

## WORKING NOTE.

1. The primary task (purpose, *raison d'être* ) of, what I shall refer to as, the 'Cause' has been up to this point in time clear. It has been to fight for freedom. There will be various formulations of this but this is the 'message' which touches the heart, so to speak. It is a primary task that engages the emotions.
2. This has been a consciously defined primary task which can be argued for using historical, political and religious justification. This is overlaid with moral imperatives. So there develops, over time, a well-rehearsed set of arguments which will always stand despite any evidence that they may be based on false premises. Or that any arguments contrary have validity. The arguments become solidified into mind sets that determine beliefs, attitudes and behaviour.
3. What has to be emphasised, in order to understand, that the primary task of the Cause engages people as much emotionally as intellectually - in fact, it would be near impossible to disentangle these. The same applies for those who are against the Cause.
4. What happens is that the leadership - which will not be contained in one person, necessarily - is able to use both the conscious and unconscious of the minds of their followers to sustain their position. There is a sense in which this capacity makes them near invincible, i.e., because they have a cause which can be supported both by the conscious and unconscious of the mind. The real stress, danger and fear that the situation engenders resonates with the psychotic anxieties which every individual carries unconsciously. Psychotic anxieties are primitive ones of fear of annihilation which every single adult carries from infancy. The membership of the Cause and all the other groups which are against the Cause have become social systems of defence against the anxiety of real political fears and psychotic anxieties. The two resonate with each other.
5. The leadership can only have authority and the power to back that authority if they have a followership which gives their authority. This authority of the followers is the key element, in my view. And, I am saying, that the authority of the followers is as powerful as one will ever experience because it is grounded in both the conscious and unconscious mind.
6. The function of the leadership of the Cause is to give the followership reasons for their fight. The fight has a psychotic element to be sure - but this is the power of the unconscious - and is, therefore, not open to reasonable questioning. The same applies to non-Cause groups.
7. For all this to be sustained the 'enemy' has to act like one. Killing has to be made not just justifiable but moral.
8. If the enemy attempts to make for peace, and has some success because the people in the environment want it, the powerful conscious-unconscious rationale of



the Cause begins to be shaky and, certainly, less easy to sustain.

9. The shifts required of the leadership may be too much for their unconscious make-up to support. They are left then to continue the belief that the basic assumption of the Cause is to fight and not to take flight from that. The followership who have made themselves dependent on the leadership will try to follow but by their role they cannot have the same commitment, otherwise they would be the leaders.

10. If the leadership are to change to fit in with the changes in the environment they have to reformulate their primary task; otherwise they are left continuing to hold a fight posture which, in time, less and less followers can support.

11. If the subject in the environment is peace, the leadership of the Cause have to be able to be seen to be the initiators in this; otherwise they lose face and credibility as righteous people.

12. There is a sense in which they have to change the dependency of their followers for fight into a dependency for what, technically, I would call a basic assumption of Oneness, i.e., that all are together. This would be a transitional phase before leading into a process that was much more reality orientated.

13. In short: if the state of the environment changes, the leadership of the Cause has to change its direction. If it continues in fight mode, it will lose the support of its constituency in time, though there will always be a hard core of, what could be called, psychopaths.

14. Whether the leadership can do this is open to question. I argued previously that the leadership of the Cause, and I now add the non-Cause groups, to sustain itself has to take up the paranoid-schizoid position and maintain that mental disposition, i.e., 'splitting' the world of other people into 'good' and 'bad'. Now they are part of the media - the film that made for peace - and what is interesting here is that the leadership can enjoy a public narcissism which, hitherto, has been exercised in private. The point is that narcissistic leadership goes with the paranoid-schizoid culture by which the Cause is sustained. Again, this applies to non-Cause groups.

15. To shift, the leadership of the Cause will have to take up the depressive position which is the one that is held when the world is seen as not being perfectly split into good and bad aspects, when other groups are understood to be both good and bad, to be both right and wrong at one and the same time.

16. The depressive position is the one of maturity when individuals recognise that they have conflicts as part of their mental make-up.

17. My working hypothesis is that the sooner a structure is established for formally managing the resources and conditions for the people to have the experience of creative living - political, economic and spiritual security - the sooner the leadership



of all the interested parties will get into the depressive position and the more hope there is of peace for everyone. What I have in mind here is of locating all the conflict in one body where all the factions are represented. Should the followers continue the fight on the ground, so to speak, the leaders are present to each other for guilt to be acknowledged and reparation to be made. Not to have this feeling would result in the formal structure breaking up which everyone would know would mean that the future was hopeless. And, in time, few would want that. The latent function of the structure, whatever it is called, is to contain the conflict. The manifest purpose is to create a community for the people to be mentally healthy so that differences are tolerated, even celebrated. The stated purpose would be stated in a simpler way.

18. The key is to provide conditions for the leadership to move from the paranoid-schizoid position to the depressive one. Then they can begin to think if only of the consequences of their behaviour,

Gordon to BD  
written in run up  
to 94 cessation.

94

Dated as 18/Aug/94  
see copy in Walter  
file.



## WORKING NOTE.

18 August 1994.

1. The primary task (purpose, *raison d'être*) of, what I shall refer to as, the 'Cause' has been up to this point in time clear. It has been to fight for freedom. There will be various formulations of this but this is the 'message' which touches the heart, so to speak. It is a primary task that engages the emotions.
2. This has been a consciously defined primary task which can be argued for using historical and political justification. This is overlaid with moral imperatives. So there develops, over time, a well-rehearsed set of arguments which will always stand despite any evidence that they may be based on false premises. Or that any arguments contrary have validity.
3. What has to be emphasised, in order to understand, that the primary task of the Cause engages people as much emotionally as intellectually - in fact, it would be near impossible to disentangle these.
4. What happens is that the leadership - which will not be contained in one person, necessarily - is able to use both the conscious and unconscious of the minds of their followers to sustain their position. There is a sense in which this capacity makes them near invincible, i.e., because they have a cause which can be supported both by the conscious and unconscious of the mind.
5. The leadership can only have authority and the power to back that authority if they have a followership which gives their authority. This authority of the followers is the key element, in my view.
6. The function of the leadership of the Cause is to give the followership reasons for their fight. The fight has a psychotic element to be sure - but this is the power of the unconscious - and is, therefore, not open to reasonable questioning.
7. For all this to be sustained the 'enemy' has to act like one. Killing has to be made not just justifiable but moral.
8. If the enemy attempts to make for peace, and has some success because the people in the environment want it, the powerful conscious-unconscious rationale of the Cause begins to be shaky and, certainly, less easy to sustain.
9. The shifts required of the leadership may be too much for their unconscious make-up to support. They are left then to continue the belief that the basic assumption of the Cause is to fight and not to take flight from that. The followership who have made themselves dependent on the leadership can only follow.
10. If the leadership are to change to fit in with the changes in the environment they have to reformulate their primary task; otherwise they are left continuing to hold a fight posture which, in time, less and less followers can support.
11. If the subject in the environment is peace, the leadership of the Cause have to



be able to be seen to be the initiators in this; otherwise they lose face.

12. There is a sense in which they have to change the dependency of their followers for fight into a dependency for what, technically, I would call a basic assumption of Oneness, i.e., that all are together. This would be a transitional phase before leading into a process that was much more reality orientated.

13. In short: if the state of the environment changes, the leadership of the Cause has to change its direction. If it continues in fight mode, it will lose the support of its constituency in time, though there will always be a hard core of, what could be called, psychopaths.

14. Whether the leadership can do this is open to question.

POL35/343(7)

*Los Jameos Playa* \*\*\*\*\*

Seaside Hotel Lanzarote

Gordon Lawrence  
to B.D.

Another copy is in  
the 94 file.

Seaside Hotels -  
on the Sunny Side

Seaside Resort Hotels Gran Canaria: Palm Beach - Sandy Beach - Residencia Maspalomas

Lanzarote: Los Jameos Playa - Seaside Business Hotels: Residenz Hotel Chemnitz - Parkhotel Leipzig