BY

COLIN LESLIE DEAN

the *absurdities* in psychoanalysis and science that make psychoanalysis a science:

reasons sociology, epistemology, ontology and metaphysics why psychoanalysis is a science: meaninglessness

the *absurdities* in psychoanalysis and science that make psychoanalysis a science:

reasons sociology, epistemology, ontology and metaphysics why psychoanalysis is a science: meaninglessness

BY

DEAN

LESLIE

COLIN

GAMAHUCHER PRESS, WEST GEELONG AUSTRALIA, 2003

PREFACE

By assaulting the reader with the, the shocking, the unexpected, and unimaginable the reader is jolted into simultaneous juxtaposition of bewilderment and uncertainty. This emotional ambivalence and corresponding cognitive dissonance, or in other words mental stress or angst is meant to break up the peoples conventional sets of classification and categories and thus unsettle the utility, sobriety and normality of their everyday lives. This work is meant to exhilarate and disturb. If the categories of ones every day life fall apart and the boundaries of ones life are expanded then the odours of these poisonous ideas have done their work

INTENT

The purpose of this work is to destroy the category and classificatory structures of ones reality such that "... the student's world begins to collapse and dissolve and static consciousness begins to be dislodged ... [With] the collapse of predictive structure, the world becomes an unintelligible flux: without categorical structure or form ... rationality and judgment becomes silenced and paralyzed. This is the level of unintelligibility and meaninglessness."[1]

[1]A. K. Gangadean, 'Formal Ontology and the Dialectical Transformation of Consciousness' , Philosophy East and West, Vol. 29, no.1, 1979, pp. 22-23.
, p.39.

This essay is a case study, via an phenomenological investigation into psychoanalysis and science to demonstrate, the Prasangika Madhyamika Buddhist demonstrations, that all our concepts, all our categories, all our ideas, all theses, all antitheses, all philosophies, all epistemologies, all ethics, all ontologies, and all metaphysics, in other words all our views are meaningless as they collapse into absurdities i.e. paradox, contradiction, regress, circularity etc. This work shows that psychoanalysis is a science because phenomenologically they both share similar absurdities. By demonstrating the absurdities of psychoanalysis and science and thus showing they are phenomenologically the same I collapse the distinction between science and non-science. This collapsing of the distinction between science and non-science is an attempt to lend weight to my claim that all classificatory systems will similarly collapse into meaninglessness as the categories which define classificatory systems themselves will collapse into absurdity Thus the purpose of this work is begin the process to destroy the category and classificatory structures of ones reality such that "... the student's world begins to collapse and dissolve and static consciousness begins to be dislodged ... [With] the collapse of predictive structure, the world becomes an unintelligible flux: without categorical structure or form ... rationality and judgment becomes silenced and paralyzed. This is the level of unintelligibility and meaninglessness."[2]

[2] ibid., p.39.

Classification is at the heart of science and the way humans order reality. With out classification there is only chaos. As Simpson notes:

"Scientists do not tolerate uncertainty and frustration, because they must. The one thing that they do not and must not tolerate is disorder … the most basic postulate of science is that nature itself is orderly … all theoretical science is ordering and if systematic is equated with ordering, then systematics is synonymous with theoretical science."[3]

This essay is an attempt to destroy this order and introduce chaos by showing, in the case of psychoanalysis and science, the classificatory system of science non-science collapses into meaningless; since phenomenologically psychoanalysis is science. Now what can be done for psychoanalysis i.e. in showing that it is a science this essay claims, while not demonstrating the claims, can be done for all the so called pseudo-sciences such as astrology, alchemy, witchcraft, or religion etc. Similarly it is claimed what can be done for the classificatory system science non-science can be done for all classificatory system with the result that all order all structure is reduced to chaos - meaninglessness

Some philosophers such as Popper have argues that psychoanalysis is not a science. This essay will argue that psychoanalysis is a science. If psychoanalysis is not a science then it is claimed that nothing is a science. This essay will not demonstrate this by some substantive examination into what the essence, i.e. some particular epistemology or methodology, of science and psychoanalysis is and then show that they share the same

substantive essence . Nor will this essay be concerned with whether psychoanalysis and science are to be understood nominalisticly or realistically. Also I will not present some normative criteria as to what makes something a science then show that psychoanalysis is a science because it meets this criteria or is not a science because it does not meet this criteria. How I will demonstrate that psychoanalysis is a science is by showing that psychoanalysis has the same phenomenological characteristics as science. By phenomenological I mean how science behaves in its investigations not by what it says it does in its investigations. On this point I follow Einstein's lead when he states " if you want to find out anything from theoretical physics about the methods they use, I advise you to stick to one principle: Don't listen to their words, fix your attention on their deeds."[4] In regard to psychoanalysis Szasz says a similar thing when he states that "there is a split … between what most … psychoanalysts do in practice and what they say about it."[5] I will do this phenomenological investigation by focusing on the psychoanalytic concept of phantasy and showing that the way this concept operates in psychoanalysis gives psychoanalysis the same phenomenological characteristics as science has in regard to some of its concepts. Further more I will show that psychoanalysis has the same type of methodological and epistemological absurdities as science and argue that because these absurdities don't make science not a science they then don't make psychoanalysis not a science. I will show that science and psychoanalysis share the same type of absurdities i.e. paradoxes and contradictions right at the heart of both paradigms. Thus I will argue that because phenomenologicaly science and psychoanalysis are similar then psychoanalysis is a science. Now what can be

---

[3] cited in C. Levi-Strauss, the *Savage Mind*, Penguin, 1966, pp.9-10
[4] Cited in T. Szasz, *The Myth of Mental Illness*, Paladin Book Granada, 1981, p.18.

done for psychoanalysis i.e. in showing that it is a science this essay claims, while not demonstrating claims, can be done for all the so called pseudo-sciences such as astrology, alchemy, witchcraft, or religion etc.

SOCIOLOGY

There have been a number of debates through time about what method makes a thing a science - which also indicate who or what says a paradigm is a science. Bacon argued that science used the inductive method. Popper disagreed with Bacon and argued instead that science used the method of falsification i.e. what make a thing a science is its actively tries to falsify or refute its hypotheses. Popper argued psychoanalysis was not a science because it was immune to falsification. Grunbaum contradicts Popper and argues Freud's theories are testable and thus potentially falsifiable.[6] Lakatos, a follower of Popper, reformulated Popper's criterion of falsification due to his perceived faults with it. The logical positivists argued that a science was not based upon metaphysical entities because these could not be verified. There have been intense historical and sociological studies on what makes something a science which disagree with the formulations of Bacon, Popper, Lakatos, and the logical positivists. Kuhn argues that science has no particular epistemology.[7] Feyerabend goes so far as to claim the idea that science has a special method is a fairy-tale.[8] Science according to Feyerabend is no more rational than voodoo.[9] Feyerabend in fact puts forward a methodological anarchism as that which

---

[5]ibid,. p.19.
[6] A. Grunbaum, *The Foundations of Psychoanalysis*, University of California Press, 1985, p.104.
[7] T. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, University of Chicago Press, 1970.
[8] P. Feyerabend, *Against Method*, New Left Books, 1975, pp.303-304.
[9] M. Charlesworth, Science, Non-science & Pseudo-science, Deakin University Press, 1982, p.44.

characterizes science i.e. there is no scientific method because science uses anything it can .[10]

When we investigate science we see that there are a number of paradigms that call themselves a science: Physics with all its subsets i.e. of relativity physics, quantum physics, statistical mechanics, solid state physic etc, chemistry with all its subsets i.e. organic, inorganic, mathematics with all its subsets statistics, Fourier analysis, set theory, number theory, etc biology with all its subsets etc.

This phenomena of paradigm variability in science is also seen in regard to psychoanalysis where there are a number of paradigms that call themselves science there are similarly a number of paradigms that call themselves psychoanalysis: Freudian psychoanalysis and Kleinian psychoanalysis. Rycroft notes "… the term 'psychoanalysis' for Freudian theorists has been rendered absurd by two local developments : the emergence of Kleinian analysis which clams to be Freudian and is disowned by many Freudian … and the close personal relations existing between individual Freudians and Jungians which has resulted in a number of Jungian analysists having become analysands of Freudians and vice versa."[11] P. Grosskurth, notes that " The Freudians tended to accept the early Freud, while the Kleinians were more amenable to his later work, even accepting the death instinct, which most Freudians passed over with embarrassed silence." [12] Schafer notes " just as ego psychological techniques is radically different from, but still continuous with, Freud's first technical efforts, so this modern

[10] P. Feyerabend, *Against Method*, New Left Books, 1975, p.23.
[11] C. Rycroft, "Introduction" in C. Rycroft ed *Psychoanalysis Observed*, Constable, 1968, p.9.
[12] P. Grosskurth, *Melinie Klein*, Jason Aronsoon Inc, 1995, p.117.

Kleinian work is radically different from Melanie Klein's first work though still continuous with it."[13]

Now these two paradigms had heated debates in the 40s around the status of their finding and ideas around the notion of phantasy. The debates are called the "the controversial discussions". These debates took place around the notion of phantasy as held by Melanie Klein and her followers and those of the orthodox school of those who followed Freud. These discussions were in regard to questions of epistemology, methodology metaphysics etc. Hayman notes that these discussions included "… disagreements over assumptions about the earliest experiences, about justifications and evidence for these assumptions, about interpretations of psychoanalytic theory and about how best to conceptualize psychoanalytic ideas."[14]

This phenomena of disputes within paradigms also occurred within the sciences, were, like the "controversy discussions" in psychoanalysis, findings methods and epistemologies are hotly discussed and disputed.[15] One such debate is that in regard to "reality" between the realists – who argue objects have innate attributes- and the anti-realists the Copenhagen school – who argue objects are observer created. These discussions in regard to reality are almost exactly like as those characterized by Hayman in regard to the "controversy discussions. Namely they disagree over the interpretation of quantum theory, disagree over interpretations of evidence, and about how to

[13] R. Schafer, *The Contempory Kleinians of London*, International Universities Press, 1997, p.2.
[14] A.Hayman, 'What do we mean by "phantasy",' *International Journal of Psycho-analysis*, Vol. 70, 1989, p.112.

conceptualize quantum mechanic ideas.[16] Kuhn notes similar historical debates about the nature of science when he states:

> " the transition from Newtonian to quantum mechanics evoked many debates about both the nature and the standards of physics, some of which still continue. There are people alive today (1970) who can remember the similar arguments engendered by Maxwell's electromagnetic theory and statistical mechanics. And earlier still, the assimilation of Galileo's and Newton's mechanics gave rise to a particularly famous series of debates with Aristotelians Cartesians and Leibnizians about standards legitimate to science."[17]

These disputes in regard to the epistemologies, methodologies, and findings of science tackle the question as to what or who says science is a science. In science and psychoanalysis, people lay down the epistemologies, methodologies that are to define and demarcate an area of investigation from other investigations, but also people decide when these criteria have been met. Now no one would say that, because of these disputes and disagreements which happen in science and about science, say in regard to physics – as Kuhn shows above - don't make physics a science. Now we see that psychoanalysis has similar disputes and disagreements over epistemology, methodology etc thus phenomenologically in this regard it shares the same characteristic as say physics. On the issue of authority, science, like psychoanalysis has its authority figures. In the

---

[15] P. King & R. Steiner, "First series of scientific discussions on controversial issues", *The Freud-Klein Controversies*, 1841-45, Tavistock/Routledge, 1991.
[16] See N.Herbert *Quantum Reality*, Rider, 1985, for a cogent outline of these debets and disagreements.

"controversy discussions" Freudians keep referring back to Freud. Similarly anti-realists keep referring back to Bohr such that a scientist can complain " Neil's Bohr brainwashed a whole generation of physicists into think that the job was done fifty years ago."[18] Also the authority of Von Neumann, in regard to objects not having innate dynamic attributes, held up the discovery of alternative ideas and theories.[19] In both cases no one would say quantum physics was not a science because it has authority figures to which other scientists refer for authority in the presentation of an idea or interpretation.

ABSURD EPISTEMOLOGIES

Rycroft notes that " most analysts believe the claims of psychoanalysis to be a science are based on its use of casual-deterministic assumptions …"[20] Casual-deterministic assumptions are rife throughout science. Thus some argue these assumptions being shared by psychoanalysis and science, makes psychoanalysis a science. Now some would argue that that because psychoanalysis cannot use these assumptions to predict behavior as science can use these assumptions to predict events makes psychoanalysis not a science. Now science has incidences in its history where a paradigm has not intended to and cannot predict events. A classic example is that Newtonian physics being a casual-deterministic paradigm, could not and cannot not predict the events of black-body radiation –this was left to quantum physics to do. Also Newtonian physic cannot predict the motions of three bodies in combined gravitational motion i.e. planets[21]. Kuhn points out that no one denied that Newtonian physic was not as science because it could not

---

[17] T. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolution*s, University of Chicago Press, 1970, P.43.
[18] N.Herbert *Quantum Reality*, Rider, 1985,, p.45.
[19] ibid., 51.
[20] C. Rycroft, *A critical Dictionary of Psychoanalysis* 2 ed. , Penguin, 1995, p.38.

predict the speed of sound, or Newton's laws of gravitation failed to predict and account for the perigee of the moon or the motion of the moon; as he states " no one seriously questioned Newtonian theory because of the long recognized discrepancies between predictions from the theory and both the speed the speed of sound and the motion of Mercury."[22] Now no one would say that because of these inadequacies of Newtonian physics it is not a science. In the same way even if psychoanalysis cannot predict events based on its casual-deterministic assumptions this does not invalidate it as a science just as Newtownian physics casual-deterministic assumptions could not predict events at the atomic level. Newtonian physics is completely unsuccessful at the sub-atomic level and speeds close to the speed of light and cannot be practiced there in both cases yet no one would say it is not a science In this regard there is truth in Freud's provocative idea, when he states, " even if psychoanalysis showed itself as unsuccessful in every other form of nervous and psychical disease as it does in delusions, it would still remain completely justified as an irreplacable instrument of scientific research. It is true that in that case we should not be in a position to practise it."[23]

---

[21] V. Illingworth, "Three-body problem", *Dictionary of Physics*, Penguin, 1991, p.487.
[22] T. Kuhn, op.cit, p.81.
[23] S. Freud, "Psychoanalysis and Psychiatry", in *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, Penguin, 1982, p.295.

Some psychoanalysts , like Rycroft,[24] Szasz[25], Schafer[26] etc claim that psychoanalysis is not a science because it is not a casual-deterministic theory but instead a theory of meaning. Rycroft claims that those psychoanalysts that claim psychoanalysis is a casual-deterministic theory "…open themselves to attack from critics like Professor Eysenck who see clearly that psychoanalysis cannot satisfy the cannons of those sciences which are based on the experimental method but believe that if they can demonstrate its inadequacy as a casual theory, they have proved that it is nonsense."[27]

Now this demonstration that because psychoanalysis cannot be a casual-deterministic paradigm it cannot be a science flies in the face of the actual phenomenology of the situation, because at least one so called science incorporates non casual-deterministic explanations for events. Also philosophers have argued that causality is an illusion or that it is not necessary for a science. The most famous philosophical refutation of causation is by Hume[28] where causation is a product of our own minds and all there are " are regularities of non-necessary constant conjunction".[29] Russell claimed that " an advanced scientific understanding of the world needs no such notion [causation]".[30]

The science called quantum mechanics uses explanations in which a casual-determinism can play no part. Quantum mechanics incorporates in its theories the belief that some atomic events have no casual explanation. In effect some atomic events are random. In

[24] C. Rycroft, "Introduction", *Psychoanalysis Observed*, Constable, 1968.
[25] T. Szasz, op.cit, 1981.
[26] R. Schafer, *A New Language for Psychoanalysis*, Yale University Press, 1976.
[27] C. Rycroft, op.cit, pp.14-15.
[28] D. Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Penguin, 1987, pp.126-131.
[29] A. Flew, "Causation" in *A Dictionary of Philosophy*, Pan, 1979, p.58
[30] ibid,. p.58.

other words according to quantum theory, not all effects are caused - some affects just happened at random.[31] Von Neumann, the author of the bible[32] of quantum mechanics, argues that causality is an illusion, due to the law of large numbers, since "… there is no reason to speak of causality in nature … [since] quantum mechanics, contradicts it."[33] Now though quantum mechanics is in part based upon a random non casual-determinism in its explanation of events no one would say that quantum mechanics is not a science. The lack of a casual-determinism in its explanations of events is also seen in psychoanalysis in regard to phantasies.

Schafer notes that the modern London Kleinian Freudians "… seem to deemphasise casual explanations of any sort. Not that they scrupulously avoid these formulations or condemn them, but primarily they remain intent on developing explicitly the phenomenology of the internal world and the way its is played out in relations with the external world."[34] Here phenomenologicaly we see psychoanalysis and quantum mechanics basing explanations, in some degree, of events on a non casual-determinism.

So we see that if psychoanalysis is a non casual deterministic paradigm this does not make it not a science since quantum mechanics has the same characteristics and no one would say that it is not a science. Thus based on the phenomenology of quantum mechanics being called a science with its non casual-deterministic explanations

---

[31] ibid,. p.58.
[32] N. Herbert, *Quantum Reality*, Rider, 1985, p.25.
[33] J. von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton University Press, 1955, p. 328.
[34] R. Schafer, *op.cit*, pp. 20-21.

psychoanalysis with the same explanations with event dealing with phantasies, must be a science, or is not precluded, from being a science.

Epistemologically some argue, that a casual-deterministic approach to psychoanalysis places it either in a paradox or contradiction. The presence of these paradoxes, or contradictions thus make it untenable and thus not a science. In regard to Freud's notion of psychic-determinism Rycroft notes that it "… [places] psychoanalysis in a contradiction, viz. that of maintaining both that conscious processes are determined by unconscious ones and that making unconscious processes conscious increased the individual's freedom of choice and action."[35] This contradiction Rycroft claims make the notion of an agent, or ego initiating defenses, or introjection impossible.[36] This can be put another way. Psychic determinism places psychoanalysis in a contradiction namely that psychoanalytic therapy and analysis, by bringing to consciousness the etiology of behavior, is meant mitigate and alleviate this behavior but by psychoanalytic theory consciousness and behavior are themselves strictly determined by unconscious forces i.e. psychic determinism. Thus psychic determinism would make psychoanalytic therapy or analysis pointless and useless as consciousness can have no function to play in behavior formation at all. Psychic determinism thus makes all belief in conscious deciding and acting an illusion.

Apart from this contradiction there is a paradox. 'Psychic determinism' is itself a conscious thought. Now seeing all consciousness is determined by the unconscious then

[35] C. Rycroft, *A critical Dictionary of Psychoanalysis* 2 ed. , Penguin, 1995, p.101.
[36] ibid., pp.4-5.

all conscious thoughts cannot be a accurate accounts This is because they are contaminated and determined by unconscious forces and process thus they must be somewhat illusional. Thus the thought 'psychic determinism' must be an illusional thought it self – a misrepresentation of reality – and thus not an accurate account of the mind if it is an accurate account of the mind.. Thus the paradox: the epistemology of 'psychic determinism' undermines itself and makes itself untenable as an accurate account of the mind if it is an accurate account of the mind.

Freud was aware of these epistemological problems; as he states philosophers " could not conceive of such an absurdity as the "unconscious mental" this idiosyncrasy of the philosophers could only be discarded with a shrug."[37] Similarly " A person of an epistemological bent might find it tempting to follow the paths –the sophists – by which the anarchists succeed in enticing such conclusions from science [i.e. its self-abrogation]. All I can say is the anarchist theory sounds wonderfully superior so long as it relates to opinions about abstract things: but it breaks down with its first step into practical life"[38] Nevertheless Freud states "Indeed it seems to us so much a matter of course to equate them in this way that any contradiction of the idea [the unconscious] strikes us as obvious non-sense. Yet psychoanalysis cannot avoid raising this contradiction; it cannot accept the identity of the conscious and the mental."[39]

[37] S. Freud, *An Autobiographical Study*, SE, Vol. 20, 1925, p.31
[38] S. Freud, "A Weltanshauung", in *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, Penguin, 1991, pp..212-213.
[39] S. Freud, "Introduction", in *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, Penguin, 1982, p.46.

There are similar epistemological problems with the notion of phantasies. On of these problems stems from their omnipresence. J. Segal notes this omnipresence when she states that " phantasies are unconscious fantasies, in the sense, which control our assumptions, our thoughts, our emotions and behavior."[40] Schafer points out that "Kleinian Freudians assume that fantasies regularly figure in the thinking of the analyst."[41]

The obvious paradox in regard to the omnipresence of phantasies is that if there are phantasies then the notion of phantasies must be a phantasy itself. To explain: if all thought is influenced by phantasies then the thought 'all thought is influenced by phantasies' must have been influenced by phantasies and as phantasies are an illusion in regard to reality then this claim about itself must be an illusion. Also there is a paradox similar to the lair paradox. If all thought is influenced by phantasies then this thought is a phantasy only if all thoughts are influenced by phantasies.

Now Freud shrugging of philosophers' claims that psychoanalysis cannot be a science because it is absurd may have been correct. Since philosophers and scientist still call those scientific paradigms which are riddled with contradiction and paradox a science. A classic case in philosophy in regard to a philosopher being wrong even though his arguments were logical is Kant's[42] insistence that space is Euclidean, when in fact it is not but Euclidean but instead Riemann.

---

[40] J. Segal, *Phantasy in Everyday Life*, Penguin books, 1985, p.20.
[41] R. Schafer, op.cit,, 7, p.7.
[42] E. Kant, Immanual Kant's Critique of Pure Reason, trans N, Kemp-Smith. Macmillan, 1993, pp. 67-74.

In mathematics paradox goes right to the heart of it. In 1930 the mathematician Hilbert began a program to prove that mathematics was consistent. With the discovery of such mathematical paradoxes as the Burli-Forti paradox, Russell's paradox, Cantor's paradox and Skolem's paradox by early 1930's as Bunch notes, Hilbert's program did not succeed such that "disagreement about how to eliminate contradictions were replaced by discussions of how to live with contradictions in mathematics."[43] Attempts to avoid the paradoxes led to other paradoxical notions but most mathematicians rejected these notions.[44] Thus the present situation is that mathematics cannot be formulated, except in axiomatic theory, without contradictions without the loss of useful results. With regard to axiomatic theory, this cannot be proven to be consistent with the result that paradoxes can occur at any time. As Bunch states:

> "None of them [paradoxes] has been resolved by thinking the way mathematicians thought until the end of the nineteenth century. To get around them requires some reformulation of mathematics. Most reformulations except for axiomatic set theory, results in the loss of mathematical ideas and results that have proven to be extremely useful. Axiomatic set theory explicitly eliminates the known paradoxes, but

---

See also N. Kemp-Smith, *A Commentary to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*, Macmillian, 1979, pp.117-120.

[43] B. Bunch, *Mathematical Fallacies and Paradoxes, Dover*, 1982, p.140.

[44] ibid., p.136.

> cannot be shown to be consistent. Therefore, other paradoxes can occur at any time."[45]

With all these paradoxes and inconsistencies Bunch notes that it is "… amazing that mathematics works so well."[46] Since the mathematical way of looking at the world generates contradictory results from that of science,[47] such as the mathematical notion of the continuum, and quantum mechanical concept of quanta. As Bunch notes "… the discoveries of quantum theory or the special theory of relativity were all made through extensive use of mathematics that was built on the concept of the continuum…that mathematical way of looking at the world and the scientific way of looking at the world produced contradictory results."[48]

Now even though relativity physics and quantum mechanics use a method i.e. mathematics which is paradoxical and contradictory no one says that relativity physics and quantum mechanics are not sciences. There is ample evidence of paradox in quantum mechanics just as there is in mathematics. Heisenberg notes that " the strangest experience of those years was that the paradoxes of quantum theory did not disappear during this process of clarification; on the contrary they have become even more marked and exciting." [49] Now even though no experiment has contradicted quantum theory predictions and quantum theory is the most successful that has ever existed nevertheless one paradox namely the Einstien-Prodolsky-Rosen paradox may require for its resolution

[45] ibid., p.139.
[46] ibid., p.209.
[47] ibid., p.210.
[48] ibid., pp.209-10.

declaring the existing quantum theory, with all its successes wrong.[50] Eberhard notes the solving of some quantum paradoxes is not decided by a method or epistemology but " [the] ideas [relating] to one' philosophical view of the world." [51]Thus from a phenomenological look at how paradox in science is treated it can be seen that if a casual-deterministic psychoanalysis, or a psychoanalysis based upon phantasy are paradoxical and contradictory this does not preclude psychoanalysis from being a science just as it does not preclude mathematics relativity physics and quantum mechanics from being called sciences.

ABSURD ONTOLOGIES

The notion of ontology in science and psychoanalysis opens up the question that some, like Rycroft, argue that psychoanalysis is not a casual-deterministic theory but instead a semantic, or theory of meaning. Now meaning also enters into science. As we shall see the meaning of what the data is hotly debated in quantum physics were, some argue, for a realist meaning and other for a some what subjectivist anti-realist meaning. This debate in quantum physics goes to the heart of Rycroft's, Szasz's, and Schafer's arguments that psychoanalysis is not a science but a semantic theory of meaning. These debates in quantum physics show that a science can be as well a semantic or theory of meaning.

Up until at least quantum theory science regarded itself as operating in objective reality with real objects . Its law were in relation to real existing entities independent of the

---

[49] F. Selleri, *Quantum Paradoxes and Physical Reality*, Kluer Academic Publishers, 1990, p.v111.
[50] ibid, p.v111.
[51] P. Eberhard, "The EPR Paradox, Roots and Ramifications", in W. Schommers (ed) *Quantum Theory and Pictures of Reality*, Spinger-Verlag, 1989, p.85.

observer. Freud believed this as he states: "scientific thinking does not differ in its nature from the normal activity of thought [but] it carefully avoids individual factors and effective influences … its endeavour to arrive at correspondence with reality – that is to say with what exists outside us and independently of us … This correspondence with the real external world we call "truth"."[52] Subjectivity was avoided as this was regarded as contaminating the objectivity of the phenomena and thus undermining the paradigm as science. Now the notion of phantasy in Kleinian-Freudian psychoanalysis in fact eschews or disregards the notion of reality and places its emphasis upon the inner subjective world. As Joan Riviere states:

> "Psychoanalysis is Freud's discovery of what goes on in the imagination of the child - and it still provokes opposition from all of us this "childishness", these unconscious fantasies are abhorred and dreaded – and unwittingly longed for – by us even yet; and this is why even analysts still hesitate to probe these depths. But analysis has no concern with anything else; it is not concerned with the real world, nor with the child's nor the adult's adaptation to the real world, nor with sickness nor health, nor virtue nor vice. It is concerned simply and solely with the imaginings of the childish mind, the fantasied pleasures and dreaded retributions." [53]

Schafer points out that notion of phantasy enters into the analysis environment were the analysts phantasies communicate with the analysand's ; as he states:

---

[52] S. Freud, "A Question of a Weltanshauung", in *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, Penguin, 1991, pp. 206-207.

> " The Kleinian Freudians assume that unconscious fantasies regularly figure in the thinking of the analyst; however these fantasies and feelings associated with them need not be treated as neurotic or psychotic invasions of the analytic process. Rather, unless the analyst is profoundly thrown off, the analyst has received certain communications from the analysand about his or experience of the analytic relationship." [54]

Here in the analysis environment it is not objective reality that is being understood but rather the subjective inner worlds of both parties where the analyst's own obvious subjectivity enters into the analyst's interpretation. Freud himself took into account the problem of subjectivity in the formulation of inferences, just as the quantum theorist does; as he states:

> " Every science is based on observation and experiences arrived at through the medium of our psychical apparatus. But since our science has as its subject that apparatus itself, the analogy ends here. We make our observations through the medium of the same perceptual apparatus precisely with the help of the breaks in the sequence of 'psychical' events: we fill in what is omitted by making plausible inferences and translating it into conscious material. In this way we construct, as it were a sequence of conscious events complementary to the unconscious psychical processes.

---

[53] E. Young-Bruehl *Anna Freud*, Macmillian, 1988, p.169.
[54] R. Schafer, op.cit,, pp.7-8.

> The relative certainty of our psychical science is based on the binding force of these inferences.[55]

This phenomenology is also seen in quantum mechanics where the Copenhagen school of quantum theorists argue that objective reality is discarded[56], as Riviere notes also, a subjectivism enters into theoretical explanations. This is because in this science the human actor plays a part in the theory. Wallace notes " this [subjectivism] represents a turning point in the history of physics, if science not science itself, with the consequence of the continuing wide spread concern with the supposed paradoxes and philosophical difficulties of quantum theory, despite its now long history of spectacular successes." [57]

One of the most fundamental questions in all science there is in physics major disagreement.[58] This disagreement centres around the question " do atomic objects exist independently of human observation and if so is it possible for man to understand their behaviour?"[59] The Copenhagen and Gottingen schools led by Bohr, Heisenberg, and Born argue that quantum theory is just a set of mathematical rules to predict future observations. The reality of the quantum object is only mathematical exists only for the experiment i.e. not independent of the observer and not an ontological existent.[60] On the other hand Einstein, Plank, Schrodringer, Ehrenfest and de Broglie argued that the quantum object is ontologically real independent of the observer like a tree; in this regard

---

[55] S. Freud, "An Outline of Psychoanalysis", in *Historical and Expository works on Psychoanalysis,* Penguin, 1986, p.390
[56] P. Wallace, *Paradox Lost*, Springer, 1996, .p.47
[57] ibid,. p.48.
[58] F. Selleri, op.cit, p.v11.
[59] ibid., p.v11.
[60] P. Eberhard, op.cit,. , p.51.

they advocated a ontological materialism.[61] Now no one says that the followers of the Copenhagen and Gottingen schools of quantum physics are not doing science when they argue that the objects of their study are not real but only products of their mathematical rules – a mathematics as we saw above is itself riddled with contradictions and paradox.. In a similar manner those psychoanalysts who argue that the objects of investigation are not real i.e. phantasies are not precluded from doing science.

METAPHYSICS

The idea that some objects are not real brings up the issue of the role metaphysics plays in scientific theories. The way a metaphysical object can play a part in theory. Metaphysical objects play a large part in psychoanalytic theory particularly the one of phantasy. Isaac's notes that phantasies are the primary content of the unconscious.[62] All modes of defence feelings and impulses are experienced as phantasies.[63] "Mental expression of instinct is unconscious phantasy. Phantasy is (in the first instance) the mental corollary, the psychic representative of instinct. There is no impulse, no instinctual urge or response which is not experienced as unconscious phantasy."[64] Phantasy for Isaacs is both a process and a thing that exists in the mind; a mental manifestation of an instinct directed towards an object. But this phantasy that is in the mind cannot be seen, touched, or handled As Isaacs notes:

[61] F. Selleri, op.cit, p.v11.
[62] S. Isaacs, "The Nature and Function of Phantasy", *International Journal of Psycho-analysis*, 1948, Vol.xx1x, Part 2 p.81.
[63] ibid., p.82.
[64] ibid,. p.81.

> " on our view, phantasy is the operative link between instinct and ego mechanism. An instinct is conceived of as a border-line psycho-somatic process. It has a bodily aim directed to external objects. It has a representative in the mind which we call a 'phantasy'… although themselves psychic phenomena, phantasies are primarily about bodily aims, pains and pleasures, directed to objects of some kind. When contrasted with external and bodily realities, the phantasies, like other mental activity, is a figment, since it cannot be touched, or handled or seen."[65]

In this regard, by not being seen, or touched, or handled, "phantasy" is a metaphysical object. The logical positivists argued that what made a thing a science was it eschewing of metaphysical objects. If an object could not be verified then it was metaphysical and had no place in science.

Metaphysical objects play a major part in science Such objects as mass, the electron, or such things as force or attraction are no less metaphysical than instincts, nervous energy , libido, or phantasy. Freud note this when he states " too it will be entirely in accord with our expectations if the basic concepts and principles of the new science (instincts, nervous energy, etc) remain for a considerable time no less indeterminate than those of the older sciences (force, mass, attraction, etc)."[66] And similarly these psychoanalytic metaphysical objects are as hotly debated as those of science. As Freud noted "the same

[65] ibid., pp.89-.90.

thing is happening in our day in the science of physics, the basic notions of which as regards matter, centres of force, attraction etc are scarcely less debatable than the corresponding notions in psychoanalysis." [67]

An example of a thing that cannot be seen, touched, or handled, like phantasy, is the mathematical notion of a point. Mathematics uses the notion of the "point" in such things as calculus. In calculus all the points between two ends of a line are added together. This calculus is used in physics with predictive results. But a point is a an object with position but no magnitude[68]. In other words it has no dimensional characteristics i.e. length, breath, or width; in fact it is infinitely small - one could say then a nothing i.e. non-existent.. Yet calculus adds an infinite number of infinitely small points i.e. nothings [non-existent objects] between two end of a line and can as a consequence science then can send a man to the moon.

The presence of metaphysical objects brings a measure of the "unknown into both science and psychoanalysis but as Freud noted even though "the processes with which it [psychoanalysis] is concerned are themselves just as unknowable as those dealt with in other sciences, by chemistry or physics for example." [69] In this way metaphysical objects does not preclude psychoanalysis, just like science, "… to establish the laws which they obey and to follow their mutual relations and interdependencies unbroken

---

[66] S. Freud, "An Outline of Psychoanalysis", in *Historical and Expository works on Psychoanalysis*, Penguin, 1986, p.390.
[67] S. Freud, "On Narcissism", in *On Metapsychology*, Penguin, 1991, p.70.
[68] J. Daintith & R, D, Nelson, *Dictionary of Mathematics*, Penguin, 1989, p.253.
[69] S.. Freud, "An Outline of Psychoanalysis", in *Historical and Expository works on Psychoanalysis*, Penguin, 1986, pp.389-390.

over long stretches – in short, to arrive at what is described as an 'understanding' of the field of natural phenomena in question." [70]

Now no one would say that because mathematics, or physics has a whole range of metaphysical objects upon which it makes inferences and theories it is not a science. Similarly the presence of metaphysical objects in psychoanalysis i.e. instinct, libido and phantasy do not preclude psychoanalysis from being a science. On the other hand phenomenologically it seems that science must have metaphysical objects.

Thus we see that phenomenologically psychoanalysis is a science. Psychoanalysis has the same characteristics as does science. Sociologically we see that both psychoanalysis and science have debates in which epistemological, ontological, methodological issues are hotly disputed and disagreed upon. Epistemologically we saw that both psychoanalysis and science has paradoxes at the very heart of their paradigms. In regard to psychoanalysis we saw that if phantasy is an omnipresent mental phenomena then the notion of phantasy must itself be a phantasy. Similarly in quantum mechanics we saw that quantum theory generated the Einstien-Prodolsky-Rosen paradox but the resolution of this paradox may mean declaring the existing quantum theory, with all its successes wrong. Both science and psychoanalysis have both casual-deterministic and non-casual deterministic explanations. Ontologically we saw that in regard to phantasy objective reality is discarded. Similarly in quantum mechanics we saw that the objectivity of reality can be discarded for a anti-realist explanation. In regard to ontological questions we saw that both science and psychoanalysis can be seen as semantic or theories of meaning.

[70]Ibid., pp.389-390.

Metaphysically we saw that both psychoanalysis and science have metaphysical objects. In regard to science these are the mathematical point, the electron, the force or attraction, matter etc And in psychoanalysis these metaphysical objects are the instincts, nervous energy, libido, or phantasy. Thus we can say that if there is a thing called science then phenomenologically psychoanalysis is a science because it phenomenologically has the same sociological, epistemological, ontological and metaphysical characteristics. If psychoanalysis is not a science then it is argued that nothing is a science.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bunch, B. ***Mathematical Fallacies and Paradoxes, Dover*, 1982.**

Charlesworth, M. Science, Non-science & Pseudo-science, Deakin University Press, 1982.

. **Daintith, J. & Nelson. R, D**, *Dictionary of Mathematics*, Penguin, 1989

Eberhard, P. "The EPR Paradox, Roots and Ramifications", in W. Schommers (ed) *Quantum Theory and Pictures of Reality*, Spinger-Verlag, 1989, pp. 49-87..

Feyerabend, P. *Against Method*, New Left Books, 1975.

Flew, A. "Causation" in *A Dictionary of Philosophy*, Pan, 1979

Freud, S. . Freud, *An Autobiographical Study*, SE, Vol. 20, 1925.

"Psychoanalysis and Psychiatry", in *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, Penguin, 1982,
pp.281-296.

"Introduction", in *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, Penguin, 1982, pp.39-50.

An Outline of Psychoanalysis", in *Historical and Expository works on Psychoanalysis*, Penguin, 1986, pp.375-445.

A question of a Weltanshauung", in *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, Penguin, 1991, pp.192-221.

"On Narcissism", in *On Metapsychology*, Penguin, 1991, pp.59-99.

Gangadean, A. 'Formal ontology and dialectical transformation of consciousness'. Philosophy East and West, Vol.29, no.1, 1979, pp.21-48.

Grosskurth, P. *Melinie Klein*, Jason Aronsoon Inc, 1995

Grunbaum, A. *The Foundations of Psychoanalysis*, University of California Press, 1985.

Hayman. A, 'What do we mean by "phantasy",' *International Journal of Psycho-analysis*, Vol. 70, 1989, pp.105-114.

Herbert, N. *Quantum Reality*, Rider, 1985.

Hume, D. *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Penguin, 1987.

Illingworth, V. "Three-body problem", *Dictionary of Physics*, Penguin, 1991.

Isaacs, S. Fantasy, "The nature and function of Phantasy", *International Journal of Psycho-analysis*, 1948, Vol.xx1x, Part 2, pp.73-97.

Kemp-Smith, N. *A Commentary to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*, Macmillian, 1979.

Kant, **E**. Immanual Kant's Critique of Pure Reason, trans N, Kemp-Smith. Macmillan, 1993.

King, P. & Steiner, **R.** "First series of scientific discussions on controversial issues", *The Freud-Klein Controversies*, 1841-45, Tavistock/Routledge, London, 1991.

Kuhn, T. *The Structure of Scientific Revolution*s, University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Levi-Strauss. C ,The *Savage Mind*, Penguin, 1966

Rycroft, C. "Introduction" in C, Rycroft ed *Psychoanalysis Observed*, Constable, 1968, pp.7-23.

A critical Dictionary of Psychoanalysis 2 ed. , Penguin, 1995

Segal, J. *Phantasy in Everyday Life*, Penguin books, 1985.

Selleri, F, *Quantum Paradoxes and Physical Reality*, Kluer Academic Publishers, 1990

Schafer, R. *The Contemporary Kleinians of London*, International Universities Press, 1997

Schafer, R. *A New Language for Psychoanalysis*, Yale University Press, 1976

Szasz, T. *The Myth of Mental Illness*, Paladin Book Granada, 1981.

von Neumann, J, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton University Press, 1955

Wallace, P. *Paradox Lost*, Springer, 1996.

Young-Bruehl, Y. *Anna Freud*, Macmillian, 1988.