

DGB Neo-Freudian, Neo-Psychoanalysis: Towards a New Multi-Integrative Oedipal-Lifestyle Object Relations Theory

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 03, 2017; **Published:** March 16, 2017

Good day Ladies and Gentlemen,

The Oedipal Complex is one of the most controversial concepts and theories in Freudian Classical Psychoanalysis. I, myself, has spent many years trying to figure out what to do with it -- mainly, reject it, keep it -- or what I have done, which is to reformulate it. Much of my work -- indeed, all of my most recent work since 2010 -- is based upon the very controversial opinions of Jeffrey Masson, former Projects Director of The Freud Archives, and probably (anyone can ask him directly to deny or confirm what I am saying here) -- I would say, most definitely, Masson's most hated Freudian concept was -- The Oedipal Complex. And for good reason.

Masson's legacy to psychoanalysis is that in the early 1980s, and onward, he showed both the academic and the non-academic, as well as the psychoanalytic and the non-psychoanalytic communities -- (not that he was the first to do so, but he was certainly the most flamboyant and charismatic to do so) -- that even Freud and Psychoanalysis as a whole could, and still can, 'disavow' certain aspects of reality that were 'real' -- most notably as far as Masson was concerned (and me too), Freud's 'Pre-Classical' memory, trauma, and seduction theories -- which together -- formed his Pre-Classical 'reality theory' which, significantly became 'disavowed' and 'ex-communicated', 'left behind' -- in the face of Freud's post 1895 or 1896 evolving 'wish-fulfillment' (1895 onwards) 'Oedipal and fantasy theory' (1897, onwards). 'impulse-drive' and 'instinct' theory (1905 and onwards...). It was like Freud in 1896 took one girl to the prom dance -- and took another one home.

Whether this 180-degree Freudian-Copernican 'switch' was done for 'ethically above board reasons' or 'ethically suspect and below board reasons' -- or somewhere in between, or both -- is a question that I will no longer engage in.

What I say is that both 'girls' -- both 'lovers' -- reality theory and fantasy theory -- were not only bipolar parts of Freud's own 'Oedipal Complex' -- but universally, they are a part of all of our own individual, customized, unique Oedipal Complexes and this is the world -- conceptually and theoretically -- that I want you to fully explore with me. One day soon, I will write and publish a book on this exact subject matter.

To me, the Oedipal Complex is a concept and a theory that represents a universal human phenomenon that is generally both partly healthy and partly 'neurotic' and/or 'pathological' -- contains elements of what Freud called both the 'life instinct' and the 'death instinct' which often reflects in both positive and negative transferences (another hugely important set of Freudian concepts) -- but here is the kicker -- although the Oedipal Complex in its psycho-dynamic structure and process is universal -- the particular content of the Oedipal Complex is unique, customized, individualized to every living human being on the planet. This is my most succinct editorial opinion on The Oedipal Complex. However, conceptually and theoretically, I go to places with The Oedipal Complex that Freud never went to -- mainly because I have the luxury of living in 2017 and not in the early 20th century and therefore much more psychoanalytic and neo-psychoana-

lytic theory to work with. So, let us take stock on how I have gotten to the very unorthodox, unusual place that I have gotten to regarding the Oedipal Complex before I finish this essay with a new twist in DGB Reality-Trauma-Fantasy-Compensatory-Defensive-Wish-Impulse-Drive-Transference-Oedipal-Lifestyle-Object Relations Theory....

Say that with your eyes closed.....

In the myriad of different schools or brands of psychology -- clinical psychology and psychotherapy -- that we have out in the field today, I am your ultimate 'eclectic' psycho-theorist -- and yet I am more than that because not only do I borrow from almost all of the major schools of psychology that are out there, but I also work at 'bridging the gaps' between these different schools. That is one of the main reasons that I call my particular brand of psychology-psychoanalysis-neo-psychoanalysis -- DGB Neo-Freudian-Neo-Psychoanalysis.

Aside from standing for the initials of my name (which I admit contains a certain amount of narcissism or egotism in it), but more importantly, DGB stands for 'Dialectical-Gap-Bridging' which alludes to my underlying 'philosophical paradigm' of being a 'Neo-Hegelian' multi-bipolar, multi-dialectic philosopher -- even before I became a 'Neo-Freudian, Neo-Psychoanalytic' theorist. I wrote about a thousand essays on philosophy at a blog site you should still be able to find by googling 'Hegel's Hotel'. My newest such blog site is called 'Freud's Hotel'. What I am mainly in the process of doing is taking the best of Freud's work, leaving behind the worst of his work (my editorial opinion of course) and integrate the best of Freud's work with the best of ideas I can find from other major schools of psychology -- and combine everything with my own 'leading-edge' ideas that are also coming out of this multi-integrative, multi-bipolar, quantum entanglement that I will call my -- 'internal symposium'.

In this regard, my writing is meant to project or communicate my 'internal symposium or symphony' (assuming it sounds that good) outwards into my social and professional environment to readers like yourself who presumably have a 'motivational stake' in learning, understanding, and advancing the 'art and science of clinical psychology and psychotherapy' -- not just the theoretical side of things but more importantly the practical, applicable, functional side of practising psychotherapy -- and being good at it.

I will never learn how good a psychotherapist I could have been because I chose to advance my career in a different direction to support myself and my family. However, even as I was working 50 to 60 hours a week at a different career, clinical psychology and psychotherapy remained my first love -- particularly on the theoretical side as a 'challenge to myself to become the best of the best at what I do' -- which is to integrate and advance psychological theories along lines that have never been pursued before. Like Star Trek, I seek to go -- in the human mind -- conceptually and theoretically speaking -- where no man or woman has gone before me.

Which brings me to what I want to talk about. I want to clearly differentiate my own brand of Neo-Psychoanalytic thinking from every other brand of thinking that is out there. Am I a Freudian thinker? Well, yes and no. Am I an Adlerian thinker? Well, yes and no. Am I a Kleinian thinker? Well, yes and no. Am I a Fairbairnian thinker? Well, yes and no. Am I a Gestalt thinker? Well, yes and no. Am I a Transactional Analysis thinker. Well, yes and no. Am I a Frommian thinker? Well, yes and no. Am I a Rogerian thinker? Well, yes and no. Am I a Cognitive-Emotional-Behavioral thinker? Well, yes and no. Am I am Massonian thinker? Well, yes and no. Ferenczi -- yes and no. Horney -- yes and no. Abraham -- yes and no. Wilhelm Reich -- yes and no. Rank -- yes and no. Maslow -- yes and no. Arthur Janov -- yes and no. 45 years of psychological theorizing has taken me in and out of a lot of different clinical schools of psychology and psychotherapy. And I have experienced many different types of group psychotherapy from my university days in the 1970s, to my days at The Adlerian Institute of Ontario and The Gestalt Institute of Toronto in the 1980s. In the 1990s, I ran into the controversial work of Jeffrey Masson -- who basically steered Psychoanalysis back to trauma theory -- and everything I have theorized and written in Psychoanalysis after my interview with Masson in 2010 -- has been my own 'Sublimated Oedipal Protest' in comparison and contrast to Masson's 'Sublimated Oedipal Protest' -- just as the building of psychoanalysis in the first place was the product of the 'Sublimated Oedipal Protest' of the one and only -- Sigmund Freud.

What I am trying to say here -- what I am trying to communicate -- is the idea that if we build on the work of Jay Greenberg in his 1991 book, *Oedipus and Beyond* -- and if I am ever able to communicate my 'Oedipal-Lifestyle-Family-Constellation' Theory (whose name keeps changing) -- then these present-day 'evolutionary mutations' of one of Freud's most controversial concepts and theories -- The Oedipal Complex -- should become the foundation and centerpiece of EVERY BRAND of Psychoanalysis.

Now, it won't happen like this because one of the main partisan and ideological dividing boundaries between most brands of Object Relations and Classical Psychoanalysis or 'Impulse-Drive' Psychoanalysis is the prioritization of 'Pre-Oedipal' theory vs. 'Oedipal' theory or visa versa.

However, Klein tried to bridge the gap between her evolving brand of Object Relations and Freud's Classical Psychoanalysis using Freud's 'death instinct' -- it is just that I, like a lot of Kleinian critics, don't exactly like the way she went about it.

As an alleged 'biological instinct', the death instinct is a more or less useless clinical concept. It breeds fatalism, pessimism, and cynicism -- after all, how can you change an alleged 'biological death instinct'?

However, if you argue, as I argue, that the death instinct -- or 'death energy' or 'death path' or 'death line' or 'death impulse' -- is not a 'genetic' phenomenon but rather an 'epigenetic' phenomenon that is socially learned during that period of our early childhood development where our 'id-ego' is undifferentiated and is involved in the formation of our 'Oedipal Complex' and that the Oedipal Complex is often born out of the subjective experience of 'id-ego trauma' and 'the introjection of a bad external object' -- now we have a brand of Neo-Classical Object Relations that is completely different from anything else that is out there in the field today -- and out of this 'New Brand' of what I will call 'DGB Neo-Classical Object Relations' is born a new field of study which I will call 'Oedipal Bad Object Wishes, Impulses, Drives -- and Relations'. These 'bad object wishes, etc., become the essence of The DGB epigenetic Neo-Freudian 'death wish'.

This is where DGB Pre-Classical-Classical-Object Relations goes where no psychoanalytic theorist -- to my knowledge at least -- has gone before me.

This is my version of Star Trek.

Have a great evening!

Volume 2 Issue 6 March 2017

© All rights reserved by David Gordon Bain.