past experiences that generated a constant fear of betrayal, apparently a product of his lack of trust. In a case of Freudian slip, a process through which some of the repressed content of the unconscious, apart from dreams, do find expression in our physical lives, Kapinsky confessed to Barnes, 'my only weakness, or perhaps it's a strength, is that I do not trust anybody' (Donor, 300). This lack of trust is also responsible for the fear of intimacy, fear of abandonment, fear of betrayal and low self-esteem that ruled his life. His inability to trust translates into his lack of intimacy manifested in the life of a loner that he lived throughout the story. Nobody was his friend even Barnes was just a research mate. His parents' death left him with a sense of abandonment; he expressed this by consciously denying himself of any form of intimacy to anyone except those that are important for the achievement of the ultimate goal.

Kapinsky's fear of intimacy transcended intimacy with humans. Tyson noted that 'our fear of death, of losing our life, can result in our fear of being intimately attached to life' (p. 23). However, for Kapinsky the fear of death which is a form of loss is the fear of the loss of victory. The only thing he is afraid of is failing or the project being discovered before that project is fulfilled, because it will bring failure. His fear of death leads him to fear of life. Tyson interprets this as the fear to live one's life because the fear of loss makes living so hurtful. Living in the sense of use here equates enjoying the thrills and frills of life as opposed to just existing. In the same case of Freudian slip mentioned above, Barnes was encouraging him to loosen up a bit and be involved socially since there was more to life than just work. He responded, 'Not for me. Before the communists killed my mother and father, I promised them that one day I would take my revenge for their deaths.' Barnes felt a chill in his spine, a popular communist had just been murdered and the police had been torch lighting the medical school for the culprit. He asked Kapinsky what he meant by revenge. Kapinsky knew he has revealed too much in the moment of mental slip and quickly covered up. 'No, not revenge in the literal sense...I mean in the sense that Kapinsky will be a name that will always be remembered' (Donor, 301). But he really meant it in the literal sense. In that slip, he also revealed the biggest content of his unconscious; he had repressed this since it happened, nursing the hurt

and planning how and when to exert his revenge not only on a person but on a group. His goal is even wider than his father's and Hitler's. Theirs had ethnic boundaries because it was defined by geographical space; Kapinsky's covers every race and once you share the ideology of the communist, you belong in Kapinsky's bad book. His victory is his way of making up for the guilt he felt at the death of his parents and ensuring the victory of the Germans. So, he has the fear of the loss of death which is the loss of victory to him because if he dies without achieving the goal, then he has lost again so he has to lose intimacy with life in order to keep himself alive to achieve the project.

Sexuality is at the core of Freudian psychoanalysis. Freud argued that sexuality is central to our identity or opinion of self. Tyson posits that in a bid to analyse sexual behaviour, the appropriate question a psychoanalyst should ask is 'do I use sex to 'purchase' something I want from my mate? Do I withhold sex to punish my mate?' and the focus should be the 'nondestructive versus destructive behaviour.' These opinions capture the realities of Kapinsky's sexual behaviour. He is only interested in sadomasochism- the act of achieving sexual pleasure or gratification from inflicting physical pain on others or receiving such pains from others. Those involved can switch from being the punisher and the punished but Kapinsky is only interested in being the punished, that's how he gets sexual gratification and this raises some curiosity. Why pain. During one of his 'sexcapades', he confessed, 'there was still the pain to come and that was the most delicious of all. Without pain he would never feel the relief. And without the relief, he would go mad. For years, it had been this way' and before one could begin to wonder what could have birth such mental state. He continued, 'first, the guilt at losing his parents, the escapades fear that someone would find out, the need of a woman who would beat him until he acknowledged his sins, and the blessed relief that would keep him sane until the next time' (Donor, 190). He gets beaten till he is unconscious at time but he still enjoys it. A question that comes to mind is 'why woman and not a man?' This reveals an aspect of his life that he had kept hidden – his mother. The only reference to her was about her capturing and eventual death by hanging, all in one sentence! She was kept and repressed in the unconscious of the story/text.

This is symbolic of her repression and that of her experience of death into Kapinsky's unconscious. It means that he felt guilty for the death of her mother, who she shares some relationship with because she was always at home with him until the age of 14 when he started going to work with his father. He carries the sin of her death on his shoulders and sought redemption in being punished for this sin. Kapinsky practised Sadomasochism; it serves a two-fold purpose for him. The punishment he receives from Susan gives him relief and a sense of atonement for the sin. It has become a good he sells at a price to Susan. Every week, after their masochistic sexcapades, he gets paid and funds the research with the money in order to complete the project. Thrice, Barnes asked to meet the unnamed sponsor of their research and for same number of times, he explains it off. Barnes knew where the funds were coming from. This self-destructive sexual behaviour was also, unconsciously, connected, to the death of his parents and his eventual demise. Ferenczi's opinion on some of the reaction of children to trauma gives the basis for Kapinsky's weird sexual behaviour. Ferenczi believes that perversions are a form of 'hysterical' reactions to trauma. to him, their foundation is in the fear the victim feels and they create a way for the traumatised to satisfy their desires without doing something frightful because at this stage any normal form of sexual interaction brings fear. For Kapinsky, the experience is sexual as it is also economic. He makes the money for the project the hard way and so must ensure that the project succeeds; his fear of loss must not come to pass. He killed both Samuel Mbeki and the nurse because they discovered his secrets and to keep the project safe, they must be 'put down.' He also died during one of the sadomasochistic episodes as one of the neck braces for holding him strangled him to death but what is 'the project?'

The reader gets the first inkling of what the project is, unsurprisingly, from Kapinsky. During one of his visits to the room housing the experimental baboons, he referred to one of them as 'Mrs. Kapinsky.' And addressed the baboon saying, 'one of these days you will give birth to our child.' That was a defamiliarization of the natural reproductive interaction amidst species, an inter-specie reproduction! In a bid to create a new breed of humans, just as was the goal of the Fuhrer, Adolf Hitler, Kapinsky injected his sperm into the ape, Mrs. Kapinsky through In-vitro fertilisation. That was what heightened his sense of failure or loss of victory, the sense of being discovered. He trained Samuel Mbeki, the black cleaner, to deliver a baby through caesarean section. Samuel had been helping with the operations on the baboon. He ran out when he saw that the creature in the baboon's womb has a half- human half ape hand. He could not wait to see the rest but he eventually started plotting to find out after he discovered that the baby was delivered, contrary to what Kapinsky told him. Kapinsky killed him by setting a trap for him using one of the apes that has a murderous rage. When the baby was born, he was indeed half human, half ape. He stands and walks like a man. Kapinsky loved him and would lock himself up with him talking to him as a way of teaching him to talk. The baby was named Josef which means that there will be addition. In numerology, people bearing the name tend to initiate event, lead rather than follow and have powerful personality. Bearer of the name 'Josef' are also believed to have the deep inner desire to inspire others to achieve a higher cause. The latter reason sits well with the overall goal of the project. He was the first in the line of a super race that Kapinsky hopes to create. Mrs. Kapinsky died during the operation. It was not clear if she was killed by Kapinsky because she was just a means to the end – Josef and this is made more confusing by the fact that he cried when she died. He injected Josef's sperm into Karen. She was Barnes's girlfriend who fell from a horse after their wedding, had a head injury and went into a coma. She was later declared dead and became the first patient in ward D7 – the ward for the living dead who would be used as donors. Barnes had given his sperm to Kapinsky for processing in preparation for insemination. The latter had exchanged his for Josef's in his bid to give his baboon half human son, a son. Josef's sperm was injected into Karen without Barnes's knowledge. Kapinsky died before he could see the result of Josef's sperm which he had exchanged for Barnes's and which was injected into Karen.

Whatever claim Kapinsky has to any form of ethicality carries a question mark because the reason for choosing that field, in the first place, was to perpetrate the evil he had in mind; the project is totally unethical so his ethical practices

were in abide to achieve the unethical end of continuing the work of the Fuhrer, of creating a superhuman race which Hitler could not conclude. Some aspects of this 'pseudoethicality' are still worthy of some consideration. The first ethical issue is around the use of animals, specifically, the apes like Baboons, Gorillas and Chimpanzees for their researches. Generally, on the use of animal subjects in research, the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki (1964) amended by its 64th General Assembly in Fortaleza Brazil in 2013, article 21 holds that '...The welfare of animals used for research must be respected.' This presupposes that animals are used in research and it is important that they are well cared for. Their research animals are well cared for, considering the fact that Kapinsky had other plans that require that the animals stay very healthy. The article above is quite generic about use of animals in researches. Specifically, they use Chimpanzees for their researches. The Institute of Medicine and National Research Council of the National Academics in their publication *Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity* (2011) assessed the use of Chimps in researches and evaluated their continued use. The publication noted that 'Chimpanzees have been used for over 100 years to model human viral, bacterial, and parasitic infections. This long history has revealed that chimpanzees are often uniquely permissive for infection with some medically important human pathogens.' (p. 93).

This underscores the importance of Chimpanzees in researches into human conditions because of their closeness to human both in their physical and biological make-up, especially in researches around genomic or genetic engineering. The committee however noted that in majority of modern studies, the use of the species is unnecessary because progress is being made to develop other options. These include 'other non-primates', 'genetically modified mice' and even silicon technology.' In this light, the use of Chimpanzee for research is not encouraged. However, they recommended that the use of Chimpanzee should be limited to researches where, there exist 'no other model', 'cannot be performed ethically on humans' and using any other specie 'will slow down or prevent important advance' in researches focused on finding a cure for 'life-threatening and debilitating' health conditions. Consequently, Kapinsky and Barnes's use of Chimpanzees is quite ethical and due permissions were sought and got from the ethics committee.

Kapinsky's secret research to birth him a mutated son which was hidden from Barnes, his research mate and unsurprisingly, from the ethics committee and Barnes's research into the possibility of pregnancy and birth is possible in brain-dead cadaveric conditions using a baboon's brain for the functions of the human brain are both unethical. As good as these researches may sound and their benefit for humans, they flouted ethical rules because they are conceived and pushed to success by selfish means. This is totally against the World Medical Association Code of Medical Ethics adopted in 1949 and amended in 2006. It expressly states that 'a physician shall not allow his/her judgment to be influenced by personal profit or unfair discrimination.' The research in reference was motivated by selfish interest. Kapinsky's used his knowledge to create a super race of being to carry to the ethics of his job. The problem that Kapinsky created will terrorise those around his house after moving to the new house with Josef. After his death, Josef could only weep but what next? The poor half human, half baboon will not know; he had relied on his father for everything. With this, Barnard raises one of the issues in bioethics. How much of control do scientists have over their creation? It highlights the tendency for creations of such researches to escape from laboratory and unleash itself on the people. Caplan recommended that scientist must build programs that will self-destruct these genetically modified creatures after some time as a way out. Bazerman and Tenbrunsel offer some insight from a behavioural angle to the ethical infraction of both Kapinsky and Barnes.

They argue in *Blindspot* (2012) that people are not as ethical as they think they are or as they may want people to believe. They posit that this happens because of the interaction between the human 'want' and 'should' selves. The latter is always in control before and after an ethical decision is taken while the latter operates at the very moment of making the ethical decision. In other words, before taking an ethical decision, people believe that when faced with an ethical decision, they will take the right ethical one because that is the one, they *should* take, that is the one the rules of ethics guiding them demands but when the time to take the decision comes, they consider other reasons that satisfy their immediate want at the decision-making moments and ends up taking a *want* decision. Let us consider this with respect to Barnes and Kapinsky. Barnes was portrayed as a disciplined doctor, highly recommended and professional. He is quite humane and patient centred. He understands and respects the medico-legal angle of the ethics guiding him as surgeon that transplants organ. He operates within the armbits of the law so it comes as a surprise when Karen's issue reveals his inability to obey the moral dimensions to his practice. He would achieve this by cautioning Kapinsky when he became uncomfortable with the secrecy around the latter's research or report him to the ethics committee. Kapinsky was also portrayed as 'a brilliant researcher' (Donor, 15) but also a very ruthless one. The reader is not shocked when his ruthless and unethical nature and decisions were revealed. But what was responsible?

Barnes's very first unethical behaviour revealed itself in his inability to pay attention to the unethical research that Kapinsky was conducting in the secret room. It was clear that he did not know that it was going on. Kapinsky had ensured that he does not know because he knew that he was going to be very mad if he discovers. That notwithstanding, there were signals constantly pointing to this secret: Prof. Thomas's accusations, Samuel's opinion and his own instincts but he did not pay attention. That comes as a surprise for a surgeon that works on the human heart, a process that takes a lot of meticulousness. If we view this through Bazerman and Tenbrunsel's prisms, we discover that Barnes suffered from what they described as motivated blindness. One of the core findings of behavioural ethics is that 'people who have a vested self-interest in a situation have difficulty approaching the situation without bias, even when they view themselves as honest' (Blindspot, 81).

Motivated blindness is a referent for situations where people fail to notice or discover other's unethical behaviour when seeing that it would or could harm the observer. If Barnes felt as strongly as he did about Kapinsky's lack of openness with the totality of the research, he should have done more to find out the truth. At the beginning of the research, if someone had hypothetically presented the situation, he found himself now (Kapinsky's secrecy) to him, he would have

trusted himself to take the ethical decision which would have been to find out the truth about it. At this stage, his 'should' self was in charge. However, faced with the situation in reality now, he could not do the ethical. Why? He has a vested self-interest. The success or otherwise of Kapinsky's research, the ones on reducing the risk of rejection in organ transplantation will affect his work and overall career. As a goal driven, career centred person that he is, he would not do anything to upset Kapinsky. He may also be afraid of him because he was a man of unstable mood. Barnes had noted that each time talks around his research comes up, 'Kapinsky [has] another lightning mood swing.' He also told Karen that he was disturbed because he knew he does not know everything about Kapinsky's research. He should know that if he was keeping secrets about the research, it cannot be for good but with all these compelling realities; he did not do anything because if Kapinsky decides to stop, it will affect the success rate of his transplants. He did not want that so he decided to look the other way. This is the point of decision and his 'want' self had overtaken the 'should' self. His immediate want, close to a person need of water or air for survival at that moment is the success of his transplants because this is the core of his own personal and professional lives.

The same reason accounts for his decision about the brain-dead Karen. If she were to be another patient in the same situation, he would demand that she be used as a donor as soon as possible and would not understand why anyone should be that emotionally attached to a brain-dead or living dead patient. He would have fancied himself to decide ethically but when the time to decide came, he suffered a conflict of interest, his want self, playing on his want, ensured he took that unethical decision. In this situation, his vested interest is two-fold; his love for Karen could not allow her go. He feared the emotional abandonment this would cause him. On the other hand, he wanted to have a child through Karen. He is the only child of the parents and his parents had always wanted a grandson. He was not going to pass the opportunity. It was very difficult for him to verbally disclose his affection to Karen, she had to help and nudge him on. Doing that again was almost unthinkable. Karen, the woman for him must bear his child. He came up with research proposal he designed just to keep Karen in ward D7 for as long as it would take for her to regain consciousness. All the researches, except his, failed!

Kapinsky also suffered motivated blindness in deciding not to stop Barnes when he discovered his plans for Karen. He had caught him having sex with the brain-dead patient but decided to keep quiet, not because of his love for any of the two but because he reasoned that he could use Karen to give Josef a son and himself a grandson. He had exchanged Barnes's sperm which he gave to him for processing at the laboratory with Josef's and that had been injected into Karen. Apparently, he did not do anything to stop him because of this vested interest. That was his immediate want which was so important to achieving the goal after the project – Josef had been successful. His first instinct was not the second option, it was to kill Karen in order to ensure that Barnes stop derailing mentally and professionally. Kapinsky ethical infractions are a product of his choice of job. His father and idol had been a doctor and could not finish the Fuhrer's goal. He was determined to continue and achieve success. This is his ultimate reason for his choice of profession so non-maleficence, as it affects saving and taking lives, counts for nothing to him. He killed Samuel Mbeki, the laboratory assistant who delivered the Baboon, Mrs. Kapinsky of Josef; he eventually 'put down' the prying Prof. Thomas, for seeing Josef when Kapinsky sent him to Susan, in order to ensure nobody knows about Josef and also killed Helen, the nurse in Ward D7 for discovering that they were using baboons head to take over the function of the brain for the patients in the ward. For him, killing is not a problem; this is not surprising considering his background and experience in Auschwitz. Kapinsky operates with a twisted mind; he was always conscious of his wants; of what he has to do. His eyes were set on the bigger picture. Even if he fancies himself to take an ethical decision, his 'want' self is constantly on the prowl.

4. Conclusion

Trauma is caused by both an event that occurred in the past and also by events that has a generation dimension to. It has an intergenerational dimension to it especially in cases of a traumatised people through forms of oppression as we find colonial brutality or forms of racism or ethnic cleansing. Trauma experiences in childhood not only survives the period; they also become platforms to launch future vengeance, aggression and other forms of psychic or physical manifestations of the repressed fear, guilt or other forms of emotional angst occasioned by the trauma. Kapinsky's anger against 'the world stems from the death of his parents, helplessness and powerlessness at the time of their death, the guilt he felt, their disappearance from the pages of history and the disconnect between their end and what he felt could have been had Germany won the war. The failure of the German race at the Hitler project became another self-imposed weight on him and the fuel towards achieving 'the project.' His traumatic experiences even as a perpetrator manifested in his rage against any perceived enemy or actual enemy and to ensure success, he committed criminal activities ranging like murder and even committed various professional ethical infractions. Becoming a doctor, in the first instance, is arguably for selfish reason and laced with ulterior motives. In Barnes and Kapinsky, we come across two medical professionals with varying levels of ethical compliance and infraction caused by the self-interest they have in their research and clinical practice. This reveals that physicians are constantly faced with taking ethical decision in their clinical interaction with people. Their ability to take ethical decision is based on their past experiences and the realities of the present situation they find themselves. Their ethical infractions were also committed in the areas where they exercise personal control more – Barnes in the Cardiology department he heads and Kapinsky in the laboratory. Barnard has employed his major characters to examine the potential threats posed to a society and individuals if physicians who are in control of the emerging frontiers of medicine decide to employ their knowledge in an egoistic manner. It also reveals the dangers of such egocentric attitude on the psychosocial wellbeing of the physicians themselves. Kapinsky died a horrible death but not until he has created something to trouble the world. He was the leash on Josef. With him out of the picture and Josef murderous rage, nobody is safe. With this Barnard has presented another perspective to the portrayal of trauma; he has presented a perpetrator's

trauma as conceived by the perpetrator and also raises arguments as to whether such scientific inventions with devastating outcomes, in the wrong hands should not have expiry date or a system to self-destruct as opined by Caplan.

5. References

- i. Barnard, C. (1996). *The Donor*. Penguin Books.
- ii. Bazerman, H. M. & Tebrunsel, E. A. (2012). *Blind spots: why we fail to do what's right and what to do about it*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- iii. Bohleber, W. (2010) *Destructiveness, intersubjectivity, and trauma. The identity crisis of modern psychoanalysis*. Karnac.
- iv. Caplan, A. L. & Arp, R. (2014). Is the deliberate induced abortion of a human pregnancy ethically justifiable? In A.L. Caplan & R. Arp. (Eds.), *Contemporary debates in bioethics*. Wileyblackwell. 105-110.
- v. Frankel, J. B. (1998). Ferenczi's trauma theory. *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 58(1), 41-61. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022522031707>.
- vi. Sevana, S. (2019). Victims, perpetrators, and implicated subjects: The effects of trauma in Sherman Alexie's *Indian Killer* and Toni Morrison's *Beloved*. [Unpublished undergraduate thesis]. University of California.
- vii. Tyson, L. (2006). *Critical theory today: A user-friendly guide* (2nd ed). Routledge
- viii. Declaration of Helsinki. (1964). World medical association www.wma.net.