

DGB Philosophy-Psychology and Neuro-Neo-Freudian-Neo-Psychoanalysis: The Great Patriarchal Wall vs. The Egalitarian Principle of 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: August 28, 2017; **Published:** October 10, 2017

August 24th, 2017,

Good morning everyone!

This morning before I sat down, I went upstairs to make my coffee, and I was asking the same question that I ask myself every morning that I want to write --- and often I seem to even be asking it in my night dreams or state of 'sleep-subconsciousness' before I get up -- 'What do I want to write about this morning?'

Sometimes, my essay might be stimulated by the last essay I wrote -- and sometimes not. Sometimes, like this morning, my essay might be stimulated by the name of a journal that contacts me in my morning email box. This morning, it was a journal on 'microbiology' that contacted me, and I wrote them back my terms, saying that I was no 'Dr.' and that I was no 'expert' on microbiology, but that I could, if they wanted it, write them an essay on 'Parallel Micro-and-Macro Universes and The Cosmic Principle of Homeostasis'. So -- here we are. Now, sometimes -- as will be the case here -- the essay that I start out to write, does not end up being the essay that I finish. But I follow the essay where it takes me.

Years ago, when I was first introduced to the world of 'blogging' -- I think we are talking about somewhere between 2000 and 2010 -- I opened up a 'network of blog-sites' called 'Hegel's Hotel', and from this blogsite network, I started writing essays on politics, psychology, philosophy, equal rights, capitalism, law and justice, medicine -- and psychoanalysis -- which eventually became my 'main field of investigation' and my 'home turf'. At that point, I was introduced to Linked In, and LI took over for Blogger.com -- and Hegel's Hotel. LI became a point of 'visibility' for all of the online journals that are now out there -- I didn't know there were so many of them! -- and over the past year and a half or so I have been contacted by seemingly every journal specializing in this subject matter or that subject matter -- mainly psychology and medical journals -- of which, once again, psychology and psychoanalysis is the 'main paradigm' of my subject knowledge -- everything else is a 'peripheral extension' of this knowledge. And once again, I am no 'doctor'.

What I am in my own self-assessment -- is a partly 'underground -- more significantly above-ground now -- historical and here and now researcher, as well as a political, medical, and psychological philosopher, specializing in the history, evolution, and integration of psychoanalysis'.

Among the main philosophers who have influenced me, are, in no particular order except maybe 'loosely' chronologically: Anaximander, Heraclitus, Lao Tse, Plato, Aristotle, Epictetus, Epicurus, Spinoza, Hobbes, Sir Francis Bacon, Locke, Hume, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Adam Smith, Karl Marx, Tom Paine, Diderot, Voltaire, Rousseau, Montesquieu, Dostoevsky, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Bertrand Russell, Wittgenstein, Korzybski, Derrida, Foucault, Sartre, Camus, Kafka, Erich Fromm, Ayn Rand...

Philosophically speaking, Hegel is the center of my universe, followed closely by Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, Derrida, and Foucault -- the 'anti-establishment, deconstructionist, shadow, philosophers' which brings us to Freud both before and after he became more of an 'Establishment' philosopher-psychologist. Even after Freud became more of an Establishment philosopher-psychologist, he still liked to

'shock' people -- only, at the same time, he knew where the 'Patriarchal Boundary of Viennese Political Correctness' lay, and after 1896, relative to the 'can of worms' of childhood sexual abuse, Freud didn't cross it again very often or very intensely.

If you want to know what Freud wrote on the subject of childhood sexual abuse and 'neurosis', you have to read Freud's three essays of 1896: 1. 'Heredity and The Aetiology of The Neuroses'; 2. 'Further Remarks on The Neuro-Psychoses of Defence' -- and arguably, the main one: 'The Aetiology of Hysteria'. After 1896, Freud's comments on childhood sexual abuse tend to get fewer and further between, more cautiously stated, if stated at all, and seemingly ever mindful of that 'Great Barrier Reef', that 'Viennese Patriarchal Wall of Political Resistance and Correctness'. The argument remains speculative and based on 'circumstantial evidence' but from our more 'egalitarian vantage point' of 2017, it certainly seems that Freud became more and more mindful of 'protecting' his growing 'socio-economic' status.

Here is where I take a partly less 'one-sided' view than my last understanding of Jeffrey Masson's editorial position. There are important elements of Freud's 'Classical-Fantasy-Impulse-Drive Psychoanalysis' that need to be protected and built upon.

However, within this paradigm of Freudian Classical Psychoanalysis, there is the 'poisoning' effect and element of what used to be, and what still partly exists today as an 'international psychoanalytic element': 'The Leftover, Great Viennese Wall of Psychoanalytic and Political Resistance and Correctness' -- a 'metaphysical' representation of what The Berlin Wall used to represent physically.

And that 'Berlin or Viennese Wall' became Freud's 'Oedipal Complex'. It was poisoned by 'Patriarchal Political, Narcissistic Bias'. And it was only a matter of time -- in Classic Hegelian Fashion -- the 'fashion' of 'Dialectic, Egalitarian Philosophical Logic' -- before the Great Wall of Patriarchal Bias and Sexism would meet the Great, Rising, Counter-Political Storm of Egalitarian Feminism. Even Anna Freud, in 1981, couldn't see it coming. But it was there. Masson saw that it was there. And it had to be addressed.

At the center of this controversy -- this fight between Establishment Psychoanalysts led by Anna Freud and Kurt Eissler, for maintaining the integrity and credibility of Classical Freudian Psychoanalysis -- and at the same time -- Anna Freud's attempt at protecting her father's 'ethical or moral integrity' -- against the younger, brash, arrogant, 'deconstructionist rebel with a cause' - i.e., Jeffrey Masson -- and his attempt to 'unlock the vaults of Psychoanalytic Patriarchal, Sexist, Bias' and, in particular, what he viewed as Freud's 'Post-1896, more politically correct views' that virtually eliminated any discussion of childhood sexual abuse -- particularly within the family, at the hands of the father -- and the 'lightning rod' or the Berlin-Viennese Wall that was 'locking up this political and psychoanalytic suppression -- was 'The Oedipal Complex'.

Agreeing with Masson on this editorial historical opinion that not many people clearly understood all the complexities of -- not even many feminists in 1981 who failed to support Masson's Oedipal Protest -- I began a seven year mission of making the Oedipal Complex more 'egalitarian' in its conceptual-theoretical essence.

To do this in the spirit of Hegelian Dialectic Philosophy, I had to, in effect, turn 'The Oedipal Complex' into the 'Seduction-Oedipal Bipolar, Dialectic Complex'. What this was doing was introducing Ferenczi's concept of 'inter-subjectivity'. This idea didn't -- and still doesn't -- guarantee 'clinical truth'. What it does guarantee -- or at least it is supposed to -- is 'an equal opportunity striving for clinical truth'. It doesn't 'skew' 'truth' in one direction or another in terms of either 'narcissistic masculine bias' or 'narcissistic feminist bias'.

The 'dialectical ideal' here is 'egalitarian masculine-feminine civil rights' -- through an 'egalitarian understanding' of The 'Egalitarian Oedipal Complex'. Neither 'childhood sexual abuse' or 'childhood sexual fantasy' -- is theoretically 'assumed'. And the Classical Psychoanalyst isn't 'painted into a corner' by Freud in assuming a 'childhood sexual fantasy' when the memory being remembered by the client might constitute an actual 'reality-based childhood sexual assault'.

Kurt Eissler, in an interview, I believe around the late 1990s, just before he died (it could have been earlier), asked the rhetorical question (and I am paraphrasing the quote that I no longer know where to find): 'Would you continue to keep in his position as 'Projects Director of The Freud Archives' a man who was challenging the 'moral integrity' of Freud?

My answer to this question, in the larger and more current political forum of 'feminine equality' and 'equal civil rights' -- is yes, I would have, or at least I would now with a much more clear understanding of the whole issue, as opposed to 2010, let alone 1981, when most people didn't really understand the full political ramifications of 'The Seduction-Oedipal Controversy' and what it all entailed. It remains a very complicated, 'truth-elusive' issue -- an issue more relevant in some cases and some ways for a judge in a court of law than it is for any psychotherapist -- who quite bluntly and frankly -- was not at the client's 'Oedipal or post-Oedipal childhood or adolescent memory-scene'. The whole issue revolves around the classical epistemological and Kantian question: 'How can we know, one way or the other, unless we saw what happened, or were there at the original memory-scene?' And to a certain extent, Nietzsche's classic quote still prevails: 'All fact (or truth) is interpretation'.

What we all seek -- or at least should unless we want to be 'neurotic' (which to a greater or lesser extent we all do on one level or another) -- is what might be called 'good enough truth' -- 'good enough' to address and deal with the relevant issue at hand.

And we can't do that to the extent that each and every one of us is operating under a 'Veil and Code of Politically Correct Silence' -- a Berlin-Viennese Wall of Resistance against what is not to be discussed -- and in Psychoanalysis -- or at least in 'Classical Freudian' Psychoanalysis -- that Wall of Resistance and Political Correctness -- is Freud's theoretical perspective -- whether intended or not -- on the Oedipal Complex.

In 2017, I introduce the 'Equal-Truth-Opportunity' -- the transparency -- of 'The Multi-Bipolar-Reality-Memory-Trauma-Seduction-Defense-Fantasy Oedipal Complex'. Its shorter name is 'The MOLD Complex'.

It abides by -- or at least is intended to abide by -- the principle of 'equal civil rights'...

And the cosmic principle of 'homeostatic balance'...

Volume SPI Issue 1 October 2017

©All rights reserved by David Gordon Bain.