

DGB Neo-Psychoanalysis: Egalitarian Feminism, Egalitarian Psychoanalysis -- and Homeostatic Balance

David Gordon Bain*

DGB Transportation Services, DGB Integrative Wellness and Education Services, Canada

***Corresponding Author:** David Gordon Bain, DGB Transportation Services, DGB Integrative Wellness and Education Services, Canada.

Received: March 09, 2017; **Published:** April 13, 2017

June 8th, 9th, 2017,

Good day, ladies and gentlemen,

Happy International Women's Day, ladies,

This did not start out to be the essay it ended up being -- but that happens with a lot of my essays. I generally go with the flow and sometimes end up writing a completely different essay than expect -- in this case -- I did not expect to write an essay on the relationship -- or at least my perspective on the relationship -- between psychoanalysis, feminism, and homeostatic balance.

My essays themselves are meant to be products of 'homeostatic balance' -- sometimes I succeed the first time through, sometimes I don't, and then, if sometimes afterward, I have a case of 'writer's remorse' -- I'm not totally happy with the result -- in technical words that I will develop here relative to Freud's early work -- I still feel an element of 'unclosure' or 'unconstancy' -- then, back to work I go on the essay to do what I am doing now -- trying to 'correct' or 'modify' yesterday's presentation -- to tone it down, or to provide more detail if needed -- with hopefully, the end result being that I finish today with the element of 'closure' or 'constancy' that I didn't feel last night after my initial presentation. So -- here we go again, second time through.

Link these associated but different term-concepts together -- the closure principle (Freud 1893, not specified as a 'principle'), the constancy principle 1894-1895 -- by 1895, Freud wrote to Fliess in one of his private letters that he no longer needed the constancy principle as being central to his work because the principle was too ambiguous and could be construed in too many different ways. Still, he held onto it -- it went through many different mutations -- and ended up as the 'death instinct' in 1920.) Lurking in the background was Freud's evolving concept of 'the pleasure-unpleasure principle'.

To these, I add Freud's later 'beyond the pleasure principle' (aggression), and what I will call 'the primal principle' which includes anything that erupts from the unconscious and/or the id -- either fast and hard or slowly and sneakily -- which includes all of the principles that I have mentioned above -- and one more -- 'the picture-symbol' principle which includes dreams, myths, art, and psychosis...

To these principles above, I add the principle of 'homeostatic balance' which was coined by Walter Cannon in his book, 'The Wisdom of The Body' (1932) which has important implications relative to Freud's unfinished 'Project For a Scientific Psychology' of 1895 which was a very concerted effort -- and significant success even though unfinished due primarily to a lack of neurological knowledge in 1895 -- at linking neurology with psychology -- and indirectly -- biology and medicine.

From books.google.ca

Walter Bradford Cannon

W.W. Norton & Company, inc., 1932 - Medical - 294 pages

1 Review

This book includes information about the regulation of body fluids, thirst, hunger, temperature, oxygen supply, sugar, water, and body proteins. It also discusses the role of the sympathetic-adrenal mechanism.

And finally, there is my main topic of the day -- the relationship between psychoanalysis and feminism.

Here is my main thesis: Freud's Oedipal Complex theory which he privately created and sent in a letter to Fliess in October 1897, 'homeostatically unbalanced' psychoanalysis just as his 'seduction (childhood sexual abuse) theory' did in 1896 -- although probably with more tangible, significant clinical evidence behind it.

All of this is to say that 'unilateral, either/or' theories will always self-destruct because they are always 'homeostatically unbalanced' -- they only reflect 'one side of the bipolar theoretical fence'. 'Reality' and 'fantasy' reflect two opposite sides of the same theoretical fence or spectrum -- so both will be one-sided, unilateral -- and eventually self-destruct to be eventually replaced by a 'dialectical bipolar theory' -- such as the 'reality-fantasy' theory or 'the trauma-defense' theory or 'the Seduction-Oedipal Theory' or 'Pre-Classical-Classical Psychoanalysis' -- and now we have a network of more 'bipolar, homeostatically balanced' theories.

What does all of this have to do with the relationship between psychoanalysis and feminism?

Ladies, remember this date: April 21st, 1896 because it was the date that Freud walked away from -- and disassociated himself from -- feminism and feminist rights -- even though this idea was largely non-existent in Victorian Europe.

Now, this is only my editorial opinion but I think that he preferred the power and the money of the 'patriarchs' in the Vienna Psychiatry and Neurology Society to the powerlessness of the 'female hysterical clients' that he was trying to help get better.

To be clear, the deepest roots of Freudian 'Classical' (fantasy, wish-fulfillment, impulse-drive, instinct, Oedipal) Psychoanalytic theory can be found as far back as 1895 when Freud started and mainly finished both his 'Project' and 'The Interpretation of Dreams' -- and between 1895 and 1897 a distinction was arising in Freud's mind-brain between 'objective reality' (which was sometimes impossible to determine) and 'subjective, psychical reality' which would have been a good concept if Freud had stayed with the clinical material that his female clients were sharing with him (such as scenes of childhood sexual abuse, unless Freud was 'interpreting' these types of scenes) but with the birth of the Oedipal Complex, Freud was no longer adhering to the principle of 'subjective, psychical reality' -- rather, he was 'projecting his own privately construed subjective reality into the 'alleged unconscious reality' of his mainly female clients heads!.

This was not his clients' 'psychical reality' except as Freud was theoretically construing it using his newest concept -- the Oedipal Complex -- which was steeped in Masculine, Patriarchal, Victorian Sexism and Narcissistic Bias!

In essence, the birth of the Oedipal Complex because of its roots in Victorian Patriarchalism -- also sealed its eventual fate as the death of Classical Psychoanalysis -- at least relative to Feminism and The Civil, Human Rights of Women. And in 1981, Anna Freud still couldn't see this! She was too steeped in her father's 'old-school Patriarchalism' -- in effect, she had 'internalized' or 'introjected' her father's Patriarchalism incorporated in his 'Classical' Psychoanalysis which significantly dissociated itself from female psychology except in the way that Freud projectively construed it along Patriarchal lines of Victorian thinking.

I ask the same question that Masson asked in 1981 and still to this day the question remains unanswered -- why has Psychoanalysis not

-- both privately and publicly -- 'fixed' this huge negative Freudian albatross that is called 'Classical' Psychoanalysis which, instead, should be called 'Neurotic, Patriarchal, Classical, One-Sided, Freudian Psychoanalysis'?

The answer my friend is 'blowing in the wind', the answer is 'blowing in the wind'.

Now, remember this date: March 8th, 2017 -- this is the date that I 'touched' upon the subject of Feminism and Feminist Rights and Responsibilities -- and will probably never return to it again -- except perhaps to the extent that I need to defend what I am about to write below:

In a nutshell, feminism can be divided into two types: 1 'Egalitarian (Responsible, Ethical) Feminism' vs. 'Narcissistic or Matriarchal Feminism' which is the feminine equivalent of 'Narcissistic Masculine or Patriarchal Masculinism -- self-centered totally to the magnification of female civil and legal rights -- without caring one iota about the disappearance of masculine civil or legal rights in the process (like Patriarchal, Narcissistic Masculinism operates relative to women).

Both Matriarchal Feminism and Patriarchal Masculinism are 'unilateral, one-sided, homeostatically unbalanced philosophies' that are 'unstable' and 'unsustaining' because they are narcissistically construed without an ounce of 'altruism' or 'ethics' or 'humanistic compassion' towards the opposite sex. Freud constructed Classical Psychoanalysis in this Narcissistically Male-Biased Image -- which left it homeostatically unbalanced and 'alienated' from evolving Feminism in the 20th century -- and no one in their right mind in The International Psychoanalytic Association wants to 'open this huge can of ugly Patriarchal worms' called Classical Psychoanalysis in order to fix what used to be the main brand of Psychoanalysis but which most psychoanalysts have 'evacuated' -- like the Titanic -- to develop the generally more 'female-friendly' Object Relations.

Thus, an important distinction can be made between 'Patriarchal' Psychoanalysis and 'Egalitarian' Psychoanalysis and it is the job of a healthy, Board of Psychoanalytic Directors to 'fix' ALL brands of psychoanalysis so that they are based on 'Egalitarian, Dialectical Masculine-Feminine Homeostatically Balanced Philosophy'; not Freudian, Victorian, Patriarchally, One-Sided, Narcissistically Based Philosophy'.

Will they ever do this? Anna Freud didn't. But that was back in 1981 when she could not see the huge gap between Classical Psychoanalysis and Feminism -- and didn't have the willingness or the capability to do anything about the problem -- which she didn't even recognize as being a problem -- and then a year later she (1982) she died -- probably hugely unhappy -- because Masson opened this huge can of Psychoanalytic Worms. How could Masson wait -- in all good ethical conscience -- until Anna Freud died to announce that The King of Classical Psychoanalysis -- Sigmund Freud -- had jumped onto his white steed only he wasn't wearing any clothes -- and now in the 1980s, the 'little boy', metaphorically speaking -- i.e., Jeffrey Masson, The Projects Director of The Freud Archives who had gone through all the Freud to Fliess letters that Anna Freud had 'suppressed from the public' -- was yelling..."The King, Sigmund Freud, when he invented 'Classical' Psychoanalysis, he was wearing nooooooooooooo clothes!!'

That, in my opinion, is what Freud did on April 21st, 1896. Freud entered the Vienna Psychiatry and Neurology Meeting as a 'brave, ethical man' -- defender of the powerless female 'hysterial' women who had been sexually abused as children (assuming that Freud didn't 'over-interpret' their stories) and he left the meeting, or started to mutate after the meeting -- even as he continued to protest bravely in a letter to Fliess a week or two later -- as something or someone less than a brave, ethical man but rather as a man now more steeped in, and worried about, 'Political and Professional Patriarchal Correctness' where 'fathers no longer sexually abused their daughters' -- this was a figment of the hysterical girl-woman's imagination -- her 'Oedipal Erotic Fantasy Towards Her Father Complex' -- which eventually became the destroyer of any type of good possible relationship between Classical Psychoanalysis and Feminism.

Freud was now an 'elitist'.

He was in the process of creating an elitist, patriarchal brand of psychoanalysis that would inevitably alienate women -- and egalitarian men as well.

Modified, the Oedipal Complex has the capability of being the most important concept and theory in Psychoanalysis -- this is the Oedipal Complex viewed as our primary, early childhood constructed 'Cognitive-Emotional-Impulsive-Defensive-Behavioral Template' -- the manufacturing plant of all of our major positive and negative transferences, projections, identifications, sublimations, symptom-formations, compromise-formations, etc. But steeped and sterile in Freudian Patriarchalism, The Oedipal Complex -- or Freud's most sexist view of The Oedipal Complex -- needs to be buried or stashed away in a Vienna or English Freudian museum. It does not belong in the 21st century. It should not be taught by Psychology Professors except as a piece of anachronism from our Victorian past -- and a juxtaposition against the type of 21st century 'Oedipal Complex' that I teach in DGB Neo-Psychoanalysis.

Will Egalitarian Feminism and Egalitarian Psychoanalysis ever meet?

The answer my friend is blowing in the wind, the answer is blowing in the wind...

And,

*'While preachers preach of evil fates
Teachers teach that knowledge waits
Can lead to hundred-dollar plates
Goodness hides behind its gates
But even the president of the United States
Sometimes must have to stand naked'.*

-- Bob Dylan

Now, regarding Freud, that is only my opinion, it might be right or wrong, But you will find it written here,

On Women's International Day,

March 8th, 2017,

At sundown.

-- DGB,

-- Dialectic Gap-Bridging Ideas

Volume 3 Issue 2 April 2017

© All rights reserved by David Gordon Bain.