

## **DGB-PPNP: Philosophical and Neurological Justification for Freud's Concept of 'The Id'**

**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:** July 28, 2017; **Published:** October 04, 2017

**July 21<sup>st</sup>, 2017,**

Good day everyone!

Within the context and the time period of an academic and professional world that seeks to become more and more 'scientific' -- which usually includes the words 'observational' and 'empirical' and 'empirical evidence supported' -- I think that it is important to remember historically and philosophically that the British 'empirical philosophers' once took empiricism to 'the cliff of absurdity' -- and 'over' -- or to use another metaphor, they 'painted themselves into a corner' that became so small and tight that they couldn't escape their corner of 'complete empirical reductionism'. Put another way, not everything we see and hear is 'real', nor is what we often don't see or hear -- 'not real'. Empiricism needs rationalism and rationalism needs empiricism just like we generally -- or at least optimally -- need two hands, two arms, two legs, two eyes to more effectively handle most life tasks which is not to say that 'compensations' can't or won't be made to deal with situations when and where we don't ideally have all of our mind and body parts working together to complete such life tasks.

Philosophically, I have found that 'dialectic Hegelian or neo-Hegelian logic' generally works better than -- say -- 'unilateral, either/or logic' such as is often connected to the 'A is A, and B is B, and A is not B logic' -- the law of non-identity -- of Aristotle. It doesn't work so well when A and B 'mate' -- such as in the case of coyotes and wolves creating the relatively new breed of 'coy-wolf'.

I am prefacing the essay-presentation that I am about to begin now in order to emphasize the idea that 'rationalists' and 'empiricists' need each other as in 'rational-empiricism'; similarly, so do theorists and philosophers need to work in 'good spirit' with empirical-scientists. The theorists and philosophers ask the type of questions created the type of theories that often need -- to the extent possible -- the type of empirical testing and validation that give these theories more substance and credibility. The more 'meta-physical' the concept or theory, the harder this may be to do. Freud's concept of 'repression' is one such 'difficult to empirically validate' concept. Personally, I don't really like the concept -- and don't use it. But I do work with Freud's concept of 'the id'. So let us look for some degree of 'reasonable, logical, rational-empirical evidence' to support the 'life and existence' of this Freudian concept that many psychoanalysts and non-psychoanalysts have abandoned or don't choose to use.

So today, I would like to look at the General Semantics of 'the id' -- its definition and description -- and briefly, its justification for being kept 'alive' as a Psychoanalytic-Neo-Psychoanalytic (PNP) concept.

From my viewpoint here, the id seems like a largely abandoned concept -- kept alive mainly and only by those psychoanalysts who remain dedicated to some version of Freud's 'Classical-Fantasy' model and paradigm.

It would seem to me that most of the Object Relations theorists and therapists feel little to no reason for keeping the concept alive -- it simply does not fit into the models developed by Fairbairn, Guntrip, and other OR theorists of a similar mindset -- the message seems to continue to be: 'We don't want Freud's biological instinctual and deterministic theory; man's primary motive is 'object attachment'; not 'instinct tension reduction'. (Try to tell sexually active men and women that they don't need the 'orgasm' at the end of their sex! -- they just

need their 'object attachment' to whoever they are having sex with. Once again, it seems like one of those too often 'either/or' psychoanalytic arguments where both sides of the argument should be kept alive; not one side of the argument abandoning the opposite viewpoint.

Again, a dialectically interactive theory -- to me -- seems unquestionably the better way to go with both motives conceptually and theoretically kept alive in the interest of better 'phenomenal representation', not one of polar theory scrapped at the expense of the other. I shake my head at this seemingly repetitive Aristotelean, either/or unilateral-reductionistic thinking. Think bipolarity, tripolarity, multipolarity, and pluralistic quantum entanglement with often 'multiple co-factors involved'. In the interests of simplicity, too often we end up with 'one-sided, one-dimensional, unilateral theories that stand up like the Leaning Tower of Pisa...Or the 'straw house' in 'The Three Little Pigs' where 'the big, bad wolf' -- a deconstructionist and reconstructionist theorist -- simply 'barely blows a breath of air' -- and knocks the little piggies straw home down. Mmmm, good supper!

Philosophically speaking, as alluded to up above, at least three philosophers easily come to mind in terms of 'anticipating' or 'pre-developing' Freud's concept of the id Hobbes, Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche. In literature, you can add the author of 'Lord of The Flies' to that list -- William Golding -- who presented a 'counter-thesis' (evil, savage human nature in youths) to R. M. Ballantye's 'The Coral Island' (good human nature in youths). Plus, we all know some of the 'evil human plots' in many of the great Shakespeare tragedies -- Caesar, Macbeth, Hamlet...So we may not be all evil -- but as psychologists in particular -- we obviously cannot overlook evil -- or its narcissistic underpinning -- not only in this person or that person, but more darkly speaking -- in all of us, starting somewhere in the deep recesses of our mind, and moving upward, if it is not shut down by the combined repression and/or suppression -- dissociation -- of the ego and the superego (in Freudian terms). Neurologically speaking, I speculate that this part of the brain -- the more savage, primal part of our mind-brain -- lies in the limbic system of the brain, as laid out from a neurological and evolutionary point of view in this quote from Wikipedia under 'the limbic system'.

### Evolution

Paul D. MacLean, as part of his triune brain theory, hypothesized that the limbic system is older than other parts of the forebrain, and that it developed to manage circuitry attributed to the fight or flight first identified by Hans Selye [26] in his report of the General Adaptation Syndrome in 1936. It may be considered a part of survival adaptation, leading to what describes evolution adaptation throughout the history of species differentiation in reptiles as well as mammals (including humans). MacLean postulated that the human brain has evolved three components, that evolved successively, with more recent components developing at the top/front. These components are, respectively:

- 1 - The archipallium or primitive ("reptilian") brain, comprising the structures of the brain stem - medulla, pons, cerebellum, mesencephalon, the oldest basal nuclei - the globus pallidus and the olfactory bulbs.
- 2 - The paleopallium or intermediate ("old mammalian") brain, *comprising the structures of the limbic system*.
- 3 - The neopallium, also known as the superior or rational ("new mammalian") brain, comprises almost the whole of the hemispheres (made up of a more recent type of cortex, called neocortex) and some subcortical neuronal groups. It corresponds to the brain of the superior mammals, thus including the primates and, as a consequence, the human species. It should be noted that similar development of the neocortex in mammalian species unrelated to humans and primates has also occurred, for example in cetaceans and elephants; thus the designation of 'superior mammals' is not an evolutionary one, as it has occurred independently in different species. The evolution of higher degrees of intelligence is an example of convergent evolution, and is also seen in non-mammals such as birds (Wikipedia).

Topographically, metaphorically, and/or metaphysically, here is how I look at the id -- it is 'the primary thinking software' within our limbic system of our brain -- the limbic system being the 'neurological hardware'. Our id is primarily and primally connected to fast,

impulsive, passionate emotional responses based on fear, flight, or fight responses relative to the 'anticipatory and defensive unpleasure principle' as well as the more 'anticipatory and positive, pleasure-imagining or dopamine responses in our mind-brain that spell 'attraction, and sometimes 'pleasure-seeking obsessive compulsion or addiction responses'.

In the next essay, I will talk about the 'romanticization and Jungianization' of the id-concept in DGB Neo-Freudian, Neo-Psychoanalysis.

Have a good evening!

David Gordon Bain.

**Volume SPI Issue 1 October 2017**

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