

European Symbolism



By
David Wasdell

An analytic critique of the symbol construct underlying the address which Mr. Roy Jenkins delivered as President of the European Commission to the inaugural session of the European Parliament in February 1980. It seeks to increase awareness of the vital importance and significance of unconscious social processes as they are brought to bear on political strategy. It raises in acute form some of the fundamental issues underlying the Brandt Commission.

Produced By: Meridian Programme, Meridian House, 115 Poplar High Street, London E14 0AE
Hosted By: Unit for Research into Changing Institutions (URCHIN), Charity Reg. No. 284542
Web-site: www.meridian.org.uk

European Symbolism

[Some notes on the symbol construct underlying the address of Mr. Roy Jenkins, President of the European Commission, delivered to the European Parliament on 12th February, 1980, as printed in the Programme of the Commission for 1980]

The conscious and rational policies and decisions of human institutions, however simple or complex, take place within a matrix of unconscious dynamic activity. The effects of this process are normally suppressed and denied in verbal and written interchanges, and structures of management and organisation are employed in order to mitigate their effect. It is, however, clear from contemporary study of institutional behaviour, that it is the unconscious processes which dominate and largely determine the eventual decisions, policies and actions of the institution concerned. The rational aspect is increasingly seen as a rationale of the underlying dynamic.

Although this perspective has long been accepted in the world of individual psychology and has been applied in depth in certain small areas to institutional and group behaviour, there has been little serious attempt to apply it to the major political structures of contemporary society. However, modern politics increasingly has to deal with the management of change in society, rather than simply with the adjustment of the operation of a stable or steady-state, unchanging world. It is the initiation and management of change, and in particular the encounter with irrational resistance to change and its dysfunctional effects on political, social and economic action and policy, with which we are now concerned. In the condition of steady-state, unconscious dynamics are constant and largely ignored. Under conditions of change, let alone increasingly rapid change, the unconscious dynamics take on a dominant role.

Human institutions and their processes serve not only as channels for work and the management of the relationship between persons, groups, institutions, societies and environments, but also, and at the same time, are used as social defences against the emergence of psychotic anxiety, both at individual and corporate levels. Changes in institutional form and behaviour therefore raise precisely those levels of psychotic anxiety against which the institutions concerned are utilised as a defence. The field literature is now extensive, but one of the earliest and most creative attempts to address the problem was that of Elliott Jaques in his paper 'On The Dynamics of Social Structure'. He presents the hypothesis, "That one of the primary cohesive elements binding individuals into institutionalised human association is that of defence against psychotic anxiety". Change in such institutions or their behaviour is only possible when the investment of anxiety defence is withdrawn. Thus he writes,

"Change occurs when the phantasy social relations within an institution no longer serve to reinforce individual defences against psychotic anxiety..... Imposed social change which does not take account of the use of institutions by individuals to cope with psychotic anxieties of these individuals is likely to be resisted..... Changes in

social relationships and procedures call for a restructuring of relationships at the phantasy level with a consequent demand upon individuals to accept and tolerate changes in their existing pattern of defences against psychotic anxiety. Effective social change is likely to require analysis of the common anxieties and unconscious collusions underlying the social defences which determine phantasy social relationships:'

The language is difficult and technical and therefore opaque to most politicians who have had no training in the social sciences, let alone the discipline of psychoanalysis and the interpretation of institutional unconscious behaviour. The content, however, is of vital importance for our understanding of social processes at the current point in human history. In brief, the implication is that political management of change which ignores unconscious process in human institutions will, at best be impotent, and at worst catastrophically dysfunctional, engaging in policies which intensify the causes of the very effects which they seek to overcome.

It is against this background that this particular analysis of the symbols and indicators of unconscious construct underlying the European Commission is offered, in the hope that it may begin to alert those in positions of responsibility to the presence and powerful effect of the surging tides of the sea of corporate unconscious, within which they seek to swim, and over which they seek to pilot the frail craft of human political institutions in an era of turbulent social change.

* * * * *

In 1979 the new European Parliament was elected. Mr. Roy Jenkins, President of the European Commission, presented the Commission's programme to this new parliament for the first time on 12th February, 1980. His address on that occasion therefore marked an extremely important and significant juncture in the development of the political institutions of the European Economic Community. It was a baton-passing exercise, in which, at an overt level, he sought to raise the key, fundamental issues facing the parliament for the future and alert its members to the main achievements of the past. This provision of foundation and agenda at a rational and overt level is embedded within a parallel symbolic construct, providing the foundation and agenda of the unconscious process of the commission and the new parliament. Such material normally lies unnamed, but at this juncture of innovation the underlying unconscious dynamic surfaces within Mr. Jenkins' address. It emerges from the depths in little eddies of terminological symbolism, tiny pinnacles of ice, surfacing, giving indications of the sub-marine mass. There are indicators and pointers only, but they are certainly there, and their emergence provides an agenda for the urgent task of analysis of the common unconscious systems which dominate the process of the European Economic Community.

Mr. Jenkins directs the attention of the parliament to its immediate future in the words,

Page 8

'Looking ahead, we face no less than the break-up of the established economic and social order on which post-war Europe was built. The warning bells have been sounding for a decade. Bit by bit we have seen the collapse of that long period of

monetary stability founded on the Bretton Woods agreements; that process began even before the rise in oil prices in 1973. Energy price increases may not have been the only cause of our present misfortunes but they have been the main catalyst. We have built our industrial society on the consumption of fossil fuels, in particular oil, and it is now certain that if we do not change our ways while there is still time - and 1980 could be almost the last opportunity - our society will risk dislocation and eventual collapse.'

The agenda at an overt level is the flexible management of high rates of change. At a dynamic level it is the resistance to dislocation and collapse. Overt policies will therefore focus on rational response to change in the environment, in technology and in the social realities of the community. Dynamic forces will drive that community into a rigid stance with paranoid boundaries, resisting change and seeking to hang on to known forms in a desperate bid to avoid the chaos, dislocation and catastrophe which is feared. Political strategy and social process are dysfunctionally opposed.

Although handled in a sophisticated rationale, the underlying anxieties are intense. The title of the above section is 'The crisis ahead', but the crisis is not only future, it is also realised in the here and now experience. Break up of established economic and social order is faced in the future, but is already beginning to be encountered in the present. The phrase 'warning bells' falls easily from the lips, but the imagery is of blaring klaxons, wailing sirens, or that jangled warning in response to which the warship springs to red alert or the submarine prepares for emergency dive. The symbolism is violent, the response negligible.

Early signs of impending crisis surface first in the financial institutions ... the 'value system' of society. The reference to Arabic catalysis of misfortune raises the spectre of scapegoating, since rises in oil prices are seen as 'causal', albeit not alone at this level. Significantly, causes and effects are massively confused under the stress. Shifts in underlying world dynamics and in the social processes determining the struggle for increasingly short, or perceived short, resources in an increasingly hungry world lie behind the effects treated as causal in this paragraph.

In brief, the stance with which the future is approached has a paranoid culture. To be sure, there are reasons in reality for the sense of threat and impending change, but the paranoid process, while triggered by such realities, is fed by unconscious social phantasy. Reaction to the emergence of previously unconscious paranoid phantasy is devastatingly dysfunctional as a reaction to the realities of environmental change.

Moving on to examine some of the economic indicators of future performance, Mr. Jenkins notes the warning signs in parameters of economic growth, unemployment, inflation and current-account deficit. The symbolic construct of the underlying dynamic then emerges in his summary reaction.

Page 8

'We may once have hoped that the waves of our recent discontents would quietly recede and that the easier world of the 1960s would re-emerge from beneath the waters. Such facile optimism is now totally untenable. The signs of irreversible change are now visible beyond mistake in the accelerating decline of some of our

older industries; in the impact of new technologies in many areas of our daily lives; in the changing and more difficult pattern of our trade.'

The archetypal symbolism of the flood emerges as the construct carrier, with no hope of the ark coming to rest on Ararat. This flood is not a temporary inundation, but the unleashing of the waters of the deep, which has its roots far back in the mythologies of middle eastern creation narratives. The racial archetype of threatening chaos - the overwhelming sea - resonates in many ways. It is the chaos monster of the deep from whose predatory persecution man lives in flight if he is to survive. It is the sea of the unconscious, ever threatening to overwhelm the rational affairs of man. Supremely it resonates with that primal trace of intrauterine existence, the watery womb-world which is the arche of every-man. The traumatic disruption of the watery, primal Eden is the nexus of human experience of loss, constriction, persecution, crushing, annihilation, despair, and change. The psychotic anxieties engendered during parturition and fixed deep in the unconscious of the neonate resonate with terror every time there is a shaking of the foundations of the known world. It is in this dynamic that dysfunctional reaction to the process of social change originates. So, deeply entangled within the agenda of the European Economic Community are not only the political realities, but also the phantasy anxieties, projecting onto the political map dysfunctional reaction to primal impingement.

The President accurately pins the fundamental issue facing the community.

Page 8

'The essential question for 1980 and the years ahead is therefore how do we adapt our society to the new economic realities?'

If that question is answered in terms of overt political strategy while ignoring covert social dynamic, the outcome will be catastrophic. The management of change in complex human institutions is fraught with irrationality and exceptionally difficult, even in times of affluence and high resource. Such is no longer the context within which change has to be managed. The dynamic agenda facing political institutions towards the end of the current century has to do with the management of increasingly massive change under conditions of increasingly severe resource deprivation. The success or otherwise of the venture depends upon the adjustment of the phantasy social relationships underlying the political institutions. Such adjustments depend in turn in changes in the underlying anxiety defences of society by which man protects himself from the emergence of 'psychotic anxiety' to use Elliott Jaques' terminology.

The agenda of the management of change is fundamental. The precise changes to be managed are incidental. Unfortunately, political energy at the moment is vested in the identification of and attempt to deal with specific changes, while ignoring the underlying dynamics of change itself. Thus Mr. Jenkins directs attention to the task of energy conservation, energy production (coal, nuclear and other sources), the need for environmental protection, the management of pollution and the reduction of hazards to both the human organism and its supporting ecology, which are associated with industrialism in high density population communities. But at the end of the day it is social inertia which exacerbates the problems.

'In working out our programme we must see the hazards as a whole and deal with them honestly and openly.

'I think we have made so me progress in recent months towards fuller appreciation of these problems. But it is now six years since the first severe warning and I fear we have missed many more opportunities than we have created. The lesson of recent developments in the Middle East is that we shall not have another such period of grace.'

The characteristic response to emergence of primal anxiety is regression, splitting, denial, and projection. Just as a snail threatened by some sudden movement near it withdraws into its shell for safety, so the human ostrich also buries its head in the face of threatening stimuli, even though functional reaction to the threat may demand intense attention to the incoming data and the co-ordination of all systems for flexible action. The fact that the threatening stimuli trigger off previous reaction to primal impingement leads to dysfunctional withdrawal. Threatening data is denied and filtered out, reports are noted and shelved, motivation associated with the threat is minimal other than in terms of anxious denial of the threat altogether. The malfunction of systems is never traced to its causal origin but scapegoats are sought and the causal system is projected in paranoid way onto so me persecutory source, over which it is assumed the organism has no control.

So much for changes emanating in the resource/energy/pollution/population cycle. Other changes push forward into the present from the future, associated with the rapidation of technological advance, precipitated by the cybernetic revolution. The facts, factors, and implications of this are well documented but again it is the dynamics of change to which we must address ourselves. Mr. Jenkins notes the agenda,

'I am convinced that the major, perhaps the ultimate test of success or failure in the next decade will be the attitude we adopt to the challenge of the new electronic technologies. The developments now rapidly unfolding herald a new industrial revolution.'

He then notes some of the damaging effects and the gains inherent in new technology. Much study has been done on behalf of the Commission, leading to the proposals that 'the Community should develop a social policy to prepare the way for innovation...'. Again the terms of reference, the contents and the policies have to do with specific elements of technology and its social application and implication, but ignore the psychology of change with its potentially Luddite manifestation, management of which is essential for the implementation of the Commission's policies.

* * * * *

Boundary transactions between the community and the rest of the world provide one of the most sensitive indicators of underlying process. The more regressed and dominated by anxiety defences a given community or institution becomes, the more paranoid its boundary

transaction with the environment. The Islamic doctrine of Jihad illustrates the process supremely with its understanding that the community of Islam is 'good' and lives in a world which is 'bad'. The in-group lives for itself at the expense of the out-group, which is perceived as persecutory and therefore to be attacked, exploited, used, if need be sacrificed or destroyed, if not incorporated, in the furtherance of in-group interest. The same process characterises sub-groups within Islam, each in-group perceiving the out-group in the same way. The result is a process of mutual destruction or internecine strife, which has as its overt purpose the attempt to maximise benefit for the in-group albeit at the expense of total system degrade. The results are self-defeating. The same process, at a more covert level, underlies the dynamic of the European Economic Community. It is possibly inevitable that member states see their participation in the community more in terms of benefit to the nation concerned rather than in terms of systemic enhancement of the Community as a whole. Sub-groups, factions and parties within each State operate with similar perception. It is also clear that the European Economic Community as a unit operates with the same dynamic with respect to the global construct. Political responsibilities within the EEC are directed at maximising qualities of life within the EEC within its global environment. In so far as well being and smooth functioning of the world system affects the stability, affluence, quality of life, economy etc. of the European Community, just so far is it important to the Community leaders. At those points in which European well being is not dependent on the world construct, the global perspective is irrelevant.

Any business conglomerate with no overall strategy, whose corporate policies were simply an ad hoc mash of conflicting sub-unit competition, is in trouble. Management of a sub-unit has to be seen as a sub-task of the management of the whole. In European terms, leadership of each national unit has to be seen as a sub-task of leadership and management within the wider Community. Similarly, strategic policies of the Community have to be seen within a world construct as sub-unit management policies within the overall framework of responsible, functional, system enhancing strategies of the world community. Failure to achieve this perspective may result in the preservation of highly defended, autonomous islands of affluence, but they will exist in a sea of relative deprivation, including large areas of social catastrophe. The argument for Third World development because of mutual interest is fallacious, since where no such mutual interest exists there is no development, and the consequence is one of selective abandonment. Mutual responsibility in the task of systemic, species enhancement is totally different from the strategy of mutual exploitation for the sake of in-group enrichment. Where the latter policy operates, it is vital to develop the resources to be exploited, and to that extent Third World development is important to Europe. It is, I suggest, the value system associated with this latter policy which underlies Roy Jenkins' outline of the external policies of the European Economic Community.

Page 12

'But the industrialized countries account for only a small proportion of mankind; and the Community more than any other industrial group is linked by history, culture, interest and trade with the rest of the world. The recovery of our economies cannot be dissociated from the development of the poorer countries and the growth in world-wide demand. There is an essential interdependence in the modern world which the energy crisis has illuminated and reinforced. We shall soon engage in a further round of discussions in the North/South Dialogue. In these discussions the Community must be able to speak with a single voice not just - as is sometimes suggested - at the

technical level, but at the top. Our political and economic interest in establishing consensus and co-operation is clear. Three themes will run through the negotiations and form the basis for greater stability in international economic relations which we all seek. First the need to ensure a better balance between energy supply and demand; second the steady growth of the economies of the poorer countries, which is in our interest as much as theirs, and third the provision of special help for those in most need. Within the Community and among the other industrialized countries, progress in this area is a high priority for 1980.

'Concern for the rest of the world should not obscure concern for what is happening here within the Community....'

The underlying motivation for the development of 'them' for 'us' is clear. There is a brief nod in the direction of 'the provision of special help for those in most need' but it is clear from the context, as indeed from the realities of political strategy at both national and European Community level, and in particular the most recent shifts in direction of those strategies, that the fundamental Community policy is that of looking after No. 1, while the rest of the world can go to the wall (provided No. 1 does not get damaged in the process). Mr. Jenkins is quite right in stressing that the European Community more than any other industrial group is 'linked by history, culture, interest and trade with the rest of the world'. Current policies would appear to be a very close reflection of that historic pattern, and a direct continuation of the oppressive, colonial, exploitative, trading imbalance which lies behind so much of the current disruption of the global construct.

The generation of responsible inter-dependence is impossible when transactional boundaries are dominated by paranoid phantasy, a process which has been amply demonstrated in the impasse encountered by the UNCTAD negotiations. The same set of paranoid boundary transactions underlies the whole thorny issue of East/West confrontation and the escalating arms race. The stress posed by the armaments industry on the budgets, economies and raw materials and energy use of the western, industrial countries, is not mentioned within the report. Again it is a commonly known phenomenon of institutions dominated by anxiety defences that issues which lead to the highest levels of anxiety are the most difficult to face and tend to be relegated to the social unconscious, from whence they exercise a dominant, albeit covert, effect upon the whole institutional culture.

It is possible to interpret the ideological split which divides East and West as a projection at international level of paranoid schizoid behaviour emanating from the stresses of rapid social change and disruption of resource distribution in the earlier stages of the industrial revolution. As such, the social splits hold at their boundaries phantasy psychotic anxiety and paranoia. The out-group is perceived irrationally as persecutory, threatening, antagonistic and malign. That perception dominates from whichever side of the boundary the view is taken. The result is the escalation of power, institutional structure and means of defence on each side of the boundary. The process reinforces the paranoia, gives a rationale for escalation of armament, which then generates a feedback loop independent of the initial triggering situation. At micro-levels, such processes underlie much industrial disruption and at macro level they are expressed in the opposed nuclear stock-piles and the exponential accumulation of the means of destruction, together with the diversion of much social energy into the management of reified anxiety defences. The arms race is locked in a vicious circle, whose energy is now self-generating. Paranoia breeds more intense paranoia and that process

has but one conclusion - a cathartic, orgasmic release of pent-up terror and destructive power, anarchic retaliation and mutual annihilation.

The issue of armament is treated as an isolated phenomenon, an uncaused cause, which has effects which are detrimental in many areas of human life. As a result, the political initiatives have to do with amelioration of the presenting symptoms in an attempt to control or moderate the chain reaction. Every attempt, however, at limiting the means of defence increases the underlying anxiety and in the long term generates an escalation of investment in defensive armament. Since defensive armament on one side of the split is perceived as offensive by the other, current strategies for disarmament or arms limitation are effectively counter-productive in the long term. They reinforce the causes of the effects which they seek to minimise. Only by the analysis of the causes of anxiety which the arms race signifies can progress be made. That analysis needs to pin-point the sources of anxiety which arise out of the realities of socio-economic engagement within the real environment, but in particular it needs, also, to understand those paranoid phantasies, those deep areas of psychotic anxiety which, projected onto the out-group, generate the persecutory delusions which fuel the paranoid activity. Only in so far as the psychotic anxiety emanating from the unconscious areas of human process is identified, contained, and ultimately annealed or 'bled out' of the system, will the energy driving the armaments cycle be reduced. Dismantling of social defences against psychotic anxiety can only take place when the psychotic anxiety itself has been dealt with. Dismantling of the international defensive arsenals can only follow and precisely not precede such a process.

Returning from the interlude on external policies of the Community, both expressed and suppressed within Roy Jenkins' text, we face again the issues of the management of change within the Community itself. In policy terms he writes,

Page 13

'First our people must be closely informed about the changes that are occurring. They must be able to see beyond their immediate horizon to the totality of the changes that affect them. Otherwise we can expect little but defensive and restrictive attitudes to changes from workers who see only that their own industry is contracting, or that their own firm is closing. Second if we are to make the necessary but difficult changes in our society required by developing technology, our policies must encourage greater mobility and willingness to change jobs. In that process temporary unemployment may sometimes be part of the price of progress, but people must be given the means to adapt to new opportunities and to learn new skills.'

Several points need making. Firstly, the giving out of information about changes does not necessarily lead to education about changes, for information is only acceptable in so far as it does not raise anxieties beyond a tolerable level. Angst-generating data or data which triggers the irruption of psychotic anxiety is simply not heard. It is distorted, filtered out, repressed, rejected and certainly not acted on. To be sure, people must be 'able to see beyond their immediate horizon to the totality of changes that affect them' but how they are to come to that position is not at all clear. That ability is not generated simply by the dissemination of

information. It involves a major restructuring of social defences against anxiety which, in their present form, ensure that any horizon is perceived as a terminus to press beyond which is to face the unknown, the threatening, the persecutory, leading to chaos, breakdown and possible annihilation. The reaction is indeed dominated by phantasy and is inappropriate to the realities of the changes, or to the realities that lie beyond the horizon, but to ignore the realities of human process, irrational though it may be, renders the functional management of change impossible. The Commission is clearly aware of the 'defensive and restrictive attitude to changes' which are likely in the future, and indeed are already evidenced in the present. There is a commitment that 'our policies must encourage greater mobility and willingness to change ...' but how such shifts in social adaptability are to be brought about is quite unclear. Further, the policies and strategies being employed at an overt level have as their dynamic effect the reifying, fixating, rendering more rigid and inflexible of the very social processes whose effects are so decisive in the implementation of overt policy.

The underlying symbol carriers emerge again in the treatment of the European Monetary System, with reference to which Roy Jenkins writes,

Page 14

'If I had foreseen a year ago the stormy waters onto which this frail craft would be launched and have to make its early voyages - a year in which the yen depreciated by 30% against the dollar; the dollar by 10% against the ECU; and gold set off on its wild and unpredictable course. Had I foreseen all these storms for the first year of the life of the EMS I would not, perhaps, have been confident of its survival. Not only has the system survived, it has worked well involving only two small adjustments to central rates and providing a valuable buttress of greater monetary stability in Europe at a difficult time of international turbulence....

'Our efforts should be seen as part of a common effort with our major trading partners to rebuild a framework within which the monetary turbulence we have experienced in recent years can be effectively contained.'

The symbolism is powerful and vivid. Monetary instability - shifts in the value system of the world - are described in terms of turbulence which acts as the bridge symbol to the watery chaos of a storm-lashed ocean, which bears the freight of the unconscious emotional reaction to the fiscal realities. The symbol construct then splits in two. The financial management systems are perceived firstly as a tiny, frail craft, a life-boat launched into this stormy sea. The craft is perceived as a weak, fragile, vulnerable, entity, whose survival is threatened by the overwhelming, storm-lashed waves. Ambivalence in the construct emerges, however, in that the monetary systems are also seen as providing 'a valuable buttress of greater... stability', or as containers of the turbulence. Thus, in antithesis to the frail craft launched on the waters, is the symbolism of the buttressed, containing boundary which delimits and restrains the destructive effects of the turbulent sea. Those familiar with primal symbolism will immediately recognise the material. Here is the ambivalent oscillation between vulnerable, foetal impotence and the strong containing uterine walls of the experience of primal chaos. The watery world has gone wild and threatens either to overwhelm that which sails upon it, or to break the boundaries that contain it. The maelstrom is alternately perceived as internal or environmental - or even both together, just as the water in a flooded hold surges destructively around in response to the lurching movements of the ship battered

by the stormy sea on which it sails. Clearly there is uncertainty as to whether the threat is generated more by the chaos within or the chaos without. Of necessity, both inside and outside are connected as a single system, responding in concert. Any unit is an open system - it contains its inside and is contained by its environment which is itself contained by the next order of environmental aggregate. Every outside is also an inside and every inside is also an outside. Turbulence affects the whole.

Again we are left facing the task of disentangling the agenda associated with financial management in an unstable economic setting from the agenda of managing the unconscious emotive response of anxiety, part of which is realistic, most of which is resonant primal transference. It is this irruption of primal anxiety into the social process which sets up the turbulence-generating feedback loops which throw the money race into exponential instability, in parallel to the arms race. The two systems are mirror phenomena of the same fundamental process.

In so far as psychotic anxiety irrupts in unmanageable ways into social process, just so far are the normal decision-making avenues of the inter-personal, inter-group, inter-institutional and inter-social structures fraught and dysfunctionally disrupted. It is not surprising, therefore, that Mr. Jenkins turns next to the problems of family squabbles over housekeeping within the Community itself.

Page 14

'I turn briefly to internal issues relating to the budget. These issues have dominated Community discussion for six months. I in no way complain. They are of importance and need to be approached in orderly fashion. But let us keep them in perspective. They are essentially part of the process of putting our house in order. Once settled we can get down to the bigger and more important issues affecting the future development of the Community. We cannot afford to spend much more time on family squabbles.'

However, when the 'bigger and more important issues affecting the future' are so fraught and raise such high levels of angst, the Community cannot afford to tackle them (as was clearly demonstrated by the avoidance of key issues at the recent Venice meeting of Community leaders). Strategically the Community cannot afford to spend much more time on family squabbles, behaviourally it dare do little else. With massive anxiety- defences brought into play the dynamics underlying fundamental issues are displaced and dealt with under the figure of domestic detail. The underlying task is to manage the anxiety, not to solve the problems, even if the process used for managing the anxiety renders the problems themselves more intractable in the long term. Inevitably, institutional scrutiny and reorganisation is the order of the day. If we are too scared to get down to work, perhaps the next best thing is to polish our tools.

Conclusion

The symbolism associated with primal regression and the management of psychotic anxiety is nowhere more clearly evidenced than in the concluding two paragraphs of the address. In

this the European Community as a bounded but open system, mirrors the unconscious dynamics of the global construct, which is in turn mirrored back into nation states and their sub-entities of regions, institutions, groups and persons. The unconscious matrix moves in concert across the multiple-order mirror system of human society.

Page 17

'I conclude. Following the events in Afghanistan, tension in the world is perhaps closer to danger point than at any time over the past two decades. The gravity of the situation was recognized by the almost unanimous view expressed by this House in its resolution last month; in the serious and important discussions within the Political Affairs Committee which I attended a fortnight ago; and in the series of actions which the Community has taken together in condemnation of Soviet aggression. These events come on top of the difficult economic and social problems which already are exercising pressure on the Community system.'

The dynamic resonance is that appropriate to 'Perinatal Matrix II' (See Stanislav Grof, 'Realms of the Human Unconscious'). The Community as an organism is experiencing boundary constriction or pressure from its economic and social environment. Piling on the pressure are other events within the world dynamic, which is seen as in a high state of tension, very close to danger point, and representing a situation whose gravity is unanimously recognised. The Community as organism is united in its internal field, develops harder and stronger corporate boundaries and acts in a concerted way to condemn or retaliate against the environmental impingement. Causes of the distress are projected into the environment which is seen as responsible for the problem. The issues of mutual responsibility and interdependence are suppressed and any sense that the European Community might itself also be caught up in the causal system is denied. The result is that the Community itself regresses to foetal impotence in the face of environmental impingement and in the terror of the imminent onset of primal trauma. The embrace of the bear is confused with the crushing cervix. So the in-group perceives the out-group as persecutory, itself as fragile and vulnerable, and responds accordingly. Tragically, what is an out-group for one unit perceives itself an in-group, suffering similar impingement, leading to similar reactions. So in these macro-economic structures we perceive the oscillation of primal transference.

In the face of such disturbing dynamics the President issues a concluding exhortation.

Page 17

'We can achieve nothing unless we act in the spirit of solidarity. That solidarity depends on respect for the rule of law, not only in our own society but in the world as a whole. Our Community institutions - the symmetry of Parliament, Commission, Council and Court each operating within a common framework - are our foundation. We depart from it at our peril. There can be no bargaining with the law. If we flout our own rules for whatever reason, we can hardly expect to command authority or influence elsewhere. No consideration of temporary advantage or national self-interest can transcend our common interest in an orderly world in which rules are respected until there is agreement to change them. The Court interprets the law on the basis of the Treaties of which the Commission is the guardian. There is no duty to

which the Commission attaches more importance. It is the rock on which the Community stands.'

The suppression of internal splits, the strengthening of foundations, the hardening of Community boundaries in order to exercise power and influence over a potentially threatening environment, this is the epitome of paranoid dynamic at work. Solidarity is essential and unity is vital if the Community is to face its foes effectively. Solidarity involves the suppression of internal conflict, the reinforcement of the process of social control at all levels of the Community. The rule of law is reified. Departure from the norms of procedure in the process of social interaction must be quashed. Rigid uniformity, based on a respect for and obedience to, legislative control is the foundation on which Community solidarity has to be built. That solidarity is essential if the Community is to survive and achieve its objectives, hence the foundation of the rule of law within the Community must be safeguarded at all costs.

At this point there emerges an institutional mandala, an incarnation of an archetype of the racial unconscious. The four-fold 'symmetry of Parliament, Commission, Council and Court.... within a common framework' is seen as the basic holding mechanism. Within this dynamic mandala reside the ultimate anxiety defence structures of the Community. This symbol of wholeness and stability constitutes one of the new deities, yet is itself a reincarnation of an archetypal pattern. Taboos begin to emerge. To depart from allegiance to the mandala is to be exposed to perilous retaliation. Challenging of the rule of law is forbidden. The religion of the Community is beginning to become overt, albeit with a pragmatic base. Loyalty to the common construct is motivated by the need to 'command authority or influence elsewhere'. Here again is the European myth writ large.... delusions of grandeur at a Community level, perceiving itself as acting with authority in world affairs. Not simply the authority to manage its own affairs within the mutual inter-dependence and co-responsibility of a world of equal partners, but actually to command authority and to exercise influence over other areas of the world.... this has indeed been its historic pattern. Colonialism dies hard. All sub-group self interests must be subordinated to the Community's task of maximising its self interest within its global context. It is the Treaties which bind the mandala together and it is the Commission which is the guardian of the Treaties. The Commission is Peter, the Rock on which the Community is built. The hope is that the waves of hell will not prevail against it.

* * * * *

Such is the mythology inherent in the symbol construct which in turn carries the unconscious anxieties of Community process. The structure may or may not achieve its task of the management of psychotic anxiety. Unless it gains in competence in the management of unconscious process it is liable to be catastrophically dysfunctional in its task of enabling the European Community to relate functionally with the realities of tomorrow's world.

D. Wasdell
19th June, 1980