

# In Denial of Shame & Altruism: a Case Study

# 2015-17

©2015-7 by [FritsKaal@Yahoo.com](mailto:FritsKaal@Yahoo.com) (64-6ys)  
Latest vs. on Academia.edu: @Frits Kaal

## Contents:

Copycats?	(2)
Territorial Instinct	(3)
Kyrie Eleison	(6)
Charisma	(8)
Figurations and Interest-groups	(10)
Freud vs. Marx	(10)
Back to Business	(12)
Advice	(14)
Knowledge or Power	(14)
Reification, Verification, Identification	(15)
Theses: Political Correctness	(16)
The long-term process	(24)
Dichotomies	(25)
Emotions	(27)
Addictions	

## Addenda:

A.Freud (1933-5) The Ego and The Mechanisms of Defense	(31)
M.Klein (1932) Childrens' Analysis	(37)
S.Freud (1930) Civilization and its Discontents	(38)
Bibliography	(40)

**A compact story that shows humans 'social work' at Bijlmermeer, Amsterdam, in time!**

The Purpose  
of Denial, of  
Shame & Al-  
truism: Our  
Herds\* Vs.z.

## Copycats, me too?

First I'd like to explain, if I may, something girls seem to know by heritage or disposition and subconsciously ('intuition'), but most boys don't and if they do, unconsciously, as ambition (a feat for it's taboo), which is often 'egged-on.' I.e: *That vertebrates, including 'us,' compete with and in each-others named group, family or clan, that they usher each other to identify with, at any meeting.* From toddler-times on, just compare the tone of 'their/our greetings' to confirm this. When mom told us what to do. What is this 'identification?' We will need to dig into psychoanalysis to find out. We limit and negotiate (with) each other in choice and acceptance of status. Elias (1939/65) describes a process of 'Zwang zur Selbstzwang' in his preface but does he mean obsessive or might this have to do with evolution or creation, or is it just gossip? Both theories are true and not mutually exclusive, i.e: Every 'day' of 'creation' (or the 'big bang') may have taken about half a billion years. So we're living in the seventh 'day,' us men and women, even if we fool each other by always pretending to be 'an holy,' denying humiliating 'facts.' But not as much among colleagues and friends and ideally even less among lovers. 'Mums the word.' But we know better and accept each other as 'good sports,' if we don't 'betray' each-other and make a show of loyalty to 'our group.' We have our 'dispositions' from S Freud (1924/76) and as he said in 'An autobiographical Study' (35/59 p.125): *Hypnosis is the formation of a group of two.* Even if it is taboo to the 8th original sin (lying about others) and state Law (discrimination), we need not be ashamed of such conduct as long as we keep within 'secret' limits and don't compete openly or harshly. Competition in games is a favorite pastime and it happens all the time. We are no different in this respect, just more or less obsessed. This in/excluding is also a form of co-operation, i.e: 'help,' an expected issue in identification, and 'our' Defense. We usually have an 'us 'n them' attitude towards each other, before we do not seem to 'comply,' whether we realize it, like it, or not. There's been a lot of research and speculation on 'us' and our '*com-petitive identification*' conduct, which is also part and parcel (the advertisement) of 'our' co-operation. It was J Huizinga in (9919) *The Waning of the Middle-Ages*, who showed us the preposterous ambitions which abide and who proved

this winning mood well and who summarized this in his (1938/55) *Homo Ludens*, where he claims games to be without material gain, which is also a denial of our sexual- and game (impressing-) functions. J y Gasset in (1946/'58) *The Idea of Theatre*, and (1922/ '46) *Idea and Belief*, also demonstrated impressing significance. E Goffman (1956), in *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (PDF/Google, 170p) and N Elias (1959/65) in *The Established and the Outsiders*, (books.Google.nl starting p.89), and countless more, among which the 4 Gospels and St.Paul's letters in the New Testament, describe this antagonistic normality and advise us to be 'tolerant.' They endlessly teach to 'love' sinners, the sick, strangers, neighbors, even other 'nations.' No mean feat and emanating from temple cultures repetitive praying by harims (women), and including their analysis and 'intentions' as rules, laws and wishful commandments, they hoped to, did and still do achieve in their homes. *EBG/Wi Eegi Kerki or 'Our own Church.'* *Very few of the invited whites came, 2015-3*



The 'game' usually seems on, whether in a 'formal,' (the rules are enforced by officials) or 'informal' (not so) situation. So, to demonstrate I will write about 'us and them' and make clear which 'them' is meant in all this positive (our heroes), and negative (anti-heroes, derision and schadenfreude) gossip. It's not easy to accept or believe that 'our world' is actually told and kept this way in parlors, papers, on radio/TV, in playgrounds, clubs, shops and churches. We have Youtube, Twitter and Facebook to enforce all this 'figurational pride,' and popular TV-series like 'Clash of Clans,' Teletubbies and last but not least: sit-coms, 'reality-' or talk-shows and the national and local 'news-' presenters pretend to be familiar, welcome us or to be part of 'our home,' which may be so because we live somewhere. They present supposed 'us' n 'them-' conflicts as 'news' and 'groups' and parties are always assumed: Even 'the medium' is the message we're all dying for. We need 'hypnotization,' to work, it seems, like horses in a herd, baboons in a pack, or 'patients.'

### **Territorial Instinct**

In the huge south-east estate of Amsterdam, built as high-rise in the 1960-ties and later in the 70-ties as lower-rise, called 'Bijlmermeer,' many tens of thousands of

people from our former colony Surinam came to live with their families, if they were up to it and already earned wages (many 'educated' civil servants). The Bijlmer was a community housing project, meant for the baby-boomers and later also for migrant workers invited here. It was not popular among Amsterdammers, only partly inhabited and a financial loss to the city's housing corporations. So these Surinamers were given these large flats, on a subsidized rent, but few other people wanted to live there, and those who did were mostly on the dole or a pension, also on subsidized rent. They had little choice either and 'we' were not expecting such an invasion. Surinamers had been to dutch-speaking schools and churches. They now ('15) have 'nationalized' in larger families than others. Migrants from north- and west-Africa or Turkey are the other half of the population, and only know 'orders,' it seems, and less responsibility at work, though the young are better at this.



*Student-squatted University department, evacuation by police, with booing choir, 2015-2*

The old 'whites' hardly attend Mass or 'services' in the churches built for them, subsidized by the municipality and are still 'ruled' by an 'old' dutch elite of 'friends' from political parties and municipal 'services' and their municipally subsidized dependents plus a few church-officials. This quasi-elite still forms the board of the trust that owns and exploits the two main buildings that are both deemed both protestant and Catholic churches. There are many more by now and also a mosque, of which many in subsidized or 'lent' buildings, controlled by this municipal 'board,' and its low-paid 'volunteers' that are not appointed by a church or mosq. The church-brands and hard-won franchises are 'kidnapped' slowly, like private buildings by civil-servants 'regulation' and taxes. To 'us Christians,' whether from the few 'old' whites left or from the many Surinam (parents) that live here for almost 40 years now, all this should seem a God-given blessing. We worry about 'our' church-finances little, unless 'we' have a part-time subsidized job through the landlord-trust. And the Surinam parents or their kids make little use of this 'blessing in disguise,' while their church-attendance is much higher. How? The 'old'

white and poorer 'crew' never understood much of their formerly Surinam competitors or refused to be interested. 'They' grew larger families and practically all were in a job all this time, which the 'old crew,' who were on the dole, were not. So there's a lot of envious gossip about kids and cars going on and likely the ex-Surinam families don't think much of their 'old' counterparts, are proud of what they've achieved and rightly so. They had 'their own' church built, which mostly 'houses' the more blackish former Surinam families, including the many black Catholics among them, gotten 'out of the Surinam jungle' by mostly Catholic 'Fathers' long ago. The slightly more Indian-looking ex-Surinamers form a large minority (1/3-1/2). After the slave-trade was more or less ended in the Caribbean, Indian, Chinese and Javanese 'coolies,' were hired in Surinam in the 19th century, replacing the slaves that ran away when told to fight 'British' coolies from Guyana, whose slaves had been freed 30 years earlier. The Surinam families spend to build 'their own' church, called 'Wi Eegi Kerki' (Our Own Church), which is exploited by the Evangelical HERNHÜTER or E.B.G, also extant in Surinam. They 'ask' a 10% fee as church-tax from their 'flock' ('our' church-services are practically free), or at least to buy a lot every week at E 25,- and they do a range of beneficial social work, from lunch for their single-mum-families, at least every Sunday, to rapping-sessions for youths and also in 'our slavery-past' work-out classes. Now we all started out as little 'slave-toddlers,' so such a 'class' can be an emancipator to anyone. Apparently 'they' do all this with their own 'cultural' signs and communicational rules of thumb. The 'young' whites, of whom there are not so many and the many single mums from former Surinam parents can well use such simple 'social' support. The E.B.G.-church does a lot for these mums and their kids, at a price, but the 'old' or even 'new whites' do not, they hardly attend Church anymore. Little in the way of kids-housekeeping or feeding or playing opportunities there. There is a kids-service planned, but few make use of it, finding it boring, soulless or too 'disciplined.' Only in the old Duivendrecht-Church of St. Urbanus, which is situated centrally, but in a different municipality, some ex-Surinam kids (but not the 'black' ones) attend, but they are not the many now mixed black (formerly) Catholic kids we could expect, while there's a large estate with many of them close-by, across a railway-levy, called Venserpolder. The kids in these side-shows make a lot of noise

and produce little more than pre-printed color-in cartoons, when led back into and at the end of Mass. It could seem that all this was planned by vicious 'old cronies,' but it is a hopeful beginning, even if blacks are not welcomed with lunch, like at the E.B.G.-services. It's not 'cool' to be victimized, so that this is even denied by the victims, who may be doing fine, but should long have been 'integrated better,' in school- and job- opportunities. Their fathers and mothers were most of the proud, taxed earners these forty years at Bijlmermeer, even if there are 'old' drop-outs on barbiturates (nighttime) and pep or methadone (mornings), like everyone with a 'PTSS diagnosis,' who feel robbed, as no 'cures' are on offer: Dead-end street.

### **Kyrie eleison**

What do 'us' whites do, and the black, but mostly of mixed blood Surinamers, who call themselves 'Hindu' and attend mass with 'us.' They look in many ways like Europeans and Indians. Creoles they are still called in Surinam, but hate it to be called 'mulats,' as their colonial elites used to, but are often rather dark or very white ('patats'), which suggests that they discriminate strongly in their partner-choices. It is well known that the level of single mothers is very high too, which suggests less strong family-ties and more 'social injustice' in this rather visible black and difficult to 'place' portion of those, who lack a recognized 'identity' among themselves. In the anti-discrimination policies of the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century they did well as nurses and bus-drivers, as they were often already families in civil-service in Surinam. They have their 'own' choir and 'volunteers' in church, but 'We' (whites), turn away from any blacks and Africans usually and do not consider 'them' up to scratch and envy their families and wealth all the same. Practically all the ensuing gossip to and fro has to pass through school-class-kids or playground-kids and (single) mums, in bars, 'social media' and church- or sports-talk-shops, including the pestering of each other with denunciation and the self-appraisal that is usual among kids and women. These 'ideas' are long-standing and do not seem to change overtly while they are denied. They do however need to be replenished for any 'group-pride' to stay. Now the 'old' whites are dying out and the better-off ex-Surinam families are leaving the field and thus also becoming less here. Church- and church-exploitation is shrinking and 'us whites' are beginning to realize the only way to keep the churches going is to 'modernize,' or 'be different.' 'Blacks' are

considered, but still not the Surinamers, who are doing fine, even if there is hatred at school, especially between north-African Berbers and Surinamers pestering each-other, but it's diminishing as 'relations' are accepted.



*Quing up at Mc.Donalds diner with many Surinamers: chatting patiently, 2015-2*

So some Ghanians are welcomed, in a politically correct good effort made. I've been singing in four church-choirs the 12 years I lived here and have learnt to cooperate with several 'them,' whether from Surinam, elsewhere, the other sex, or both. We take care together, from wherever 'one' is. At the same time the buildings-exploiters and their subsidized cronies, complain about 'their' attendance and likely also 'our' dwindling turnover. But they begin to realize and fear the necessary inclusion of former Surinam families, who have shamed them and of whom many, probably about half were Catholics in Surinam, but not in 'our church-society,' where they should be a large majority by now. A controversial missal with prayers and hymns by an ex-communicated Catholic priest who has gone commercial on his own in 'The New Love,' is permanently used, but is not appropriate to needs and problems of successful or one-parent, former Surinam-families and makes mockery of Mass. Children's-play is not allowed, even after Mass and lunch may be essential, but it is forbidden to cook in the well-meant and fitted-out kitchens. We all have sorrow, anger and frustration in common, which is never addressed, except for the 'old gossip,' which is by now (in the 3rd generation), out of date, but still kept up with its typical 'behind-the-scenes' denunciation, always denied in public, 'up-stage,' as E Goffman would have it. This is only 'suspicious' to a few. At least in Church some 'blacks' (to the 'whites'), who consider themselves 'hindu,' come and are treated politely, but not out in the streets. Whether these black 'hindus' actually feel shame I couldn't say, but they do behave shyly, usually deferrent, when bluffingly (not nicely) greeted, as kids and not so young girls do.

## **Charisma**

Now last year the Catholic Church ordained four young priests from east-Asia and appointed some new assistants to a much larger area and population includ-

ing all of 'East-Amsterdam,' which is partly 19<sup>th</sup> C. and partly new-built (on water), but almost as populated as 'our Bijlmermeer' area. 'We' see the young priests seldomly. They live at the Urbanus church and understandably have other things to do apart from showing 'face' in the 'old' Bijlmermeer, where almost everything is run by municipally subsidized 'volunteers,' with their own cash-flows in choirs, meals after service, lotteries, collections and outings by bus (including meals). We do however, practically only 'get' masses now by 'old' former priests who can't sing or 'follow' the 'service-headers' and pictures, that are projected behind them with a beamer by the 'volunteers.' This disappoints with distracting 'mistakes' and also reassures the 'old-crony' pride, but not that of the 'Hindus', who 'stay mum.' We had a few months weekly wednesday-evening 'vespers,' last spring, where the choir sang and its conductor read lectures on the 'shamefulness of Jesus' nakedness,' and 'our own.' An interesting topic maybe but nobody attended, it cost a lot of effort and left 'priest' and choir without an audience. A social engineer at work? The wife maybe? The more authoritarians, including Surinam Christians and Mus-



*2<sup>nd</sup> generation Muslima in the church-bazaar, chatting with volunteer salesperson, 2015-3*

lim 'believers,' reject such comparisons, to name but a few 'figurations.'

The weekly 'bazaar' (jumble-sale or flea-market) is organized by a foundation and former politician and makes more money than all weekly church-collections combined. It's a great meeting place for old cronies, who have their scheduled meetings for each 'sub-group,' according to denominations and locations. They keep no financial accounts and benefit from the 'churches' tax-free status and their toleration by the official churches. They do a lot of good besides, but of their behind-the-scenes-meetings in 'church,' no-one ever hears, which gives them the power to do business as they please. All this has evolved through the years, and the 'players' from these 'sub-scenes' feel (by now) that it is 'their' church or job in it, and pretend this to be so even if it isn't officially, but just practically. To an average 'Christian,' attending 'Mass' or a 'service,' this all seems a little unreal, with some of these hard-nosed 'volunteers,' running the respective shows and in a not-ordinary



way being 'modern,' but alienating any 'out-group' including the by now 'old' Surinamers, who have already built their own church but who may well feel betrayed or 'left out,' Catholic or Protestant. It is useful and normal that people swap household goods and share cheap meals, especially those single-mums with their kids, black, 'Hindu' or white. This is a normal church-service both all-over Africa and in Surinam, where this is only one of the few 'worldly social services,' and a separate collection is held every week for these meals in white boxes. This work always belonged to 'the Church' and the Mosq, maybe just not in it. But it is very beneficial, and even attracts muslima mothers to the bazaar in church every week. 'Groupwise' this still seems a 'problem,' but in practice it is not, even if 'they' seem a little 'shy' and do not join 'us' with meals 'behind-the-scenes,' which 'formally' they could, as they are advertised during the Bazaar. The 'volunteers' are not interested in shame or hate and certainly deny their own shaming. They get irritated if reminded of it. We must be careful ascribing 'feelings' to participants or outsiders, they may be more or less traumatized, feigning, or inferenced.

**We compete,** and so does the gossip, also in the many 'new' churches catering for 'their believers,' for better or for worse. By now we are practically all Dutch nationals who were educated here, so there is an opportunity to 'make good,' if recognized by a Church or school. Surinamers became bus-drivers or nurses and did their thing, they practically all do but the young ones come to church less, unless there's a playground or party like the St. Patricks sing-song, a summer barbecue or breakfast or lunch, which a few churches organize around their services. These events could well attract the (rather few) Muslim offspring who now have a hard time, being pestered in school, especially by ex-Surinam youths v.v, or at the jobs they can hardly get. Just 'normal' politeness is usually enough to lighten up faces and they obviously need the service, as do all the single or just lonely mums and their little ones, that may prefer to stay out of the hands of expansive 'youth officers.' The 'games' of typifying stories remain, while toddler-realm is its monopoly.

### **Look-alikes, figurations and interest-groups**

So is it really 'Religion,' or is this gossip just respective interests, that seem to 'connect one in such a figuration?' It is likely we are only subconsciously in a *figuration*,

to many, but not to most or all anymore, as N Elias (1939/69) called 'it,' and E Goffman (1958) 'framed' it, even if many are 'in the know,' including the victimized, who also contact each other in their own 'up-stage' sub-cultures. These obsessions may even cause the victimized to take pride in 'revenge' on their pursuers, by giving a show of triumph or laughter, like teen-age girls do to whistling wannabees. It often happens that such a group hangs around at a bus-stop or park-bench and laugh at passers-by, their 'out-group,' and annoy them while being 'untouchable,' as the deriding 'meanings' are simultaneously denied, or rather, repressed, by all 'parties.' We may accept such assumptions (and insinuations) with K Popper ('51), as we will see shortly, but it is not, as he thought, a question of money and consumables, they are secondary, but rather of anxiety, and gratification, which we usually crave for (see 1932: Klein M, in Addm. II). It is only through 'historicism, we can get to know our childhood memories.' Popper writes (1951pp. 330+):

### **Freud vs. Marx (/FK)**

*"No more is assumed than that the science of society must coincide with the history of the development of the economic conditions of society, usually called by Marx 'the conditions of production.' It may be noted, in parentheses, that the Marxist term 'production' was certainly intended to be used in a wide sense, covering the whole economic process, including distribution and consumption. But these latter never received much attention from Marx and the Marxists. Their prevailing interest remained production in the narrow sense of the word. This is just another example of the naive historico-genetic attitude, of the belief that science must only ask for causes, so that, even in the realm of man-made things, it must ask 'Who has made it?' and 'What is it made of?' rather than 'Who is going to use it?' and 'What is it made for?'"*

*(-III -) If we now proceed to a criticism as well as to an appreciation of Marx's 'historical materialism,' or of so much of it as was presented so far, then we may distinguish two different aspects, first is historicism, the claim that the realm of social sciences coincides with that of the historical or evolutionary method, and especially with historical prophecy. This claim, I think, must be dismissed. The second is economism (or 'materialism'), i.e. the claim that the economic organization of society, the organization of our exchange of matter with nature, is fundamental for all social institutions and for their historical development. This claim, I believe, is perfectly sound, so long as*

*we take the term 'fundamental' in an ordinary vague sense, not laying too much stress upon it. In other words, there can be no doubt that practically all social studies, whether institutional or historical, may profit if they are carried out with an eye to the 'economic conditions' of society. Even the history of an abstract science such as mathematics is no exception.' In this sense, Marx's economism can be said to represent an extremely valuable advance in the methods of social science. But, as I said before, we must not take the term 'fundamental' too seriously. Marx himself undoubtedly did so. Owing to his Hegelian upbringing, he was influenced by the ancient distinction between 'reality' and 'appearance,' a distinction between what is 'essential' and what is 'accidental.' His own improvement upon Hegel (and Kant) he was inclined to see in the identification of 'reality' with the material world (including man's metabolism), and of 'appearance' with the world of thoughts or ideas. Thus all thoughts and ideas would have to be explained by reducing them to the underlying essential reality, i.e. to economic conditions. This philosophical view is certainly not much better than any other form of essentialism. And its repercussions in the field of method must result in an over-emphasis upon economism. For although the general importance of Marx's economism can hardly be overrated, it is very easy to overrate the importance of the economic conditions in any particular case. Some knowledge of economic conditions may contribute considerably, for example, to a history of the problems of mathematics, but a knowledge of the problems of mathematics themselves is much more important for that purpose; and it is even possible to write a very good history of mathematical problems without referring at all to their 'economic background' (In my opinion, the 'economic conditions' or the 'social relations' of science are themes which can easily be overdone, and which are liable to degenerate into platitude.).*

*This, however, is only a minor example of the danger of overstressing economism. Often it is sweepingly interpreted as the doctrine that all social development depends upon that of economic conditions, and especially upon the development of the physical means of production. But such a doctrine is palpably false. There is an interaction between economic conditions and ideas, and not simply a unilateral dependence of the latter on the former. If anything, we might even assert that certain 'ideas,' those which constitute our knowledge, are more fundamental than the more complex material means of production, as may be seen from the following consideration. Imagine that our economic system, including all machinery and all social organizations, was destroyed one day, but that technical and scientific knowledge was preserved. In such a case it might conceivably not take*

very long before it was reconstructed (on a smaller scale, and after many had starved). But imagine all knowledge of these matters to disappear, while the material things were preserved. This would be tantamount to what would happen if a savage tribe occupied a highly industrialized but deserted country. It would soon lead to the complete disappearance of all the material relics of civilization. (-) It may be noted in this connection that Marx's friend, the poet H. Heine, thought very differently about these matters. 'Mark this, ye proud men of action,' he writes; 'ye are nothing but unconscious instruments of the men of thought who, often in humblest seclusion, have appointed you to your inevitable task. Robespierre was merely the hand of Rousseau ..'<sup>15</sup> (Something like this might perhaps be said of the relationship between Lenin and Marx.). We see that Heine was, in Marx's terminology, an idealist, and that he applied his idealistic interpretation of history to the French Revolution, which was one of the most important instances used by Marx in favour of his economism, and which indeed seemed to fit this doctrine not so badly-- if we compare it now with the Russian Revolution. Yet in spite of this heresy, Heine remained Marx's friend;

### **Back to business**

The Muslim parents seem to stay inside a lot. They were Berbers, not the Arabs who once drove them into the mountains or enslaved them, or exiles in the Balkans, from Turkey or Syria. Are these neighbors and mothers still illiterate, with their kids pestered and excluded from play at school and from the job-market? These few kids cannot be 'jihadists,' if they have not been forced to 'choose sides' by their mums, their surrounding schoolkids, colleagues, or worse. By now there are more Surinam kids than there are Muslim at the schools, who form bands. 'We,' even less the former Surinamers, do not 'like' them and hardly communicate, *vice versa*, unless there is some 'authority' that 'tells us to.' They or their parents pro-



*Modern temple-culture, the Rosary with 'Intentions' as enforced rules. Church of Our Lady,*<sup>15-1</sup> *vice versa*, unless there is some 'authority' that 'tells us to.' They or their parents probably learned the Q'ur-an, but possibly not to write. We see their mothers at the 'bazaar,' where we sometimes discuss what's on offer in a cheerful way. It seems some are already 'coming-out,' or rather 'in' and they speak Dutch and deserve so-

me help, even respect and not just service-jobs or subsidized jobs as guards or police, where 'revenge' is on the rise. Only maybe a hand-full very obsessed ones might deserve suspicion. We're in an unplanned but nevertheless self-made figuration, in which we force each-other into respective 'roles,' 'statusses' and 'identities.' It is not just the 'old group' that has more than religious, or 'spiritual' interests. By themselves they do not try to change these childish assumptions, unless some 'higher authority,' i.e: a 'hero of the clan,' senior relative, priest, teacher, systematically de-escalates these known 'differences' and 'likes,' that are only entrenched and 'pimped' by the going gossip and in the 'social media,' that lack boundaries. 'IS' is kept 'alive' in the 'news' this way. They must be bands of exiles or refugees from the east or south, armed by oil-states. Making people here or there conscious of this, cannot be left to 'the laity,' but Church-, Mosq- and Case-work must keep behind-the-scenes cronies, volunteers and 'experience-workers' in check and will have to do their jobs vocally and confidently, not leaving its 'performance' or jobs to be directed by 'volunteers.' So here is what 'charisma' entails and anybody knows the meaning of 'even-handedness,' when a 'guest' among 'other' people, nations, pride-groups, families and fantasized figurations.

I will not start on the 'jihadi-' suspicions and fears that abide, alongside the broken dreams and the illusions that were 'promised them' and the obvious anger about 'this shaming.' I travelled across east- and north Africa as a kid and could then get along fine with the 'majority kids:' They were good at soccer and I was not. They bent over backwards to play soccer with me and taught me to pass to frontrunners, which was in both our interest. It was fun among Chagga's (Moshi) and Dinka or Juba (Juba) even when I had no sweets or money: We were a proud herd. In most mosqs, as in Jewish 'shuls' (except maybe 'liberal' ones), there is a separate, fenced-off and usually raised 'balcony' in the back for the women, who thus are tactily, visually one-way, but not vocally insulated from the kneeling men. Are these women formulating their 'societies' rules, 'public opinion' (laughs, giggles) for their men only? Was this the same in Temple Culture and Court Society? I assume so, with its harims, courtisans and (childish and traumatized) eunuchs or harle-

quins to keep peace among them and their distance from men, who were gathering, hunting, fighting or otherwise employed. This mechanism and its function is retained in Catholic, but more so in protestant churches, where there is no celibacy, but a 'democracy' of a few women. This 'culture' retains in NGO's, municipal, i.e: mental-, garbage, schools, hospitals, universities, police, judiciary ('Lady Justice') and also in the many small family-businesses, that are 1/4 of net business.

### **Not so humble advice for sociologists and anthropologists**

Two quotes, first: **M Klein** (1932) *Psychoanalysis of Children* (p159): *What, as a child the individual shows us in these play phantasies will emerge in him in manhood as a necessary condition of his love life;* Second: from **N Elias** (1965) *The Established and the Outsiders* Conclusion chapter: *There is a certain **abhorrence** (bld:FK) against the idea that societies or (-) the figurations which individuals form with each-other exercise some power over the individuals which form them and limits their freedom. Yet whatever our wishes may be, looking at available evidence, one cannot get away from the recognition that figurations limit the scope of individuals decisions and in many ways have a compelling force even though this power does not reside, as it is often made to appear, outside individuals, but merely results from the interdependence (and gossip/ FK) between individuals. They fear that one may (not so/ FK) magically deprive men of their freedom merely by saying things. Not facing up to the fact, that figurations of individuals (-) have a compelling power over the individuals which form them, is one of the main factors which prevents human beings from lessening this compelling force. For it is only if we understand its nature better that we can hope to gain some control.* For/ of what might one want control? It is mostly our eudipal disposition/intuition/'ambition,' consciences and castration-fear, not to mention penis-envy, from toddler-times, that makes us adhere to or defy a figuration. Women have intuition that keeps them 'loyal.' They are more vulnerable and 'scandal-' driven, revealing the 'markers' and behavioral rules to look for. Playing along may not seem easy when nodding and guestimating the 'self-'rules and markers of any 'figuration', to be 'respected.'

### **Knowledge or power**

Listen to mums and kids fantasies and chat along if necessary. But those in charge had better stop anyone creating 'news' or figurations in their own interest, if not the interest of their 'study.' That's the business of journalists. Finding the depen-

dencies can be done with these ‘institutional’ sources. They are not in hiding, if a little secretive, so keep gps-stamped ‘evidence,’ in these stubbornly hardly changing figurations, but mind that the gossip is actually boring if you are not part and parcel of the game. It may seem speculative, but can be made evident, since many of us have accepted ‘figuration,’ shaming, pride and intuition, or just know better by now. Stay polite, even if you think you are being taken for a ride and this is not mere journalism, but we are recording endlessly and only subconsciously but loyally copied gossip. Do not worry about this ‘multy-culty- discourse,’ it’s nonsense. To boot I must remind you that without our monotheist religious institutions, including the Islamist and even our nation-state and its schools, we should still all be thugs and thieves. But we had better always ask: Who benefits by the figuration-work, or ‘Qui bono?’, when dealing with innuendo or satire and we will have to make do with these beliefs, be they ‘scientific,’ religious or ideological. And like N Elias (1939/78, Preface) warned, ‘we’ are always part and parcel of ‘our own’ fi-



gurations too and like E Goffman (1956) warned: ‘we’ observers may be recognized as snoopers, snitches or spies, and cause a row. That is ordinary, but also ‘paranoia’ (Silver C 2011) and everybody reacts as-if they know these ‘mechanisms’ quite well. We are constantly overwhelmed by this dualistic party-naming and often forget the hard-wares, like the comfort: I.e: The water, fertile land, real-estate, safe sleeping-places, food and drink and the loyalty-demanding powers exerted on us, in our meetings, dilemmas, sexual encounters, failings, shamings and the hardships we endure in our lives of so plenty. It is in our individuation where sexually frustrated ones lag behind but are more competitive. Minority complexes, obsessive or existentially useful (crucial distinction) loyalties make us compete.

### **Reification, or verification to identification?**

We keep each-other on our feet in our herd, it seems, and on our toes, by constantly but subconsciously and automatically testing each-others ‘motives:’ The markers or rules of thumb we share, presented in our (body-) language and in C Darwins (1872) ‘Expression of the Emotions,’ initially in greetings. By doing this we

urge each-other to 'identify' to some figuration and to submission to its rules of thumb. We promise not to be a threat to one-another and to know expected loyalties. That is the **ratio** of these rituals and a responsibility to priests, volunteers and anybody even pretending 'charisma.' The 'reification' is only the pass-word (to 'us') or the catchword (for 'them') among the figurational markers, familiar names and signals, we all treat like our own furniture. The loss of which can threaten us and what we consider 'our' world and home and that triggers defensive, panicky, even aggressive reactions. This can happen, when entering a 'group or figuration,' but a wink or nod can get you 'in' usually, at least as a guest for now. It happens all the time in our 'figured groups' and thus poses a threat to 'our' 'science' too, and The Church. We can, after all, only describe. But descriptive parables can be revealing and can teach inclusion of 'personalities' and make the markets for co-operation work better and more openly, but also worse. We need not call this 'theory' yet, but to write or signal parables can be done quite truthfully and seriously. This should not, however be done solemnly as in a ritual, except when actually 'entering' and maybe staying in such a 'group' for a while. 'Sociology' should not be one of them, unless it is declared as such. We feel helpless when excluded or ignored and to be an ignoramus means death in our (womens) dreams.

### **Theses: Political Correctness to expected identification as figuration**

1. The remnants of matriarchy do not individualize any soon, and girls fear this more than men for obvious reasons. So we always did have religion and 'science,' to help us be together more productively. The Catholic practice of Rosary-praying, like the Muslimas and Jews in the back of the Mosq or Schul, may seem monotonous, but many 'intentions' are spread during it. If we see this coercive mechanism as continuation of temple culture and N Elias (1927/67) 'Court Society,' it is easy to picture as continuing in a nation-state, its assurance, insurance and its monopoly on its weaponry, which I would not dare call 'progress,' but which is. The persons/humans will all individualize but mostly resist changes in 'their figurations,' they belong to. They 'anti-figurate' any perceived figuration-changes to the prides and prejudices of the figurations they chose and identify with.



Figurations are under constant pressure from ‘the media’ to change ‘their ways,’ to ‘integrate,’ for instance, with a ‘majority-figuration,’ but they will and not necessarily only among ethnic or church-figurations, as these may well remain competing voluntary institutions, as long as they are not being subsidized by the state.

Should we not get off our high ‘scientific,’ religious, ‘stately,’ ‘medical’ or otherwise ‘ideological’ or ‘cultural’ -horses and start just improving the normal (closing of) business to everyone eligible, by making the process conscious and so opening up markets, where possible. Only some of us may be in a position to do so, or contrarily to profit malignantly from the subsidies, and those are responsible. ‘Lay people,’ or those not ‘in the know’ will resist such a change while they think that is their duty, interest, loyalty or that it is their pride and belief. Bewailing the victimizing of ‘peoples’ only ‘shames’ them and derides who one hopes to protect.

2. After many years of such ground-work, observations may be compared to debunking and satire in media of the past, such as prints, cartoons and papers and even etiquette and fashion-inquiries and to what dynasty, faction or figuration seems to wield power locally or nationally in time. Then this could add-up to become a real-life and long-term Sociology. Figuration lasts for long, and only changes in shocks with moving beneficiaries and victims, like the Moroccan and Turkish immigrants’ kids at Bijlmermeer now, who are excluded from normal ‘tolerance’ and contribution, which doesn’t mean they need compassion or subsidies.

3. Then there is the ‘morality’ of all this vulnerable identification hunger: The better we know it the less vulnerable we are and the more figuration-information is spread, which is not the figurational gossip, the more ‘humor’ and the less figurational conflict there will be. Humor on ones figurations deficiencies and normal politeness and recognition, promotes tolerance and lessens ‘affective’ tensions.

4. The above-cited ‘**abhorrance**’ (disgust) from Elias (’67) is apparently the politically correct shame or guilt we feel, when threatening to be disloyal to the ‘home-’ identity or figuration: The as-always spectating, while encouraging ‘ours’ and booing and debunking ‘theirs’ and other popular out-groups during a match in the ‘home-stadium’ excuses. Better take it figurationally, not ‘personally,’ even if our

intuition scares us. It is only in the minds of a few intellectuals that any possible offending is a no-no. It is the civil-servants and priests, like police, teachers at school and all 'social' workers, that expect everybody to be politically correct anywhere, anytime. Then there is this naturally competing dichotomous(e) attitude which Elias warns us against. Were we digitized in 'the cloud' or born in it? One may know many 'figured' enormities by heart and recognize the figurational markers, but those who do, can only rarely perform the accompanying body-language signs, like 'giving' a boks instead of a handshake and a 'smile or wink,' grin, or shake of the head. Realize that, slow as the process(ion) of generations seems, having started pre-history, many 'know' and ignore or 'take' all sorts of figurational insults with a 'pinch of salt.' But not all do, or can yet and only if depending on their own individual resources instead of some figurational 'pride.' This parochialism is waning against resistance from a diminishing majority, not just from one 'figuration.'

**5.** The Individuation and Matriarchy are opposing processes, it seems: The one comes at the cost of the other trend and leaves less 'room' for the other, it seems, when we consider Christianity, Islam and Court-society a continuation of what is left of Temple Matriarchy, and a means of power-exertion in a 'balancing' society. Not just religious institutions are remnants of this, but also the editing and presentation of news and educators, employed by governments, hierarchy in small firms, the Judiciary, schools, health and many political parties in 'our democracies' which Blumer H ('67) describes. The services organized are run by partymembers nephews or friends. We buy what the commercials tell us to, so the pimping of brands (re-) makes loyalty to old and new figurations. But most victimized figurations still oppose new allegiances and cherish 'their' rules and markers, for a long time, even at 'its,' his or her own peril, just like Elias predicted. That is 'systemic corruption.'

**6.** This 'Matriarchy-thing' or rather, process, should not be moralised positively or otherwise. It's where we are from, be it only hereditically (sometimes heretically) and from toddler-education. It has been a 'cause' (in both senses), of many war, and peace-times in the past. We do recognise, however, the wide-spread feeling of loss of influence by women, especially the 'womens-libbers.' Things didn't get

worse for any human 'sex,' just less hierarchical. We do still compete for one-another, but we found better ways to co-operate. The often derided meritocracy-trend gives better chances to those who are being excluded. There is as always Love, not servitude anymore, as wishful power-thinking or even partnership.

**7.** Matriarchy has its merits, like the making of a market for peoples functioning, that benefits families more, if not always all or even most. We better watch the 'grapevine,' excluding the continuous T.V.-repetitors and wellwishers, who out-babble real concerns. It has its functions, as do all choirs, commenters, applauses and voice-overs. Just do not let them confuse you, but do ask: Qui Bono? Why? Go and sin no-more! It's not algebra, but we can find denials lurking around.

**8.** The 'secrecy-aspect' of all figuration-, choir-, board- and backseat (womens-) opinion is part and parcel of the 'agreed' markers, so it is difficult to hear all of a figuration, just because of 'who' one looks or speaks like (accent?). Secret information is not deliberately so, but is repressed to subconscious in a 'figuration.'

**9.** Obsessed, digitized, dichotomous(e) analysis is 'official science' everywhere. What is conscious to us or not cannot be proven, but people just talking away playfully, in a (work-)team, only selectively remember the hierarchical 'facts.'

**10.** I admit it, it's as much the eye as the beholder, as any 'concluding' on our ways of life is a frame-story-frame. We 'need' common 'beliefs' and assumptions to cooperate. The classification 'science' is an assumption of truth. K Popper told us to declare our biases, along with his hated (Elias) 'nomenclature,' but from what we've learnt from S Freud in practice; It being all about the pleasure-unpleasure principle (see A + S Freud, 1933, Addm. I + III p26). I think it even better to 'declare,' or at least to be on the watch for what is not declared in this respect, and this is usually also the 'F-word,' in the purpose of all we all do or refrain from. We need to be very careful about all this in each-others interests and in our own competition. The purpose of this repression of eudipal and toddler-memories and protracted behavior seems obvious, but will not free us from shame, even if laughed away. Popper would have admitted that with hindsight it is unlikely to falsify outcomes of experiments on our past 'toddler-clan-behavior.' If, we could

declare obsessions, we wouldn't go wrong anymore. Nevertheless this conundrum is neglected and repressed in 'the Humanities,' which retains ignorance. If we then consider that 39% of our population is in (>12 h. a weeks) commercial work and that the other 1/2 to 2/3 are in (semi-)public service, including Universities, (mental) hospitals, on the dole, pension or other subsidies, we can estimate how 'biased' 'we' are. We can't do this away with the dichotomy: For or against 'methodical individualism,' reconciliation is required: No contradiction here.

**K Horney** ('50), the psychoanalyst, describes the obsessions of 'the west' from a behaviorist point of view: *'(-) I shall assume that the self-effacing partner is a woman and the aggressive one a man. (-) self-effacement has nothing to do with femininity or aggressive arrogance with masculinity. Both are exquisitely neurotic phenomena.'* (but) *'Her mood depends upon whether his attitude toward her is more positive or negative.'* (p247). In (1939/59) *Female psychology*, she adds a more real picture than Freud admittedly could: *Still these described cases that emanate from an unhappy individual history of particular neurotic entanglements nevertheless arise clearly from unfortunate individual development. This description might give the impression that the two sets, social and individual, are separated from each other. This is not the case. I believe I can show in each instance that the type described can develop in this direction on individual factors and I would pose that in this type of woman which is usual, only minor personal difficulties are enough to force the girl into this feminine role. (ch. 7 / 8, trln: FK).*

She poses to me a treacherous eudipal dichotomy, because some ladies pretend and I expect, from when I was a toddler in eudipal conflict, and still at 'war.'

The **11<sup>th</sup>** commandment was and is; Do not get caught leaving 'the family,' which makes it very hard for any stigma or 'Schande' to be relieved, after such a change, or to come back into a well-defined society after leaving it. Well-known exception to this rule is the parable or lesson of the Prodigal Son, Luke ch.15.11.

The **nil<sup>th</sup>** commandment, from Genesis (Bible) and preceding the 10 from Deuteronomium, is or are 'Go away' and 'multiply.' Freud thought this to be a prohibition of incest, but it also has an ambivalent relation to the **11<sup>th</sup>**. Both are not officially recognized, but everybody knows that 'going from home' is considered irreversible (so that you cannot come back), for all who were first excluded or exiled and then

‘fled’ or left, to slip in, in another ‘figuration,’ at the ‘others’ cost. Figuration- and framing-theory may predict what will become of them, us and the figuration-work done by any ‘populace,’ of whichever figuration or ‘situational’ interdependence. **The question** about the usefulness and legitimacy of marked dichotomies we keep up for so long, even if unproductive, lies in its origin, eudipal conflict and identifications, over and over, from generation to generation. Also we have the fierce opposition against calling them into question. It scares any party or anyone considering him- or herself part and parcel of a society, and thus, its figurations, which we all do by disposition (in the Freudian sense of our character when leaving our ‘eudipal phase’). Is it our nature or nurture? Often loss will be substituted with obstinacy in a fixation. We are not the same when our interests differ: Solidarity and approval are earned. If one chooses celibacy or to live on less than they hoped for, or were able to get, whether from weakness or loyalty, they should recognize and take responsibility in these sexually or otherwise differing assumed interest-groups, where we can raise our voices beneficially to all, even without resorting to a tradition, like the Catholic or the Muslim, or ‘Communications science.’ These will become more individuated traditions too. But it is still irresistible to ‘gloat,’ to all of us and it is wise to respect another’s ‘pride’ as long as we can’t all do without it. We may tone it down a bit and have a laugh. Shames are unresolved eudipal conflicts and cannot be accounted to victimized or protected ‘figurations.’ **Making fun** of competing ‘groups’ or playing blame-games for unlikely offences. We still seem to need to, to ‘feel OK’ (an ‘affect’) and that is often a black-and-white thing, and then another obsession: We’ll do even better, as we did before, gradually, wars were always our recurrent state, also when a large stream of hardly employable men and later their (extended) family members manage to swim, hike or are ‘saved’ to northern Europe while in a financial crisis of zero interest, after taking the plunge. Who benefits? They cannot be sent or, ‘come back home.’ These obsessions have had a Function in Evolution but are diminishing while being newly imported. A little cool, ‘fuzzy logic’ and the willingness to defend borders could make a huge difference here. There’s no end to this free pension, men-

tal care and housing-wanting people. It is quite feasible to calculate the value of a Syrian passport and/or fleeing-story, which gets one into the EU and is for sale on any smartphone. European states will be forced by people, who were educated with the stick to be 'productive,' even if wealthier than the poorest of 'them.' Social insurance costs half our commercial turnover in taxes, which doesn't worry civil-servants, who just see work and opportunities. It's not difficult to get at the 'figurative Christian rules' or to feel sick (of poverty) or behave childishly and 'we' are very naïve by 'feeling' shame and wanting others to help. Any in fast growing Central Asian, African or Middle-East-economies finds it on their smartphone.

**C Cooley, H Blumer, N Elias and E Goffman** tried to explain sociology and psychology, if only in a behaviorist sense, with our herd(y) need of hypnotization\* and acknowledgement. Shame, as we know from S Freud, is negative pride, separation-fear and displaced guilty feelings of early painful and traumatic loss.

**All vertebrates** guard each-other jealously. Apparently, but only that, we all construct our 'self' by old digital (1/0) choices, but a summary can hide the long-term process and its causations, even if describing all 'traumatic,' repressed or tabooed family-feuds, until now, should do. Filogenesis, similarity of human babies to adult baboons, in language and sign(all)ing is not recognized enough, but C Darwin certainly did that, in his (1872) 'Expression of the Emotions.' The reifications mystify as far as they hide our sexual object-orientation: These dichotomies still seem 'inherent,' even if of our own making, which we both debunk and glorify.

**All 'news-features'** are polemized accidents, including those with kalashnikows and/or draught. Behaviorist observation is not enough to study Mankind, there is much more to know, that we have in common, when there's only a few 'types.'

**Certain traumata** and neuroses in man are prejudiced by evolution, negatively or positively, which makes them all the more prevalent. Some even had advantages. We should have the courage to stay close to our toddler-times 'home,' and forgive the trespassers along our way, if we wish to describe them and to prescribe the better or fewer laws and companies to control our diminishing herds. Planned, in a personalized Contest, in 'democracies,' be it that all 'nominees' are said to 'represent' some 'Party' we are expected to 'identify' with (Blumer H '67). Those who

were not schooled for long and girls (not the same) know the ‘Rules of Thumb’ that are likely to apply: They have intuition, preliminary and mutually accepted hierarchy, but the females usually still sell the stuff the males produce. Our neuroses, normal and abnormal, define our emotions, feelings, affects. They are a communicational given, better not denied. A pity psychologists do just that, when concocting D.S.M.-quasi-diagnoses and prescribing regressive drugs and hospitalization others crave. Shame and feelings are replicas of early education, but pass on to generations. M Foucault (1975/84) describes the way the ‘nation-states’ and all sorts of ‘representatives’ control their figurational herds as a spiral of control of pleasures, rewarding officials with more pleasures. *‘Not because having tried to erect too rigid or (-) a barrier against sexuality, society succeeded in giving rise to a whole perverse outbreak and a long pathology of the sexual instinct. We must not imagine that the objective of saying no to all these things that were formerly tolerated attracted notice and a pejorative designation when they came to give a regulative to the one function as mechanism with types of sexuality, a double impetus: Pleasure-power that was capable of reproducing labor power and the form of the family.’* (Foucault’76p47) ‘Society’ doing anything is an impossible reification but, from all the figurational ‘work’ having been done, this seems to be so. Causes and process are represented by ‘trends’ and ‘institutional facts.’ *‘(-) A world where these relations could no longer operate in the same way: The relation of superiority (-) in the household, and over the wife (outside/ FK) had to be associated with (-) reciprocity and equality.’* (F1984p95). Shame is only felt so far we’ve been traumatized in early life and is diminishing in western ‘cultures,’ but not as yet in Africa or the Middle-East. We see that this burgeoning state-control cannot go on forever because of the costs, until minorities revolt. But a new human ‘species,’ ‘homosexual’ was ‘figured,’ to be controlled in a different way, i.c: medicallized. We already see this with so-figured ‘populists,’ gaining ground in ‘the West,’ but prevalent in the (Middle) East and Africa. Pampered ‘westerners’ realize what’s at stake, with their ‘freedoms’ and respected privacy. Few ‘trespassers’ of this ‘secret’ (G Simmel 1906) are needed to end this plight, but almost nobody dares to ‘know’ or mention it. Freudians, analysts and gays and lesbians often do, even if they are ambivalent about it, by supporting ‘refugees’ and other ‘outsiders,’ just like any woman would, almost anywhere, usually. It yields power, opportunities and supposed status, or ‘class.’

## The long-term process

Renewed matriarchal rule and the realizing of 'self,' as idealized by Horney, 'framed' by Goffman and 'figured' by Elias as 'individualization,' is a belief that still prevails. We have similar 'inner,' toddler-conflicts. If you do not believe the theory of matriarchal history, we have all been infants and were weaker than the mums that forced our super-ego and 'consciences' onto us. We always 'long' for our 'own nostalgia.' Recognition of our early mechanisms of identification and projection causes this 'individualization' in the long term, not the strictness of our superegos or civilization *per se*, which are two sides of the same coin (see 1936, A Freud, next from p.30). People are pressured a lot from infancy on, to adhere to these yes-and-no-nos, do's and don'ts, namings and shamings. They represent 'tradition.' We crave for 'freedom,' but do not understand of what or from when or whom. It is either instinct already present during infancy, or what inhibited its satisfaction and gratification. That struggle is not 'individualization,' because that could only mean struggling against one another, for pride, food, drink, shelter, like we expected, and often got, as infants. The identifications and projections, are these 'interdependendencies,' which make us reinvent them, with the applying affects and anxieties. The types of possible identifications are rather limited, according to Anna Freud ('36, Addm. I p26+), in their infantile scope of identifications and/or projections, positive or negative and passively or actively: our 'figured frames,' societies, communities and 'groups': religious, 'ethnic,' 'academic' and stately ones too. **'Choices' forced on us in 'education' are the scope of 'figurations.'** Its 'leaders' are considered and expected to be totalitarian as 'kings,' or the 'figuration,' 'our belief,' church, state or 'identity' will fall apart, by our own undoing, if not 'mended' or 'healed.' We all react to this, sometimes, with: **The populism.** Nobody known as 'populist' calls himself a populist. The stigma comes by gossip: Social identification is recognition of ones identifications by the situational group and the adaptation to the advertised one of four possible and recognized identification stances. This recurring mechanism and consciences 'force' to comply to advertised dispositions in any family or (media-) 'setting,' that will accept us only as such. We confirm and enforce each-others and our own choices as toddlers.



## Dichotomies and polarization

We always seem to look for causes of any harm or glory in the form of 'groups' or 'communities,' split into 'badies' and 'goodies' and I guess all us men and many women suffer their super-ego hatred of their toddler and eudipal punishments 'away,' by glorifying them, rightly or wrongly, after all they represent kid-defeats. Most of us repress childish memories this way or love to just laugh them off as fun. And as one can believe in a nation, some science or religion, one will have to confirm 'belief' *sui generis*, as bastardized projections and identifications, not to be 'abhorred' in moral outrage, by the same common mechanisms anymore, as they also serve competing evolutionary 'purposes.' These 'beliefs' are 'reaction formations' and stem from our own kindergarten-time or earlier, and they are not easily left behind and kept as obsessional rules to adhere to loyally, representing old failures, defeats and mortifications, accepted, though not wholly, and transposed to the 'prides' that form our present-day 'selves' and, 'identities,' whether from 'religious,' 'ideological' education, or fairy-tales we were told, mirroring the eudipal choices of time long passed. This applies, even more so in 'minority-circumstances,' West, South or East, where obsessive 'failures' of old are stronger, even if parental education was less, but more severe. There is a time-lag, as growing up with less parenting traumatizes more and expectedly leaves stronger feelings of pride and 'self.' The 'historical approach' is not enough and comparisons will always have to be made with analysis of our own personal history, i.e: our filogenesis, right into our eudipal phases, where 'mine' will be a history of a 'figuration,' and the personal ones of individuals as part of their first 'figurations:' their own family and schools, which will be copied from the wished models. It may seem a bold conclusion, but with the Freuds observations in the Addenda, it will not be anymore. The mechanisms are known by our youths by now, except maybe those of minorities, (old) leaders, 'teachers,' or 'mothers,' that don't take no for an answer and who were excluded from modern peer education. Allow more personal history and less rules to comply with in humanity-papers, with more sympathy for writers toddler-memories and of solving of our mystery-conflicts. That requires determination, fuzzy logic and honesty. When looking for freedom, inspiration, our souls, humor, liberation, nostalgia, psychology, theology, pathology, esothery, religion, the occult, sociology, spirituality, love, togetherness, warmth, dreams, fun and games,

glory, morality, romance, pride and a 'strategy,' conversion, amazement, change, heaven, enlightenment, and respect, we are usually only after our own identifications in our own eudipal figuration as our would-be 'collective' childhoods. To be reminded, zap Comedy Central to Xdisney for a while and observe the 'comedy,' cartoons, drama, horror and sci-fi. Look at e-mails, sms, twitters and listen to our gutturals: ha-has, a-ahs, aus, screams, wows, aarghs, eeks, (o)ohs and h-aas, hoarseness and our distorted voices and instruments: Like screaming toddlers, Neanderthals, and chimps. We often, refer to each-other now 'informally,' a distinction phased out of the English language and any slang. On 'the continent,' we said 'thou' to each-other in any meeting, but it's fading there too. This probably means that we are getting more conscious of these internalized, wished relations, our intuition/ambition, and are controlling them better as a result, with a guilty 'feeling' of loss or 'shame.' *Wer die Sehnsucht (longing, yearning) kennt, weiss (knows, knows) was ich leide,* '(suffer) said J von Goethe (1821). We address each-other increasingly again as-if we are brothers and sisters, whatever we suffered as toddlers, as still usual in clubs, sports parties, Church, rural places and small business, where hierarchy thrives. Dichotomies we love so much, we handle them unconsciously, but they should not be ignored or rejected for they're reflections of past choices, not voluntarily made, if we still wish for them. We expect and accept (to be) 'medicalized,' when anxious. We know from marketing and clinical psychology research, that decisions are usually already made when we find rationalizations for them. They are 'figurational memories' we cling to as-if they were our home-towns and families, where we revisit and wonder whether we belong there or if it all (still) belongs to us. If we admit it proudly, or not (shamefully), 'we,' (mankind at least and not just me) 'need' to 'belong' to a named 'world,' if only at least a wished and 'figured' one. With Anna Freud (1932) we cannot deny any longer that sexual life begins long before puberty, which makes the organization we want reidentification or reintroduction with, passively or actively, positively or negatively by the pleasure-principle and whichever gave most of it eudipally, then. Confirm this from experience with 'national-socialism' (German families felt robbed between the wars with 'Versailles'). We feel securer now than ever, so our educators and mothers can afford the passive introjection, at others expense, which we 'love' with the 'refugee-crisis.'

## Emotions

Alice Miller (1980-3), German psychoanalyst, etc. wrote on 'roots of violence:'  
*"Something similar occurs when people in therapy ask relatives questions about their deceased parents. The parents, faultless while they were alive, are automatically promoted to angels upon their death, leaving a hell of self-reproach as a legacy to their children. Since it is unlikely that anyone these children-knew will confirm their earlier negative impressions of their parents, they must keep them to themselves and think themselves very wicked for having them. It would have been no different for the thirteen-year-old Hitler when he lost his father. (-) Who would have acknowledged to the boy his fathers (or his mothers/ FK) cruelty and brutality then, if even today biographers still attempt to describe those regular beatings as (..well-meant). Since Klara, his mother extended her reverence for her husband even after his death to her pipes, we can scarcely imagine that her son would have been allowed to confide his true feelings to her"* (or later anyone else/ FK).

Dump the pride and gain the 'self-confidence' from kindergarten, accept humiliations, necessary self-control and hate of superego (= shame), reality from then!

We can thus distinguish 2<sup>3</sup> / 2 expected types of figurations: s(traight), g+l, and t+b and 'medically bad!' These landmarks we all distinguish are ambivalent, can change around, sometimes at will, be multi-poled or feigned. They are not 'groups' with 'rights' to be allocated to as such, because they are not static, sometimes malleable and always part of a game. The dialectics of Hegel, Heidegger and Merton (1949-68) are reinvented from within ourselves, and typical of human choice. All mammals tend to notice only extremes. We have had to make choices sometimes, which were always a gamble, also our eudipal ones, **so there are 3 digital (1/0) dimensions and one analog one, amount of ambivalence, to any figuration.**

Observe that: *The 'g+l' or gay- and lesbian-orientated persons and 'groups' are more **ambivalent and more hierarchical** than their 'straight' counterparts, despite their 'humour' and railing over what they 'love' and that they dominate media narrative, with the use of first names, wigs, and constant pouting (with teeth). All these relationtypes usually espouse an active and a passive partner. The 'g+l's' are feared and resented as 'liberated,' but mostly for their supposed promiscuity. The 'wow-' factor, huge, strong, delightful, is always the same, and women, who are more competitive, (think) they are 'worse off,' and the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> worlds have more 'l+g' combos/ singles than the 1<sup>st</sup>, even if suppressed by Judiciary, police, (church) and mosqs. All we see is only what it looks like, to me or to you; Sorry, but the 'l+b-' combo's were there before the 'straight'*

*duos. 'Straight' has evolved to be less hierarchical.*

*The 'l+b's' then, are the immanent upcoming heterosexuals of their future, that needs not be in 'the west.' 'West-' or 'north-people' will not insure the 'l+g's' from 'south' or 'east,' and that would not do them any good, they would only expect more 'freedoms,' 'rights' and more pampering, just like we tried once. This 'helping' with such good intentions caused so many wars in the past centuries. All 'we' can do is help 'them' with more commerce over there and more tolerance. They will first have to 'fight-out' their ambivalence and repress it with their 'civilization,' as 'we' did.*

*This applies increasingly to women in general, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> world people and the other mammals. Hierarchy, or 'devotion,' which is diminishing fast, is what all long for, what seems 'romantic.' We may conclude that the 'g+l' combo's and groups were there first, as ongoing love/hate fights, from which the now prevalent, less ambivalent, hierarchical and sado-masochist relations evolved. Consequently the 'l+g' combos are both more prevalent and more subdued than in 'the west.' The limit-less urge to be 'respected' there, is a postponed eudipal choice,' which westerners cannot resolve. They 'want' more, or think they 'deserve' even more, than 'us' rich, zealous 'westerners.'*

Dichotomies? Interesting! Love, destiny, sociology, humanities, anthropology etc!  
Do we ever grow up? Who is 'responsible?' Lies, lies! No-one in particular. In a 'democracy,' 'bosses' of utilities, can deny their clients services they've already paid taxes for, or admit others to compete for 'free.' That power has its limits, where the 'bosses' are always part of a sort of a 'court' of assumed bosses and/or their spouses, like party-members who obtained a civil position in the past, whos parties may have lost their mandate, i.e. in a municipal board. In the end, it will only be those in a 'court of military power,' a medical function, in schools, providers of shelter or police, who can threaten or extort the taxed to let them 'do' more, as we know from Elias introduction (1969): 'State-formation.' Are appointed 'bosses' in their 'courts' 'grown-up?' Not if they 'believe.' With Gasset J (1922), 'theatre,' movies and stories are only accepted as such when written from a recognised eudipal toddler scope, of which there are only 4, if dominant/active vs. deferrant/passive is not counted as a 'typical relation,' because it always is, or male/female, which is a static given, not a choice. In Church only 2 are allowed and respected ('holy trinity'), or we wouldn't know what to expect in our agreed 'belief' or social rules. We call 'scientific,' objective, or 'nonfiction' only so if they are made by one of them, lesbian or gay, i.c: one of the regular 'outsiders.' They are less than 1/5<sup>th</sup> of all, but 'growing,' if taken very broadly and include the 'manifest,' who don't qualify when

their wish is 'only just' a 'figurated' family. At puberty there is no such 'choice' anymore, except with a painstaking analysis, with no success or definitive 'choice' guaranteed and much insecurity of 'identity.' Judging from our youths dressing nowadays, with lots of torn (off) trousers and strange haircuts, they accept this. Youngsters are freer to express and play on sexual orientations and preferences. The question: What's in a name? gives: 'Claimants eudipal appearance as kings, queens or (good) beggars; which it's all about in games of attainment, where ambivalence reigns. State, Church and Islam, are long-term solutions for our castration-complexes, apart from the redistribution/insurance 'clans.' Men, incorporated their mothers complexes in their super-egos by her disciplining education. Deduction is digital choice by an assumed rule, of which many seem to 'even-out,' but this 'subjectivity' can never be all wrong and statistical 'proof' certainly can. Everybody and at least the large majority think possible or 'true' what they 'like.' The question of 'progress yes or no?' cannot be bypassed. We evolve and compete, with the dichotomies we always have to 'choose' from, and in, to be 'understood.' It is not more state or conscience, but more consciousness of our own childhoods. To judge any ('in power'), we must compare our own private toddler (hi-)stories, when everything we see is Platos 'appearance-reality,' not Aristotles 'matter-reality,' which requires psycho-analytical self-inspection, for which the Freuds, Sigmund and Anna, gave us the tools a century ago, suppressed by our educators for laughing-stock reasons, of which all can be read, next. In the mean time we're still being extorted and given what we 'believe' we 'want.'

### **\* Imperative**

We're used to being commanded, us humans actually want to be yelled at: We 'feel safe, 'at ease' and 'looked after,' as 'good slaves' did and Slavs still do and as we all must have craved for as toddlers. Recognize this? Any addiction is unconscious craving for relief from our suppressed, but remembered directives from our keeper(s) then: Wished for parent(s), yet still we 'want out.' Congratulations, thanks.

[©2015-7FritsKaal@Catch-22.net\(64-6ys\)](mailto:©2015-7FritsKaal@Catch-22.net(64-6ys)) No copyright, except source be mentioned if published, no text-changes and please send me a copy. You can download the doc-file from my site: Click right down below on the blue 'bye.' When you open this file, open the menu 'Control,' then choose 'no markings'/'definitive.' The text will then fit the 40 pp.

*Muslimas at the Church-bazaar, searching clothes to wear. Look at their pouts. Desire, excitement, guilt, fear or fun?'15-5*



**Ch.9 Identification with the Aggressor**

It is comparatively easy to discover the defense mechanisms to which the ego habitually resorts, so long as each is employed separately and only in conflict with some specific danger. When we find denial, we know that it is a reaction to external danger; when repression takes place, the ego is struggling with instinctual stimuli. The strong outward resemblance between inhibition and ego restriction makes it less certain whether these processes are part of an external or an internal conflict. The matter is still more intricate when defensive measures are combined when the same mechanism is employed sometimes against an internal and sometimes against an external force. We have an excellent illustration of both these complications in the process of identification. Since it is one of the factors in the development of the superego, it contributes to the mastery of instinct. But, as I hope to show in what follows, There are occasions when it combines with other mechanisms to form one of the ego's most potent weapons in its dealings with external objects which arouse anxiety. August Aichorn relates that, when he was giving advice on a child guidance committee, he had to deal with the case of a boy at an elementary school, who was brought to him because of a habit of making faces. The master complained that the boy's behavior, when he was blamed or reprimanded, was quite abnormal. On such occasions he made faces which caused the whole class to burst out laughing. The masters view was that either the boy was consciously making fun of him or else the twitching of his face must be due to some kind of tic. His report was at once corroborated, for the boy began to make faces during the consultation, but, when master, pupil and psychologist were together, the situation was explained. Observing the two, Aichorn saw that the boy's grimaces were simply a caricature of the angry expression of the teacher and that, when he had to face a scolding by the latter, he tried to master his anxiety by involuntarily imitating him. The boy identified himself with the teachers anger and copied his expression, though

the imitation was not recognized. Through his grimaces he was assimilating himself to or identifying himself with the dreaded external object. My readers will remember the case of the little girl who tried by means of magic gestures to get over the mortification associated with her penis envy. This child was purposely and consciously making use of a mechanism to which the boy resorted involuntarily. At home she was afraid to cross the hall in the dark, because she had a dread of seeing ghosts. However, she hit on a device which enabled her to do it: she would run across the hall, making all sorts of peculiar gestures as she went. Before long, she triumphantly told her little brother the secret of how she had got over her anxiety. "there's no need to be afraid in the hall," she said, "you just have to pretend that you're the ghost who might meet you." This shows that her magic gestures represented the movements she imagined ghosts would make. We might be inclined to regard this kind of conduct as an idiosyncrasy in the two children whose cases I have quoted, but it is really one of the most natural and most widespread modes of behavior on the part of the primitive ego and has long been familiar to those who have made a study of primitive methods of invoking and exorcising spirits and of primitive religious ceremonies. Moreover, there are many children's games in which through the metamorphosis of the subject into a dreaded object anxiety is converted into pleasurable security. Here is another angle from which to study the games of impersonation which children love to play.

Now the physical imitation of an antagonist represents the assimilation of only one part of a composite anxiety experience. We learn from observation that the other elements also have to be mastered. The six-year old patient to whom I have several times alluded had to pay a series of visits to a dentist. At first everything went splendidly; the treatment did not hurt him and he was triumphant and made merry over the idea of anyone's being afraid of the dentist. But there came a time when my little patient arrived at my house

in an extremely bad temper. The dentist had just hurt him. He was cross and unfriendly and vented his feelings on the things in my room. His first victim was a piece of India rubber. He wanted me to give it to him and, when I refused, he took a knife and tried to cut it in half. Next, he coveted a large ball of string. He wanted me to give him that too, and painted me a vivid picture of what a good leash it would make for his animals. When I refused to give him the whole ball, he took his knife again and secured a large piece of the string. But he did not use it; instead, he began, after a few minutes to cut it into tiny pieces. Finally, he threw away the string too, turned his attention to some pencils, and went on indefatigably sharpening them, breaking off the points, and sharpening them again. It would not be correct to say that he was playing at "dentists." There was no actual impersonation of the dentist. The child was identifying himself not with the aggressor but with his aggression.

On another occasion this little boy came to me just after he had had a slight accident. He had been joining in an outdoor game at school and had run full tilt against the fist of the games master, which the latter happened to be holding up in front of him. My little patient's lip was bleeding and his face tear-stained, and he tried to conceal both facts by putting up his hand as a screen. I endeavored to comfort and reassure him. He was in a woebegone condition when he left me, but next day he appeared holding himself very erect and dressed in full armor. On his head he wore a military cap and he had a toy sword at his side and a pistol in his hand. When he saw my surprise at this transformation, he simply said, "I just wanted to have these things on when I was playing with you." He did not, however, play, instead, he sat down and wrote a letter to his mother: "Dear Mummy, please, please, please, please send me the pocketknife you promised me and don't wait till Easter!" Here again we cannot say that, in order to master the anxiety experience of the previous day, he was impersonating the teacher with whom he had collided. Nor, in this instance, was he imitating the latter's aggression. The weapons and armor, being man-

ly attributes, evidently symbolized the teacher's strength and, like the attributes of the father in the animal fantasies, helped to identify with the adult and so to defend himself against the narcissistic mortification or actual mishaps.

The examples which I have so far cited illustrate a process with which we are quite familiar. A child introjects some characteristic of an anxiety object and so assimilates an anxiety experience which he has just undergone. Here, the mechanism of identification or introjection is combined with a second important mechanism. By impersonating the aggressor, assuming his attributes or imitating his aggression, the child transforms himself from the person threatened into the person who makes the threat. In "*Beyond the Pleasure Principle*" (1920, Freud S) the significance of this change from the passive to the active role as a means of assimilating unpleasant or traumatic experiences in infancy is discussed in detail: "If the doctor looks down a child's throat or carries out some small operation, we may be quite sure that the frightening experiences will be the subject of the next game; but we must not in that connection overlook the fact that there is a yield of pleasure from another source. As the child passes over from the passivity of the experience to the activity in the game, he hands the disagreeable experience to one of his playmates and in this way revenges himself on a substitute. (p.17). What is true of play is equally true of other behavior in children. In the cases of the boy who made faces against and the little girl who practiced magic, it is not clear what finally became of the threat with which they identified themselves, but in the little boy's ill temper the aggression taken over from the dentist and the games master was directed against the world at large.

This process of transformation strikes us as more curious when the anxiety relates not to some event in the past but to something expected in the future. I remember a boy who had the habit of furiously pulling the bell of the children's home where he lived. As soon as the door was opened, he would scold the housemaid loudly for being so slow and not listening for the bell. In the interval between pulling the bell and

flying into a rage he experienced anxiety lest he should be reproved for his lack of consideration in ringing so loudly. He upbraided the servant before she had time to complain of his conduct. The vehemence with which he scolded her—a prophylactic measure—indicated the intensity of his anxiety. The aggressiveness turned against the actual person from whom he expected aggression, not against some substitute. The reversal of roles of attacker and attacked was in this case carried to its logical conclusion.

Jenny Waelder has given a vivid picture of this process in a five-year old boy whom she treated. When his analysis was about to touch on the material connected with masturbation and the fantasies associated with it, this little boy, who was actually shy and inhibited, became fiercely aggressive. His habitually passive attitude disappeared and there was no trace left of his feminine characteristics. In the analytic hour he pretended to be a roaring lion and attacked the analyst. He carried a rod about with him and played at “Krampus” (a devil/AF), i.e., he laid about him with it on the stairs, in his own house, and in my room. His grandmother and mother complained that he tried to strike them in the face. His mother’s uneasiness reached climax when he took to brandishing kitchen knives. Analysis showed that the child’s aggressiveness could not be construed as indicating that some inhibition on his instinctual impulses had been lifted. The release of his masculine tendencies was still a long way off. He was simply suffering from anxiety. The bringing into consciousness and the necessary confession of his former and recent sexual activities aroused in him the expectation of punishment. According to his experience, grown-up people were angry when they discovered a child indulging in such practices. They shouted at him, checked him with a box on the ears or beat him with a rod; perhaps they would even cut off some part of him with a knife. When my little patient assumed the active role, roaring like a lion and laying about him with the rod and the knife, he was dramatizing and forestalling the punishment

which he feared. He had introjected the aggression of the adults in whose eyes he felt guilty and, having exchanged the passive for the active part, he directed his own aggressive acts against those same people. Every time that he found himself on the verge of communicating to me what he regarded as dangerous material, his aggressiveness increased. But directly (after /FK) his forbidden thoughts and feelings broke through and had been discussed and interpreted, he felt no further need of the “Krampus” rod, which till then he had constantly carried about with him, and he left it at my house. His compulsion to beat other people disappeared simultaneously with his expectation of being beaten.

In the “identification with the aggressor” we recognize a by no means uncommon stage in the normal development of the superego. When the two boys whose cases I have just described, who identified themselves with their elders’ threats of punishment, they were taking an important step toward the formation of that institution: they were internalizing other people’s criticism of their behavior. When a child constantly repeats this process of internalization and projects the qualities of those responsible for him, making their characteristics and opinions his own, he is providing material from which the superego may take shape. But at this point children are not quite whole-hearted in acknowledging that institution. Internalized criticism is not yet immediately transformed to self-criticism. As we have seen in the examples, it is dissociated from the child’s own activity and turned back on the outside world. By means of a defensive process, identification with the aggressor is succeeded by an assault on the outside world.. In certain phases of resistance a young patient used bitterly to reproach her analyst with being secretive. She complained that the analyst was too reserved and she would torment her with questions on personal matters and be miserable when she received no answer. Then the reproaches would cease only to begin after a short time, always in the same stereotyped and, as it were, automatic fashion. In this case again we can de-



fect two phases in the psychic process. From time to time, because of a certain inhibition which prevented her speaking out, the patient herself consciously suppressed some very private material. She knew that she was thereby breaking the fundamental rule of analysis and she expected the analyst to rebuke her. She introjected the fantasied rebuke and, adopting an active role, applied the accusation to the analyst.

Her phases of aggression exactly coincided in time with her phases of secretiveness. She criticized analyst for the very fault of which she herself was guilty. Her own secretive behavior was perceived as reprehensible on the analyst's part. (-). These three (*two/FK*) examples have given us some idea of the origin of this particular phase in the development of function of the superego.

### Ch.10 A form of altruism

The effect of the mechanism of projection is to break the connection between the ideational representatives of the dangerous instinctual impulses and the ego. In this it resembles most closely the process of repression. Other defensive processes, such as displacement, reversal or turning around upon the self, affect the instinctual process itself: repression and projection merely prevent its being perceived. In repression the objectionable idea is thrust back into the id, while in projection it is displaced into the outside world. Another point in which projection resembles repression is that it is not associated with any particular anxiety situation but may be motivated equally by objective anxiety, superego anxiety, and instinctual anxiety. Writers of the English school of psychoanalysis maintain that in the earliest months of life, before any repression has taken place, the infant already projects its first aggressive impulses and that this process is of crucial importance for the picture which the child forms of the world around him and the way in which his personality develops.

At all events the use of the mechanism of projection is quite natural to the ego of little children throughout the earliest period of development. They employ it as a means of repudiating their own activities and wishes when these become dangerous and of laying the responsibility for

Even when the external criticism has been introjected, the threat of punishment and the offense committed have not been connected up in the patient's mind. The moment the criticism is internalized, the offense is externalized. This means that the mechanism of identification with the aggressor is supplemented by another defensive measure, namely the projection of guilt.

An ego which with the aid of the defense mechanism of projection develops along this particular line introjects the authorities, to whose criticism it is exposed and incorporates them in the superego. It is then able to project impulses outward. Its intolerance of other people precedes its severity to itself. It learns what is regarded as blameworthy but protects itself by this defense mechanism from unpleasant self-criticism. (-)

them at the door of some external agent. A "strange child," an animal, even inanimate objects are all equally useful to the infantile ego for the purpose of disposing of its own faults. It is normal for it constantly to get rid of prohibited impulses and wishes in this way, handing them over in full measure to other people. If these wishes entail punishment by authorities, the ego puts forward as whipping boys the persons upon whom it has projected them; If the projection was prompted by a sense of guilt, instead of criticizing itself, it accuses others. In either case it dissociates itself from its proxies and is excessively intolerant in its judgment of them.

The mechanism of projection disturbs our human relations when we project our own jealousy and attribute to other people our own aggressive acts. But it may work in another way as well, enabling us to form valuable positive attachments and so to consolidate our relations with one another. This normal and less conspicuous form of projection might be described as "altruistic surrender" of our own instinctual impulses in favor of other people.

The following is an example of what I mean. A young governess reported in her analysis that, as a child, she was possessed by two ideas: she wanted to have beautiful clothes and a number of children. In her fantasies she was almost ob-

sessionally absorbed in picturing the fulfillment of these two wishes. But there were a great many other things she demanded as well: she wished to have and to do everything better than her much older playmates had and did—indeed, she wanted to do everything better than they and to be admired for her cleverness. Her everlasting cry of “Me too!” was a nuisance to her elders. It was characteristic of her desires that they were at once urgent and insatiable.

What chiefly struck one about her as an adult was her unassuming character and the modesty of the demands which she made on life. When she came to be analyzed, she was unmarried and childless and her dress was rather shabby and inconspicuous. She showed little sign of envy or ambition and would compete with other people only if she were forced to by external circumstances. One’s first impression was that, as so often happens, she had developed in exactly the opposite direction from what her childhood would have led one to expect and that her wishes had been repressed and replaced in consciousness by reaction formations (unobtrusiveness instead of a craving for admiration and unassumingness instead of ambition). One would have expected to find that the repression was caused by a prohibition of sexuality, extending from her exhibitionistic impulses and the desire for children to the whole of her instinctual life.

But there were features in her behavior at the time when I knew her which contradicted this impression. When her life was examined in more detail, it was clear that her original wishes were affirmed in a manner which seemed scarcely possible if repression had taken place. The repudiation of her own sexuality did not prevent her from taking an affectionate interest in the love life of her women friends and colleagues. She was an enthusiastic matchmaker and many love affairs were confided to her. Although she took no trouble about her own dress, she displayed a lively interest in her friends’ clothes. Childless herself, she was devoted to other people’s children, as was indicated by her profession. She might be said to display an unusual degree of concern about her friends’ having pretty clothes,

being admired, and having children. Similarly, in spite of her own retiring behavior, she was ambitious for the men whom she loved and followed their careers with the utmost interest. It looked as if her own life been emptied of interests and wishes; up to the time of her analysis it was almost entirely uneventful. Instead of exerting herself to achieve any aims of her own, she expended all her energy in sympathizing with the experiences of people she cared for. She lived in lives of other people, instead of having her own. The analysis of her infantile relations to her mother and father revealed clearly the nature of her inner transformation which had taken place. Her early renunciation of instinct had resulted in the formation of an exceptionally severe superego, which made it impossible for her to gratify her own wishes. Her penis wish, with its offshoots in the shape of ambitious masculine fantasies, was prohibited, so too her feminine wish for children and the desire to display herself, naked or in beautiful clothes, to her father, and to win his admiration. But these impulses were not repressed: she found some proxy in the outside world to serve as a repository for each of them. The vanity of her women friends provided, as it were, a foothold for the projection of her own vanity, while her libidinal wishes and ambitious fantasies were likewise deposited in the outside world. She projected her prohibited instinctual impulses onto other people, just as the patients did whose cases I quoted in the last chapter. The only difference lay in the way in which these impulses were subsequently dealt with. The patient did not dissociate herself from her proxies but identified herself with them. She showed her sympathy with their wishes and felt that there was an extraordinary strong bond between the people and herself. Her superego, which condemned a particular instinctual impulse when it related to her own ego, was surprisingly tolerant of it in other people. She gratified her own instincts by sharing in the gratification of others, employing for this purpose the mechanism of projection and identification. The retiring attitude which the prohibition of her impulses caused her to adopt where she herself was con-

cerned vanished when it was a question of fulfilling the same wishes after they had been projected unto someone else. The surrender of her instinctual impulses in favor of other people had thus an egoistic significance, but in her efforts to gratify the impulses of others.

Her behavior could only be called altruistic. (-) Any number of cases similar to those which I have quoted can be observed in everyday life, when once our attention has been called to this combination of projection and identification for purposes of defense. For instance, a young girl, who had scruples of conscience about marrying herself, did all she could to encourage her sisters engagement. A patient, who suffered from obsessional inhibitions in spending any money on herself, had no hesitation in spending lavishly on presents. Another patient, who was prevented by anxiety from carrying out her plans for travel, was quite unexpectedly pressing in her advice to her friends to do so. In all these cases the patients identification of herself with a sister, a friend, or the recipient of a gift betrayed itself by a sudden warm sense of a bond between them, which lasted as long as her own wish was being vicariously fulfilled. Jokes about "match-making old maids" and "meddlesome onlookers, for whom no stakes are too high," are perennial. The surrender of one's own wishes to another person and the attempt to secure their fulfillment thus vicariously are comparable to the interest and pleasure with which one watches a game in which one has no stake ('sports'/FK).

This defensive process, serves two purposes. On the one hand it enables subject to take a friendly interest in the gratification of other peoples' instincts. And so, indirectly and in spite of the superegos' prohibition, to gratify his own, while, on the other, it liberates the inhibited activity and aggression primarily designed to secure the fulfillment of the instinctual wishes in their original relation to himself.

The patient who could not lift a finger to gratify her own oral impulses could feel indignant at the mothers' refusal to indulge her child, i.e., at oral renunciation imposed on someone else. The daughter-in-law who was prohibited from claim-

ing the rights of the dead wife, felt it permissible to defend the symbolic right of another with the full force of her aggression. An employee who would never venture to ask for a raise in salary for herself suddenly besieged the manageress that one of her fellow workers should have her rights. Analysis of such situations shows that the defensive process has its origin in the infantile conflict with parental authority about some form of instinctual gratification. Aggressive impulses against the mother, prohibited so long as it is a question of fulfilling the subjects' own wishes, are given rein when the wishes are ostensibly those of someone else. The most familiar representative of this kind of person is the public benefactor, who with the utmost aggressiveness and energy demands money from one set of people in order to give it to another ('socialists'/FK). Perhaps the most extreme instance is that of the assassin who, in the name of the oppressed, murders the oppressor. The object against which the liberated aggression is directed is invariably the representative of the authority which imposed the renunciation of instinct in infancy.

Various factors determine the selection of the object in favor of whom instinctual impulses are surrendered. Possibly the perception of the prohibited impulse in another person is sufficient to suggest to the ego that here is an opportunity for projection. In the case of the patient, who assisted in disposal of her mother-in-law's property, the fact that the vicarious figure was not a near relation was a guarantee of the harmlessness of the wish which, when cherished, by the patient mastering anxieties that belong to it more strongly than the boy does. Very often, too, she adopts the masculine mode of mastering anxiety. We shall see in the next chapter why it is more difficult for her to establish the feminine position than it is for the boy to establish the male one, as herself, represented by her incestuous impulses. In most cases the substitute has once been the object of envy. The altruistic governess in my first example displaced her ambitious fantasies onto her men friends and her libidinal wishes unto her women friends. The former succeeded to her affection for her father, and her big broth-

er, both of whom had been the object of her penis envy, while the latter represented the sister upon whom, at a rather later period of childhood, that envy was displaced into envy of her beauty. The patient felt that the fact that she was a girl prevented her from achieving her ambition and, at the same time, that she was not even a pretty enough girl really to be attractive to men. In her disappointment with herself she displaced her wishes onto objects who she felt were better qualified to fulfill them. Her men friends were vicariously to achieve for her in professional life what she could never achieve, and the girls who were better looking than herself were to do the same in the sphere of love. Her altruistic surrender was a method of overcoming her narcissistic mortification. This surrender of instinctual wishes to an object better qualified to fulfill them often determines the relation of a girl to some man who she chooses to represent her —to the detriment of any true object relation. On the grounds of this “altruistic” attachment she expects him to carry out the projects in which she believes herself to be handicapped by her sex: for instance, she wants him to lead the life of a student or to adopt a particular profession or to be-

#### ADDENDUM II: **Melanie Klein (1932) Childrens Analysis** (p262..4)

It is here that his activities and achievements come in. By means of those achievements, whether in the physical or the mental field, which call for courage, endurance, strength and enterprise he proves himself, among other things, that the castration he dreads so much has not happened to him. His achievements also gratify his reactive tendencies and allay his sense of guilt. They show him that his constructive capacities outweigh his destructive tendencies, and they represent restitution done towards his objects. By giving him these assurances they greatly add to the gratification they afford him. The allayment of his anxiety and sense of guilt, which in the latency period he has found in the successful pursuit of his activities in so far as they are made ego-syntonic by the approval of his environment, must in the period of puberty come from the value which his performances and achievements have for him.

come famous or rich in her place. In such cases egoism and altruism may be blended in very various proportions. We know that parents sometimes delegate to their children their projects for their own lives, in a manner at once altruistic and egoistic. It is as if they hoped through the child, whom they regard better qualified for the purpose than themselves, to wrestle from life the fulfillment of the ambitions which they themselves have failed to realize. (-) A man's success in life does, indeed, go far to compensate the women of his family for the renunciation of their own ambition. (-) when his impulses have been surrendered in favor of other people, their lives become precious rather than his own. (-).

It was only after analysis, when she happened to fall ill, that the young governess discovered that the thought of dying was painful to her. To her own surprise she found that she ardently desired to live long enough to furnish her new home and to pass an examination which would secure her promotion in her profession. (-)

*She goes on showing these early types of decisions repeated according to the then pleasure-unpleasure principle, that 'forms' our 'worlds,' 'cultures,' 'discourses,' 'narratives,' 'frames,' 'selves,' 'ethnicities,' all 'figured along, (FK).*

We must now give a brief consideration in which the girl deals with her anxiety-situations at puberty. At this age she normally preserves the aims of the latency period and the modes of masculine one. The erection of standards and ideals which take place in the boy at puberty plays an important part in her development also, but it takes a more subjective and personal form and she sets less store by abstract principles. Her desire to please her objects extends to mental pursuits as well and plays part even in her highest intellectual achievements. Her attitude to her work, in so far as the masculine components are not predominantly involved, corresponds to her attitude towards her own body; and her activities in relation to these two interests are largely concerned with dealing with her specific anxiety situations. A beautiful body or a perfect piece of work provide the growing girl with the same counter-proofs as she had need of a child—

namely, that the inside of her body has not been destroyed by her mother, and that the children have not been taken out of it. As a grown woman, her relation to her child, which often takes the place of her relation to her work, is a very great help to her in dealing with anxiety. To have it and nurse it and watch it grow and thrive—these things provide her, exactly as in the case of the little girl and her dolls, with ever renewed proofs that her possession of a child is not endangered, and serve to allay her sense of guilt. (-) Similarly, her relation to her home, which is equivalent to her own body, has a special importance for the feminine mode of mastering anxiety, and has, besides, another and more direct connection with her early anxiety-situation. As we have seen, the little girl's rivalry with her mother finds utterance, among other things, in phantasies of driving her out and taking her place as mistress of the house. An important part of this anxiety-situation for children of both sexes, but more especially for girls, consists in the fear of being turned out of the house and being left homeless. Their contentment with their own home is always partly based on its value as a refutation of this element in their anxiety situations. Her relation to men, furthermore, is largely determined by her need to convince herself through their admiration of the intactness of her body. Her narcissism, therefore, plays a great part in her mastery of anxiety. It is as a result of this feminine mode of mastering anxiety that

**ADDENDUM III: Sigmund Freud (1930) Civilization and its Discontents (Ch.II)**

*Wer Wissenschaft und Kunst besitzt, hat auch Religion;  
Wer jene beide nicht besitzt, der habe Religion!*

(He who possesses science and art also has religion; But he who possesses neither of the two, let him have religion.) Goethe, *Zahme Xenien IX*  
This saying on the one hand draws an antithesis between religion and the two highest achievements of man, and on the other, asserts that, as regards their value in life, those achievements and religion can represent or replace each other. If we also set out to deprive the common man, (who has neither science or art) of his religion, we shall clearly not have the poets authority on our side. Life, as we find it, is too hard for us; it

women are so much more dependent on the love and approval of men—and of objects in general—than men are upon women. But men, too, extract from their love-relations tranquillization of their anxiety which contributes no little to the sexual gratification they get from them. The normal process of mastering anxiety seems to be conditional upon a number of factors, in which the specific methods employed act in conjunction with quantitative elements, such as the amount of sadism and anxiety present and the degree of capacity possessed by the ego to tolerate anxiety. If these interactive factors attain a certain optimum, it appears that the individual is able to modify quite successfully even large quantities of anxiety, to develop his ego in a satisfactory manner and even well above the average, and to achieve mental health. The conditions under which he can master anxiety are as specific as the conditions under which he can love, and are, as far as can be seen, very intimately bound up with them. In some cases, best typified in the age of puberty, the condition for mastering anxiety is that the individual shall face especially difficult circumstances, such as give rise to strong fear; in others, it is that he shall avoid as far as he can—and even in extreme cases, in a phobic way—all such circumstances. Between these two extremes is situated what can be regarded a normal impulsion to obtain pleasure from the overcoming of anxiety-situations that are associated with not too much anxiety.(-).

brings us too many pains, disappointments and impossible tasks. In order to bear it we cannot dispense with palliative measures. (-) There are perhaps three such measures: powerful deflections, cause us to make light out of our misery; substitute satisfactions, which diminish it; and intoxicating substances, which make us insensitive to it. Something of the kind is indispensable. Voltaire has deflections in mind when he ends *Candide* with the advice to 'cultivate one's garden;' and scientific activity is of this kind too. (-) (Ch.VII:). Having reached the end of this journey, (I) ask (my) readers' forgiveness for not ha-

ving been a more skillful guide and for not having spared him empty stretches of road and troublesome *detours*. It could have been done better. In the first place, I suspect that the reader has the impression that our discussions on the sense of guilt disrupts the framework of this essay: that they take up too much space, so that the rest of the subject-matter, with which they are not always closely connected, is pushed to one side. This may have spoilt the structure of my paper; but it corresponds faithfully to my intention to represent the sense of guilt as the most important problem in the development and to show that the price we pay for our advance in civilization is a loss of happiness through the heightening of the sense of guilt. Anything that still sounds strange about this statement, which is the final conclusion of our investigation, can probably be traced to the quite peculiar relationship – as yet completely unexplained – which the sense of guilt has to our consciousness. In the common case of remorse, which we regard as normal, this feeling makes itself clearly enough perceptible to consciousness. Indeed, we are accustomed to speak of a ‘consciousness of guilt’ instead of a ‘sense of guilt.’ Our study of the neuroses, to which, after all, we owe the most valuable pointers to an understanding of normal conditions, brings us up against some contradictions. In one of those affections, obsessional neuroses, the sense of guilt makes itself noisily heard in consciousness; it dominates the clinical picture and the patient’s life as well, and it hardly allows anything else to appear alongside of it. But in most other cases and forms of neurosis it remains completely unconscious, without on that account producing any less important effects. Our patients do not believe us when we attribute an ‘unconscious sense of guilt’ to them. In order to make ourselves at all intelligible to them, we tell them of an unconscious need for punishment, in which the sense of guilt finds expression. But its connection with a particular form of neurosis must not be over-estimated. Even in obsessional neurosis there are types of patients who are not aware of their sense of guilt, or who feel it as a tormenting uneasiness, a kind of anx-

iety, if they are prevented from carrying out certain actions. It ought to be possible eventually to understand these things; but as yet we cannot. Here perhaps we may be glad to have it pointed out that the sense of guilt is at bottom nothing else but a topographic variety of anxiety; in its later phases it coincides completely with *fear of the super-ego*. And the relations of anxiety to consciousness exhibit the same extraordinary variations. Anxiety is always present somewhere or other behind every symptom; but at one time it takes noisy possession of the whole of consciousness, while at another it conceals itself so completely that we are obliged to speak of unconscious anxiety or, if we want to have a cleaner psychological conscience, since anxiety is in the first instance simply a feeling, of possibilities of anxiety. Consequently it is very conceivable that the sense of guilt produced by civilization is not perceived as such either and remains to a large extent unconscious, or appears as a sort of *malaise*, a dissatisfaction, for which people seek other motivations. Religions at any rate, have never overlooked the part played in civilization by a sense of guilt. Furthermore – a point which I failed to appreciate elsewhere – they claim to redeem mankind from this sense of guilt, which they call sin. From the manner in which, in Christianity, this redemption is achieved – by the sacrificial death of a single person, who in this manner takes upon himself a guilt that is common to everyone we have inferred what the first occasion may have been on which this primal guilt, which was the beginning of civilization, was acquired. Though it cannot be of great importance, it may not be superfluous to elucidate the meaning of a few words such as ‘super ego,’ ‘conscience,’ ‘sense of guilt,’ ‘need for punishment’ and ‘remorse,’ which we have often used, perhaps too loosely and interchangeably. They all relate to the same state of affairs, but denote different aspects of it. The super-ego is an agency which has been inferred by us, and conscience is a function we ascribe, among other functions, to that agency. This function consists in keeping a watch over the actions and intentions of the ego and judging them, in exercising a censorship. This sense of guilt, the

harshness of the super-ego, is thus the same thing as the severity of the conscience. It is the perception which the ego has of being watched over, the assessment of the tension between its own strivings and the demands of the super-ego. The fear of this critical agency (a fear which is at bottom of the relationship), the need for punishment, is an instinctual manifestation on the part of the ego, which has become masochistic under the influence of a sadistic super-ego; it is a portion, that is to say, of the instinct towards internal destruction present in the ego, employed for forming an erotic attachment to the super-ego. We ought not to speak of a conscience until a super-ego is demonstrably present. As to a sense of guilt, we must admit that it is in existence before the super-ego, and therefore before conscience too. At that time it is the immediate expression of fear of the external authority, a recognition of the tension between the ego and that authority. It is the direct derivative of the conflict between the need for authority's love and the urge towards instinctual satisfaction, whose inhibition produces the inclination to aggression. The superimposition of these two strata of the sense of guilt – one coming from the *external* authority, the other from fear of the *internal* authority – has hampered our insight into the position of conscience in a number of ways. Remorse is a general term for the ego's reaction in a case of sense of guilt. It contains, in little altered form, the sensory material of the anxiety which is operating behind the sense of guilt; it is itself a punishment and can include the need for punishment. Thus remorse, too, can be older than conscience. Nor will it do any harm if we once more review the contradictions which have for a while perplexed us during our inquiry. Thus, at one point the sense of guilt was the consequence of acts of aggression that had been abstained from; but at another point – and that is precisely at its historical beginning, -- the killing of the father – it was the consequence of an act of aggression that had been carried out. But a way out of this difficulty was found. For the institution of the internal authority, the super-

ego, altered the situation radically. Before this, the sense of guilt coincided with remorse. (We may remark, incidentally, that the term 'remorse' should be reserved for the reaction after an act of aggression has actually been carried out.) After this, owing to the omniscience of the super-ego, the difference between an aggression intended and an aggression carried out lost its force. Henceforward a sense of guilt could be produced not only by an act of violence that is actually carried out (as all the world knows), but also by one that is merely intended (as psychoanalysis has discovered). Irrespectively of this alteration in the psychological situation, the conflict arising from ambivalence – the conflict between the two instincts – leaves the same result behind. We are tempted to look here for the solution of the problem of the varying relation in which the sense of guilt stands to consciousness. It might be thought that a sense of guilt arising from remorse for an evil *deed* must always be conscious, whereas a sense of guilt arising from a perception of an evil *impulse* may remain unconscious. But the answer is not so simple. Obsessional neurosis speaks against it.

The second contradiction concerned the aggressive energy with which we suppose the super-ego to have been endowed. According to one view, that energy merely carries on the punitive energy of the external authority and keeps it alive in the mind; while, according to another view, it consists, on the contrary, of one's own aggressive energy which has not been used and which one now directs against that inhibiting authority. The first view seemed to fit in better with the *history*, and the second with the *theory* of the sense of guilt. Closer selection resolved this apparently irreconcilable contradiction; The common factor was that we were dealing with an aggressiveness which was displaced inwards. Clinical observation, allows us to distinguish two sources for the aggressiveness which we attribute to the super-ego; one or the other exercises the stronger effect, but generally they operate in unison.'

- Becker H S** (1963) *Outsiders\** (on 'figuration' too/FK)  
**Blumer H G** (1969) *Symbolic Interactionism\**  
**Cooley C H** (1922) *Human Nature and Social Order\**  
**Darwin C** (1872) *The Expression of the Emotions\**  
**Elias N** (1933/59) *Court Society.*  
**Elias N** (1939/69) *On The Civilization Process*  
**Elias N** (1959/65) *The Established and the Outsiders\**  
**Foucault M** (1961/7) *Madness and civilization,\** (1975) *Discipline and Punish\**  
**Foucault M** (1976/84) *The History of Sexuality I-III\**  
**Freud A** (1936/66) *The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense\**  
**Freud S** (1905/60) *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious\**  
**Freud S** (1909/79) 'Little Hans,'\* *obsessions*  
**Freud S** (24/76) *The Dissolution of Eudipus Complex\**  
**Freud S** (1921/22) *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego\**  
**Freud S** (1930/56) *Civilization and Its Discontents\**  
**Freud S** (1913/18) *Totem and Taboo\**  
**Gasset y J O y** (1922) *The Idea of Theatre,\** (1930-2) *Revolt of the Masses\**  
**Gasset y J O y** (1946) *Idea & Belief,\**  
**Goethe J von** (1821) *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre\**  
**Goffman E** (1956) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life\**  
**Goffman E** (1963) *Stigma and Social Identity\**  
**Greer G** (1972) *The Female Eunuch*  
**Horney K** (1937/57) *Feminine Psychology,* (50) *Neurosis and Human Growth\**  
**Huizinga J** (1919/26) *The Waning of the Middle Ages\**  
**Huizinga J** (1935) *In the Shadow of tomorrow\**  
**Huizinga J** (1938/55) *Homo Ludens\**  
**Kaal A** (2017) *Worldview and Social Practice\**  
**Kuelfer M** (2001) *The Manly Eunuch, Masculinity, Gender and Christian Ideology\**  
**Burton R** (1880-90) *Bk6: On Courtisans,\** trln. **KAMASUTRA** (-250~+250).  
**Klein M** (1932/32) *The Psychoanalysis of Children\**  
**Kuipers G, van der Ent B** (1995-2012) *The Seriousness of Ethnic Jokes\**  
**Lewinsohn R (Morus)** (1957) *The History of Sexuality*  
**Merton R K** (1949/68) *Social Theory and Social action\**  
**Martin G M M,** (2011) *Game of Thrones*  
**Mead M, Baldwin J** (1971) *A Rap on Race*  
**Miller A** (1980-3) *For Your Own Good, Hidden cruelty in child rearing roots violence\**  
**Moltmann-Wendel E** ('80/'82) *Rediscovering Friendship/The Women around Jesus*  
**Popper K** (1951) *The Open Society and its Enemies\**  
**Puzo M** (1965) *The Fortunate Pilgrim (Immigrants, NY, NY)\**  
**Reve, G** (1947) *The Evenings, a winters tale*  
**Rubin L B** (1976) *Worlds of Pain*  
**Silver C B** (2011) *Paranoid Instit'l Responses to Psychoanalysis by Sociologists\**  
**Simmel G** (1906) *The Sociology of Secrets and secret Societies\**  
**Swaan A de** (1972) *Een boterham met tevredenheid\*/Myth of Workers Happiness*  
**Vidal G** (1948/65) *The City and the Pillar*

\* Freud S 'Complete Works'/ at Google.com or Academia.edu\*

Copyright 2015-7: [FritsKaal@Catch-22.net](mailto:FritsKaal@Catch-22.net) (Made in Holland)