March 14th, 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 -- 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 ‘inconstancy’ -- 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
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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 was ‘unbalanced’ in that it was reductionistic, one-sided, patriarchal, sexist, and ‘suppressive of real childhood sexual abuse’. Fix the theory and what we will call ‘DGB Neo-Classical Psychoanalysis’ becomes less one-sided, less patriarchal, less sexist, and non-suppressive of actual cases of childhood sexual abuse -- particular between father and daughter, or step-father and daughter.

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 theories in and by themselves -- and eventually self-destruct unless or until they are replaced by a ‘dialectical bipolar theory’ -- such as a ‘reality-fantasy’ theory or a ‘trauma-defense-fantasy’ theory or a ‘Seduction and/or Oedipal-Lifestyle-Deathstyle Theory’ -- and this having taken place, now we have a network of more ‘bipolar, homeostatically and dialectically balanced’ theories.

What does all of this have to do with the relationship between psychoanalysis and feminism? Very simple. If or when Psychoanalysis ever decides that ‘Classical’ Psychoanalysis -- or some modified version of it that satisfy ‘egalitarian feminists’ -- is worth ‘repairing’ in a modified, in a non-sexist, non-patriarchal paradigm -- and announcing this modification to the general public -- well, that is the time at which ‘Neo-Classical’ Psychoanalysis and ‘Egalitarian’ Feminism (as opposed to ‘Narcissistic’ Feminism that is no better than ‘Narcissistic Masculinism and/or Patriarchalism’; just the radical, bipolar reflection of the other -- well, that is the time that ‘Neo-Classical’ Psychoanalysis -- preferably well integrated with both ‘Pre-Classical’ Psychoanalysis and Object Relations’ -- and Egalitarian Feminism can -- in John Lennon’s words...

‘Come Together’...(with or without my help)...

The object of both Psychoanalysis -- in any mutation -- and Feminism -- should be to mutually uplift and enhance each other:

-- DGB,
-- David Gordon Bain
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