

## Freud's Hotel: DGB Neo-Psychoanalysis: New Twists on Three Classical Freudian Concepts: The Ego, The Id -- and a 'Bad Oedipal Moon Rising'

**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 05, 2017; **Published:** March 24, 2017

March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017,

Good morning!

About 80 percent of what I write can be found somewhere in The Standard Edition of Sigmund Freud's Complete Works. And yet within this essay, you should start to get a serious feel for the height of DGB Freudian unorthodoxy as I reconceptualize some of Freud's most 'Classical' concepts. You see -- there are some serious reasons why 'Classical Freudian Psychoanalysis' went out of vogue -- hundreds of Freudian critics have been here before more me -- and I have cited some of these reasons in previous essays -- Freud's pan-sexualism, his libido theory, his biological instinct theory, his reductionistic theories in general that cater to one side of a human equation while ignoring the other -- such as his infamous Seduction Theory vs. Oedipal Theory dualism; his castration theory, his penis envy theory, his psychosexual theory of development, his death instinct theory, his patriarchalism and negative, skewered feminine ideas...and this is just off the top of my head...

Nobody -- no psychoanalytic theorist -- to my knowledge -- other than Melanie Klein -- and there are serious limitations and mystical, not very scientific, not very rationally-empirical convolutions in her theory relative to what is going on inside the mind of a newborn baby -- so let's say again, other than Melanie Klein, there is no one who, in light of present-day knowledge has gone back to 'The Standard Edition' of Freud's Complete Works to significantly re-work and reconceptualize it -- particularly in the light of present-day Object Relations Theory which -- in its various derivatives and vicissitudes is the most popular brand of psychoanalysis today.

If it wasn't for Object Relations Theory, modern day Psychoanalysis might have been close to dead today -- or locked up in a museum. Masson certainly wanted to put most of Classical, Freudian Psychoanalysis into a casket in the early 1980s, although in 2010, he published a beautiful, hardcover, artistic edition -- including some of his own (and other Freudian critics and revisionists) 'mini-essays' scattered and 'hidden' within the art in the book -- of 'The Interpretation of Dreams' (Freud, 1900). (That was the same year that I interviewed Masson -- and Masson told me -- and I am only partly paraphrasing here, that psychoanalysis was 'far from his mind' and 'not his world' anymore. Ah, Dr. Masson, psychoanalysis is still in your blood and will be as long as you live -- new editions of 'The Assault on Truth' -- 2003, I believe, being the last one -- and famous Freudian works like 'The ID' (Interpretation of Dreams) being testimony to this assertion and prognostication on my part.

So, if I may humbly do so -- after a lifetime of psychological theorizing -- let me give any new theorist -- particularly psychoanalytic theorists -- this small piece of advice -- and I believe this is where even Masson's ideas about psychoanalysis at least partly crumble: make your theories 'homeostatically balanced' so that they 'follow' and 'represent more accurately' the many homeostatic bipolarities in the mind, brain, and body of man -- and Nature -- or the Cosmos -- as a whole.

Under this essential rule of thumb, almost all of Freud's theories eventually failed because they were 'too one-sided', they were 'too homeostatically unbalanced'. This includes all of the theories I mentioned above -- indeed, any theory that can be accused of significant 'reductionism' or 'over-generalization'. Falling by the wayside -- or at least partly under this rule of thumb -- is Freud's trauma theory, his

seduction theory, his Oedipal theory, his biological instinct theory, and on and on we could go throughout the whole Standard Edition. As Hegel would say, and much more recently, in Jay Greenberg's introduction in 'Oedipus and Beyond' (1991) -- theories are meant to fail, self-destruct, and be replaced by new, evolving theories that are meant to compensate for the 'deficiencies' and 'inefficiencies' of previous theories. Well, there is a way that this problem can be at least partly overcome and that is by making sure that your theory is as 'homeostatically and dialectically balanced' as possible -- in effect, a bipolar theory, or even better -- a 'multi-bipolar theory' that covers more of 'both sides' or 'all sides' of the theoretical fence. Thus, in this respect, there are times when the Seduction Theory needs to give way to Oedipal Theory -- and there are other times (or the same time) when Oedipal Theory has to give way to The Seduction Theory.

This is what I call a 'homeostatically and dialectically balanced theory' -- as opposed to a one-sided, unilateral, either/or, black or white theory that will obviously generate rhetorical, theoretical wars on both sides of the bipolar theoretical fence. Witness Freud and Adler, Jung and Freud, Freud and Ferenczi, Anna Freud and Melanie Klein, Anna Freud and Jeffrey Masson, The 'Impulse-Drive' theorists and the Object Relations theorists, 'the Pre-Oedipal theorists and the Oedipal theorists -- and so on. Thesis, antithesis, synthesis. Hegel paved the way for the birth of dialectical as opposed to unilateral theories. Unfortunately, wars still start on the basis of 'unilateral, homeostatically and dialectically unbalanced theories'.

Thus, I introduce theories like 'reality-fantasy theories', and 'trauma-fantasy theories', and 'Seduction-Oedipal theories' and 'Classical Object Relations theories' and 'Pre-Classical-Classical theories'...and having been partly self-taught in Derrida's 'Deconstruction' which 'turns theories upside down' and 'shines light on shadow theories that are suppressed and/or disavowed or simply not thought about by the greater number of people relative to a certain subject matter -- I turn Freud's 'Penis Envy' theory upside down and assert that it is a psychological phenomenon more often found in men than women -- just as 'breast envy' is a psychological phenomenon more often found in women than in men'. Alfred Adler's 'masculine protest' theory disappeared from Adlerian theory for the most part, just like Freud's seduction theory -- but I bring both these concepts and theories back alive again under partly different names: 'The Masculine Oedipal Protest' and 'The Feminine Oedipal Protest', as well as 'The Oedipal Seduction Complex' which is a phenomenon where the client or subject has 'built' an Oedipal Complex which contains the wish to 'seduce his or her childhood bad/rejecting transference object/figure'. This is a narcissistic, Oedipal defense mechanism built on the love-hate ambivalent conflict between the subject and his or her childhood 'bad or rejecting or abandoning or betraying Oedipal transference object'.

Now, regarding the id, the ego, the Oedipal Complex --and homeostatic functions.

Freud variously defined and described 'the id' as 'the it', a 'reservoir' or 'container' that 'contains' the 'life' and 'death' instincts -- these are all 'objectifying' definitions and descriptions of 'the id' -- as a 'container full of life and death, sex and aggressive impulses, drives, instincts that are buried deep in the unconscious and presumably only uncoverable through maybe hypnosis, 'persuasion' (brain-washing), and -- psychoanalysis.

In contrast, I suggest that 'the id' should not be 'objectified' like Freud did' but rather, it should be 'subjectified' as an extremely important 'alter-ego function' of our Self -- more like how Jung defines and describes 'The Shadow' as being a compensatory function in the unconscious to balance out our homeostatic imbalances in the conscious self -- or 'persona'. The id abides mainly by the 'primary (pleasure) principle, and the 'primal' (beyond the pleasure) principle', and 'the picture-symbol' principle (mythology, dreams, art, etc...), the 'chaotic' and 'multipolar' principles, whereas the ego generally-speaking (all else being equal), abides by the 'secondary' (reality) principle, the order and organization principle, the 'civilization' principle, the 'word-symbol' principle and so on... The id can be associated at least partly with Schopenhauer's unlabelled conception of 'the Hedonistic-Narcissistic Id-Ego' as well as what I will in my own words conveniently label as Nietzsche's 'Dionysian Id-Ego' -- as contrasted against his 'Apollonian Id-Ego'.

The Oedipal Complex -- reconceptualized in DGB terminology -- can be viewed much as Freud defined and describe the id -- but in my words, the Oedipal Complex is the 'product of the id or the undifferentiated early childhood id-ego'. The Oedipal Complex is the largest and most important 'Superego-Id-Ego Vault' (SIEV) in the psyche. It is the 'container' or the 'reservoir' that Freud was talking about when

he defined the id -- the Oedipal Complex is a quantumly entangled filing cabinet from our early childhood years -- our Pre-Oedipal and Oedipal years mainly -- but also to part of our Post-Oedipal years as well. This filing cabinet is very strongly structuralized and cemented into place -- subject to modification through life experience and/or psychotherapy -- but still, very resistant to change -- i.e., to a great extent --our Oedipal Phoenix that arises mainly out of the ashes of early childhood trauma, narcissistic injury, and/or narcissistic fixation -- and once 'cemented' into place -- our Oedipal Destiny and our Oedipal Seduction Complex -- where we often try to 'seduce transference surrogates of our early childhood bad objects'. Our 'Oedipal Bad Objects' contain 'bad wishes', 'bad impulses', 'bad drives' -- all that play a part in the formation of our 'Oedipal Deathstyle Complex' in contrast to our 'good objects' and 'good wishes' and 'good-impulse-drives' that make up our 'Oedipal Lifestyle Complex'.

Together, they form our 'Oedipal Lifestyle-Deathstyle Complex -- and our 'Oedipal Destiny' of either 'creative self-actualization' on the one hand as well as the 'positive' and 'negative' transferences that are contained within our 'Erotic Ambivalent, Love-Hate Oedipal Transference Games' and/or because of the usually negative outcome of the 'Deathstyle' component of these Oedipal transference games -- our Oedipal Repetition Compulsion of Self-Destruction.

Much of this phenomenon occurs through the introjecting or internalization of memories of experiences -- both specific encounters and longer relationships -- somewhat similar to 'imprinting' in newborn ducklings. 'Oedipal Imprinting' if you will -- and what I call an 'epigenetic' phenomenon.

Some of these 'Oedipal Introjections' can turn a little (or a lot) 'quacky'.

Not always -- but far too often to count. In effect, the 'pit us against the internalized bad objects, wishes, impulses, drives, fantasies -- in ourselves' -- our 'internalized demons' if you will.

One might call this the 'anti-human element of being human'.

It is much of the essence of a psychoanalytic or neo-psychoanalytic investigation.

A 'bad early childhood internalized Oedipal Transference Object' plus a 'trigger' in the person's here-and-now, 'reality-fantasy world' equals:

A 'Bad Oedipal Moon Rising'...

-- DGB,

Dialectical Gap-Bridging Ideas,

-- David Gordon Bain

**Volume 3 Issue 1 March 2017**

**© All rights reserved by David Gordon Bain.**