Good morning ladies and gentlemen,

Let’s break loose of Freud for a moment before I compare Freud with Jung -- relative to a couple of their key respective concepts -- and then ‘dialectically reconcile’ these concepts in DGB Neo-Psychoanalysis in the context of my expanded and mutated rendition of Freud’s Oedipal Complex. The key two concepts of comparison that we will be looking at are Jung’s ‘Shadow’ vs. Freud’s ‘id’. But first there is another focus of comparison -- Jung’s Mandala vs. Freud’s Oedipal Complex.

I borrowed this brief presentation of Jung’s Mandala from another website. http://carl-jung.net/mandala.html

Jung and Mandala

Mandala is a graphical representation of the center (the Self for Jung). It can appear in dreams and visions or it can be spontaneously created as a work of art. It is present in the cultural and religious representations.

Examples of mandala can be found in all the ancient cultures. We find it in Christianity under the form of frescos with animal images representing apostles (and the zodiac). The astrologic zodiac and its versions are examples of mandala. Also, in the Indian spiritual practices we find fascinating examples of mandala, with symbols of the local pantheon. In the yoga practices mandala can be a support for meditation or an image that must be internalized through mental absorption. This image organizes the inner energies and forces of the practitioner and puts them in relationship with his ego.

Generally speaking a mandala is a geometrical form - a square or a circle - abstract and static, or a vivid image formed of objects and/or beings.

In our dreams, the mandala indicates the phenomenon of centering the individual psychic in which the ego reconsiders its (dominant) position through the assimilation of the collective unconscious contents (symbols or archetypal images). http://carl-jung.net/mandala.html

Well, without trying to massively confuse everyone, this is how I have come to view Freud’s concept of The Oedipal Complex. But here is the kicker -- I arrived at this conceptualization of The Oedipal Complex -- not by studying Jung -- but by studying and extrapolating on Freud. How? Well, that is complicated because it has taken me about seven years of developing Freud’s Oedipal Complex into its ‘multi-bipolar, quantum entanglement, MOLD’ version -- to get here.

Before I explain briefly some of the key parts of this evolution, let’s compare Jung’s concept of ‘The Shadow’ in relation to the Unconscious with Freud’s concept of the ‘id’ and its relation to the Unconscious according to Freud. With Freud, the id basically became the unconscious in 1923 apart from small components of the ego and superego which were also viewed as unconscious. More importantly, perhaps, according to Freud, the id is totally unconscious and never becomes anything else -- except through ‘vicissitudes’ of the id.

Now, what the difference is between the id and a ‘vicissitude’ of the id is beyond me -- rather a head-scratcher, in my books. Perhaps a vicissitude of the id is a ‘watered-down, sugar-coated’ version of the id -- but to me that doesn’t cut it -- because there are lots of human behaviors that I would view as ‘full-blown id behaviors’ -- anything from hysterical reactions to psychotic paranoia to serial rapes and killings, to war...there is nothing ‘sugar-coated or watered-down about these type of human behaviors that I would definitely classify as ‘full-blown, conscious id behaviors’.

Perhaps, a man making love to his wife when unconsciously his id wants to make love to his mother would be -- in Freud’s view (not mine) -- the difference between a full-blown, unconscious id-drive and a ‘vicissitude’ of this id drive.

However, if you get away from -- or beyond -- Freud’s ‘id as sex and aggression model’ to Freud’s ‘the id contains all the life and death instincts of 1923’ -- well, the latter definition of the id suggests that the id is the ‘home of every type of human thought, feeling, impulse, behavior -- via a bipolar [dialectical] interaction between the life and death instincts -- thus offering an all-encompassing and completely abstractified conflict model of human nature and human behavior. This latter idea is a much broader conceptualization of what is ‘inside’ the id -- effectively, everything before some of this everything becomes conscious in the ego.

In comparison and contrast, this does not seem to be too far away from Jung’s idea of the ‘Unconscious’ and ‘the Shadow’ as a ‘compensatory function’ that addresses those types of thoughts, feelings, impulses, and behaviors that are neglected, ignored, pushed away, dissociated, disavowed, etc. by the conscious ego which is then further ‘reduced’ into the person’s ‘social ego’ -- or ‘Persona’ in Jung’s terminology. Now, in this respect, Jung’s ‘mandala’ becomes a graphic representation of the Shadow, the Unconscious, and ‘The Self’ which is very similar -- if not completely similar -- to the way that I view my expanded, mutated version of Freud’s Oedipal Complex.

That is a long way from a man being ‘erotically fixated on his mother’. The psychical pathway is long and arduous from ‘the stereotyped version’ of Freud’s Oedipal Complex Theory -- and the more Jungian-DGB version that goes through Pre-Classical and Classical Psychoanalysis, Object Relations, Adlerian Psychology, Gestalt Theory and Therapy, and Cognitive-Emotional-Behavior Theory and Therapy. Rogers ‘Client-Centered Psychology’ and Humanistic-Existentialism as well.

Aside from Jungian Psychology, the main influence in this evolution is probably Object Relations. Object Relations focuses first and foremost on the ‘Pre-Oedipal’ (‘pre-natal’ to 2 years old) where you might consider me to be an ‘Oedipal Object Relations Theorist’. By this, I mean that I focus on anything and everything that enters a child’s mind starting with his earliest conscious memory to about the age of 7 years old -- the ‘Oedipal’ years.

In this regard, let us not only view the Oedipal Complex as being like Jung’s Mandala, but also like ‘the rings in a tree’ -- 1. the ‘Pre-Oedipal Ring’; 2. the ‘Oedipal Ring’; 3. the ‘Post-Oedipal-Pre-Adolescent Ring’; 4. The ‘Adolescent Ring’; 5. the ‘Young Adult Ring’; 6. the ‘Middle-Age Adult Ring’; and 7. the ‘Senior Adult Ring’. What I will now call ‘The Magnet-Mandala’ Oedipal Complex draws all perceptions and memories of experiences that are consciously or unconsciously deemed important into the ‘Rings of The Oedipal Complex’ -- like a ‘magnet’ -- and then after ‘working these memories of experiences over’ -- ‘organizes them’, ‘synthesizes them’, ‘compensates for them’, ‘defends against them’, and ‘fantasizes’ about them.

We now have an evolving and/or de-evolving, organic Oedipal Complex that is being ‘catabolized’ and ‘anabolized’ all the time, organizing and re-organizing, prioritizing and de-prioritizing experience and beliefs all the time -- either slowly or quickly -- usually slowly -- with possible distinctions being made between a person who may have a very pliable, flexible, permeable Oedipal Complex vs. a person who may have a very ‘anally stringent, non-pliable, non-flexible, non-permeable Oedipal Complex.

Whatever is in our Oedipal Complex -- and prioritized in the unconscious -- at any one point in time -- is then ‘projected, transferred, displaced, sublimated in our work, our relationships, our dreams, our jokes, our allusions, our symptoms, our repetition compulsions, our mastery compulsions, our obsessive-compulsions, our ‘unfinished business’; and in some cases, our addictions, our hysteria, our psychoses, our serial behavior patterns -- our ‘transference signature patterns’.

And that is where I will leave you today.
Cheers! Have a great day!
David Gordon Bain