

An enigma of modern psychology understood in the light of the Madrian faith.

Modern psychology has been a mixed blessing. Insofar as it has increased awareness of levels of mind beyond normal waking consciousness, it has done humanity a great service, but insofar as it has tried to explain these in purely material terms, it has attempted to deprive humanity of even such glimpses beyond the 'natural' as nineteenth-century scientism allowed.

One truly significant aspect of the psychoanalytic method, however, has been its recognition of the importance of myth. Even Freud, the most materialistic of psychoanalysts, realised that in order to express the unmotive and psychic quality of a psychological situation as well as merely describing it intellectually, one must harness the archetypal depth of myth to one's purposes. He did not realise, though, that the psychological level of myth is inextricably connected with far deeper levels of spiritual meaning, and that one cannot use one without unconsciously bringing in the others.

It is because of this archetypal depth that the idea of the Oedipus complex has had such a profound effect on modern thought -- despite the fact that most of its details are incorrect.

Baldly stated, the idea of the Oedipus complex is that nearly every man has within him the repressed and therefore unconscious desire to kill his father and marry his mother. The evidence upon which Freud came to this conclusion was correct; but Freudian theory is founded upon a thoroughly materialistic world view -- the belief that human beings have no souls, but are merely 'naked apes.' This gave rise to two prejudices which distorted the interpretation of the evidence:

1. The prejudice that we cannot have had any existence previous to this life -- and therefore all feelings held from an early age must originate in childhood experiences (or even 'womb-experiences.')
2. The prejudice that we have no higher or spiritual impulses -- and therefore all motivation can eventually be reduced to animal instincts -- hunger, aggression, sex, etc.

The Oedipus story is, in its origins, connected with the early stages of the patriarchal revolution. (see footnote.) On the surface level, it is a chronicle of an attempt to overthrow Madrian-Matriarchal society and religion, and the tragic consequences which followed. But as the overthrow became complete, the story took the form of a paradigm of the feelings of the deep unconscious of every person -- a longing to return to the Goddess, and a bitter resentment against the cruel and arrogant 'father' god of wrath, and the repressive social order set up by his followers.

When one realises the tremendous emotional power of past and present Madrian devotion, and the tender and delicate relationship which is built up between the aspiring soul and her Goddess, it is easy to understand the depth and bitterness of the psychological trauma when she feels herself rudely thrust aside by a coarse and violent-tempered 'god' claiming first to own and possess the Goddess, and then denying Her existence altogether.

Under the influence of the first of his two prejudices, Freud, who saw every fairy-tale queen and king as types of mother and father, of course interpreted Jocasta and Laius in the same way.

Under the influence of his second prejudice, the only motivation he could come up with for the whole thing was his good old standby — sex. And because of his emphasis on sexual (and purely heterosexual) motivation, he could not conclude that women could also have 'Oedipal' feelings. He therefore invented for women the 'Elektra complex,' a pitiful afterthought which has made no real contribution to the understanding of psychology. The Oedipus complex has become a household word because it expressed something which people instinctively felt to contain a great truth -- but how many people have even heard of the 'Elektra Complex'?

The fact is, however, that the so-called Oedipus complex not only applies to both sexes, but applies more strongly on the whole to women, because they tend to be more spiritually developed.

The sexual aspect of Freud's theory, and of the patriarchal version of the Oedipus myth itself are both typical of the spiritual immaturity of masculinist culture. The primary act of communion is the union of the female soul with female Deity -- not because all Her worshippers are female, but because the soul itself is female. The matriarchal Celts taught that upon death the soul took an 'angel' form, and that all 'angels' were female. The patriarchal Greeks and Romans spoke of their souls as 'she.' Only Christian dogma ended this with its unsophisticated doctrine of bodily resurrection after death. (Incredibly, this doctrine is still officially held by all the major Christian denominations to this day!)

The Freudian version of the Oedipus complex has two extremely harmful effects. Morally, its effect is at one with that of puritan patriarchy -- it both crushes and innures; making people feel 'sinful' because of the wicked thoughts which they are unconsciously harbouring, and making them feel that since they have wicked ideas which they can't control, they aren't really morally responsible anyway.

The second effect is to help establish repression as a condition of life. One's most basic desire is to kill one parent and marry the other. One cannot possibly do that, therefore one's most basic desire must be repressed. Emotional life is to be founded upon frustration from the beginning.

Once we have understood the real nature of the desire, we see also that it can and must be fulfilled. We must overthrow the male 'god' and all the materialisms and puritanisms that follow in his train. We must return to the love of Our Lady, the one true Deity.

\*

Footnote. See Robert Graves, "The Greek Myths," Penguin, vol. II, pp. 9-15.