Good day Ladies and Gentlemen,

Over the last 125 years plus, since psychology started to separate itself from philosophy, and Freud started writing on both the subject of neurology and psychology -- at first trying to integrate the two in his unfinished but still hugely important ‘Project For A Scientific Psychology’ in 1895 -- psychology has proceeded down a trail of what we might call ‘Hegelian Evolution’ -- captured by those philosophical scholars interpreting Hegel’s work under the now famous formula of 1. thesis; 2. anti-thesis or counter-thesis; and 3. synthesis or integration.

Now, for those theorists who hold onto to unilateral theories who insist that it has to be ‘this way’ and not ‘that way’, Hegelian philosophy as applied to psychology -- or whatever other subject matter the theorist may be engaged in -- will not seem to be very attractive. People -- and by this I mean both theorist-writers and the reading public -- generally prefer simplicity to complexity, and before bipolar, dialectic theories and ‘quantum entanglement’ theories and theories about ‘chaos’ and ‘dark energy’ as opposed to ‘light energy’ started surfacing, both scientists and theorists generally subscribed to ‘unilateral theories’ -- ‘black’ or ‘white’ theories -- theories that argued that A is A, and B is B -- and never the two shall meet. This was Aristotle’s principle of ‘identity’ and ‘non-identity’ -- a coyote is a coyote, and a wolf is a wolf, and the two different species of animals have different sets of characteristics even though they may both have a ‘dog-like’ appearance.

However, a funny thing happened on the way to the forum, and wolves and coyotes started mating with each other to the point that a new ‘species’ of animal came into existence -- the ‘coywolf’ -- a mutation of the coyote and the wolf.

So not only did Hegelian Philosophy offer a paradigm -- a framework -- by which to understand the evolution of history, and the evolution of ideas, which -- when you think about it -- if you subscribe to this philosophy of ideas, ideas are generally viewed as ‘representations of reality’ -- assuming that that is their intention. Some ‘art representations’ wander far away from reality but we expect this to happen because ‘art’ does tend to intentionally ‘wander away from reality’ based on the artist’s vibrant imagination.

Not so with ‘scientific theories’ which are supposed to ‘stay as close to reality as possible’ -- and theories that do wander too far away from ‘the reality that they are purported to represent’ are generally viewed as ‘bad theories’. And so we get into the ‘market’ of ‘theories’ that are designed to be ‘better theories’ than the theory or theories that preceded it/them. This is an important part of both ‘science’ and ‘clinical psychology’ which is looking for better and better ways to represent their clients’ subjective reality in the therapy room in order to conduct ‘better and better’ forms of (psycho) therapy -- even though ‘better’ is often hard to articulate and/or ‘empirically demonstrate’ in any type of manner that even professionals can agree on. Walking out of a heart operation with a new heart valve that works better than the old one is quite easier to agree on than walking out of psychoanalysis with a ‘new Oedipal Complex’ and/or set of ‘transferences’ in ‘place’ that are better than the ‘old’ ones.

This having been said, theories that are deemed to have ‘functional value’ in the clinical room are generally kept -- and those that aren’t, are discarded. Such is the way of the world. People don’t want to ‘hang onto those things or ideas that don’t have functional value’ -- unless
it is for aesthetic or historical or ‘personal keepsake’ value -- or worse in the academic and psychotherapy business -- people get ‘stuck’ on old, outdated ideas and ‘hang onto’ them because they don’t wish to expend the energy to adapt and change to new and better ideas.

Both live organisms and man-made tools as well as man-made ideas keep evolving -- usually, but not always, for the better. In a Darwinian sense, if they are not fully functional, then they are probably going to be left behind to be replaced by something better -- or if not, then the organism -- read ‘man’ here -- that hangs onto an outdated idea and/or skill set for too long is an organism itself that may be heading for extinction.

The difference between Darwinian Evolution Theory and Hegelian Evolution Theory -- Hegel’s theory actually preceded Darwin’s -- is that Darwin’s theory suggested that evolution takes place very, very slowly over generations of genetic mutations whereas Hegel’s theory of evolution is a much ‘faster’ theory of evolution -- it refers to the type of evolution that is happening ‘right here and now’ such as within the confines of this essay as I ‘synthesize’ Pre-Classical Freudian Theory with Classical Theory -- and then ‘synthesize’ again ‘Greater Classical’ Psychoanalysis with Object Relations -- and furthermore, with Adlerian Psychology, Gestalt Therapy, Transactional Analysis, and Cognitive-Emotional-Behavior (CEB) Therapy. That doesn’t guarantee the increased functionality of the ideas but it is the route that most forms of evolution take -- i.e., mutation, deconstruction, reconstruction, and synthesis -- and it is the route that this brand of ‘Hegelian Dialectical Theoretical Evolution’ is taking us.

As more and more psychoanalysts -- particularly probably most of the Object Relationists -- try to distance themselves from Freudian ideas altogether -- (aside from the ‘Impulse-Drive’ psychoanalysts who do hold onto one of the most important elements of Freudian ‘Classical’ theory even as they may not use the term ‘id’ anymore; to me, ‘Impulse-Drive’ theory and ‘Id’ theory are synonymous with each other; and I hold onto them both) -- to repeat, as many psychoanalysts -- not to mention theorists and therapists from other schools of psychotherapy altogether -- try to distance themselves more and more from Freud, I EMBRACE the whole 45 years of Freudian theory and have done my best to rebuild Freudian ‘Greater Classical’ theory in a way that is more functional, less patriarchal, less sexist, than the way Freud built it. What this means is that I am including in my ‘DGB Neo-Freudian, Neo-Psychoanalytic Synthesis’ ideas that most psychoanalytic theorists and non-psychoanalytic theorists have left ‘124 years and a thousand miles behind’.

This refers specifically to the years 1893 to 1896 -- ‘the Pre-Classical years’.

What I do is go back and show how Freud’s mainly ‘discarded’ ideas between 1893 and 1896 -- specifically, his energy theory, his theory of ‘blocked’ energy and ‘displaced energy’, his constancy principle, his memory theory, his reality theory, his trauma theory, his childhood sexual abuse theory -- all have just as much significance today -- perhaps even more so with ‘new’ emphasis on the idea of ‘synthesis’ and ‘integration’ in the areas of neurology and medicine -- than they did in Freud’s unfinished manuscript -- ‘The Project’ -- of 1895. It is easy for me to view Freud’s work between 1893 and 1896 as being ‘the true foundation of ALL Psychoanalysis including BOTH Impulse-Drive (ID) theory and Object Relations -- as well as Adlerian Theory, Gestalt Therapy, Transactional Analysis, Neurology, and Medicine -- and that is the type of synthesis that I am about to unfold for you.

Many of my concepts and theories are ‘coywolf’ concepts and theories -- multi-bipolar, quantum entanglement and disentanglement theories that mutate, and mutate, and mutate again -- much like ‘quantum physics’ evolved from the dialectic integration of ‘particle theory’ and ‘wavelength theory’ when they were combined together.

If bacteria and viruses can ‘mutate’ and ‘evolve’ in ways that leave scientists and doctors baffled as to how to deal with these ‘defensive’ and ‘offensive’ mutations, well, it becomes incumbent for science, and scientists and theorists to ‘adapt’ and ‘represent’ these mutations and evolutions better so that man too can stay ‘ahead’ of the game of ‘survival’ and ‘enhanced living’ as opposed to being ‘complacent’ and ‘Waiting for Godot’ and the next ‘Great Plague’ that defeats all antibiotics and strikes millions of people dead. That’s in biology and the field of medicine. I am starting with a foundation of ‘Pre-Classical’ Psychoanalysis which as I will show can easily be integrated with both neurology and medicine (and politics and business…) under the guiding principle of ‘adaptive’ and ‘non-adaptive (healthy vs. pathological)’ homeostasis. Freud’s ‘Constancy Principle’ foreshadowed Walter Cannon’s concept and theory of ‘homeostasis’.

What to do with Freud’s famous and infamous ‘Oedipal Complex’? Discard it all together -- or ‘mutate’ it. I decided -- after years of self-debate -- to mutate it.

This being the case, you will see some seemingly ‘unorthodox’ or ‘strange’ terminology/conceptology in my work that are mutations of the Oedipal Complex.

These include such concepts as:

1. Oedipal Period Complexes (Psychological Complexes developed between the ages of roughly 3 yrs to 7 yrs old);
2. Oedipal Memory Complexes (Memory Complexes developed during the Oedipal Period of roughly 3 yrs to 7 years old);
3. Oedipal-Lifestyle Complexes (A combination of Freudian and Adlerian interpreted complexes in the Oedipal Period of roughly 3 years old to 7 years old);
4. Oedipal-Lifestyle Repetition, Mastery, and Fantasy Compulsions (Repetition and Mastery Compulsions formed during the Oedipal Period of psycho-social development);
5. Oedipal-Lifestyle Projections, Identifications, and Sublimations;
6. Oedipal-Lifestyle Masculine and Feminine Protest Complexes;
7. The Master-Integrative Oedipal-Lifestyle Complex;
8. Oedipal-Lifestyle Relationship Complexes;
9. Oedipal-Lifestyle Object Relations;
10. Oedipal-Lifestyle Impulse-Drives;
11. Oedipal ‘Life’ (Good Object) Wishes and ‘Death’ (Bad Object) Wishes.
12. Oedipal-Lifestyle Attraction-Protest-Repulsion Complexes (Positive and Negative Oedipal Transferences);

And that is where I will leave you today.

Have a great day!

-- DGB, Dialectic-Gap-Bridging Ideas....

-- David Gordon Bain