
**Adam and Eve as a Metaphor
for Pre-Oedipal Development**

**A Metapsychological Application of
Psychoanalytic Theory**

By James H. Thomas, MD

October 12, 1991

Adam and Eve as a Metaphor for Pre-Oedipal Development: A Metapsychological Application of Psychoanalytic Theory

By James H. Thomas, MD

October 12, 1991

Abstract:

The story of Adam and Eve is presented as a dynamic metaphor for pre-oedipal development that encourages the development of consciousness. Eve is viewed as Adam's mother, and God and the snake are his split father. A model of psychoanalytic metapsychology is then developed focusing on the nature of metaphors, the human experience of reality, and the derivation of consciousness. Validating metaphors or paradigms for consistency with external "reality" is discussed. Metaphors or paradigms are tested by applying them to data with known conclusions and then used to predict, discover, and create new phenomena.

INTRODUCTION:

Psychoanalytic thinking has derived much of its insight from an examination of historical records of human behavior alongside the evaluation of present clinically observable behavior. All the major psychoanalytic themes concerning focal or pivotal points in our personal psychological histories and development can be shown through a psychoanalytic interpretation of these historical records and frequently even become described by the historical record

itself, for example, the "Oedipus" complex or "Narcissism." It is intriguing to speculate why so little attention is paid to the Bible as a source of historical metaphors that may be used to substantiate or suggest revision of various psychoanalytic themes.

The story of Adam and Eve, the first story of the Bible and upon which all the rest are based, seems a useful place to start. The following investigation discusses ideas related to the derivation of and then use of this theory: the story of Adam (and Eve) is the story of the pre-oedipal development of the baby boy Adam. Eve was Adam's mother, and God and the snake were Adam's split father. As Freud stated,

To begin with, we know that God is a father substitute; or, more correctly, that he is an exalted father. . . . We also know, from the secret life of the individual which analysis uncovers, that his relationship to his father was perhaps ambivalent from the outset, or, at any rate, soon became so. . . . It does not take much analytic perspicacity to guess that God and the Devil were originally identical — were a single figure which was later split into two figures with opposite attributes. ¹

In the first part of this paper, I will present the derivation of one possible psychoanalytically informed interpretation or understanding of the story of Adam and Eve. In the best psychoanalytic tradition, I offer this as one

¹ Freud, Sigmund (1923). "A Seventeenth-Century Demonological Neurosis", The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, translated by James Strachey, Vol. XIX, pages 85-86.

interpretation from a pluralistic world of understandings that is consistent with certain basic psychoanalytic concepts that also will be discussed. Later in the paper, I will use this interpretation to comment on psychoanalytic metapsychology and aspects of its relationship to *scientific* awareness.

ADAM and EVE

At the beginning of Adam's life, before the development of his secondary narcissism or object constancy, he perceives himself and the external world, with all its objects, as being one and the same. As Mahler described the infant,

In this sense, we would propose to distinguish two stages within the phase of primary narcissism. . . . During the first few weeks of extrauterine life, a stage of absolute primary narcissism, marked by the infant's lack of awareness of a mothering agent, prevails.... It is followed by a stage of dim awareness that need satisfaction cannot be provided by oneself, but comes from somewhere outside the self.²

According to the Biblical story, at times this results in loneliness. Adam first becomes aware of his good father, God, as the only other SEPARATE object "in his likeness" in the physical world. Adam is still psychologically merged with and physically directly dependent on his mother Eden-Eve, whom he perceives as being a part or extension of himself. Then God, Adam's good father, helps Adam differentiate Eve out of Adam's primary narcissistic state. Until then,

² Mahler, M.S., Pine, F. and Bergman, A. (1975). The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant, New York: Basic Books, page 42.

Adam experiences Eden-Eve as a part of himself along with the rest of his infantile omnipotence (master over all the beasts, etc.).

With the help of the good father, Adam creates Eve out of "his" rib. As Adam would nurse at his mother's breast, he psychologically experienced her as an extension of himself, and he could feel her ribs as he nursed. As Ella Freeman Sharpe points out,

Psychoanalytic experience has shown that the ideas that are symbolized concern the fundamental basic factors of our actual existence, namely our own bodies, life, death, and procreation. These fundamentals, in relation to ourselves and the family of which we were a member, retain for us through life their original importance, and energy flows from them to all derivative ideas.³

Initially, Adam experienced Eve's ribs as part of himself since all of Eve was "in" his psychological self as part of his primary narcissism. He experienced significant pleasure as he nursed and during these times would associate the pleasure of her breast with the feeling of her firm ribs beneath and next to her breasts. A little later, after he had begun to discover the pleasurable feelings of playing with his erect penis (which may have also occurred during nursing), he condensed the pleasure of the breast, the feeling of the ribs, and the feeling and pleasure of his erect penis into one image. Later, primitive awareness of the penis as a procreative organ additionally motivated earlier people to develop the idea that she was created from his (her real) rib, resulting in his loss of that rib as

³ Sharpe, Ella Freeman (1937). Dream Analysis, New York : Brunner/Mazel, pages 53-54.

a *part* of himself! With the transition from primary to secondary narcissism, he sensed that he had "lost" a part of himself. Indeed, later, he does lose Eve's breasts and her ribs when she weans him. This also set the stage for the development of subsequent shame. This view of the origin of women is still reflected today in religious and social systems where women are considered *part* of the man's possessions and/or self.

As Adam recognizes Eve as a separate person from himself, he sometimes misses her and at other times feels angry with her. Adam also begins to realize that Eve is having an affair with a snake, his "bad penis" father, who is aiding Adam's awareness of Adam and Eve being separate persons. Mother covers her breasts as they both become ashamed of their nakedness after the son "may" no longer nurse, which also may be incidentally or serendipitously associated with increasing instinctual pleasure from playing with his penis. This coincides, not coincidentally, with Adam's growing consciousness that he is separate from his mother, Eve. As Freud said,

An infant at the breast does not yet distinguish his ego from the external world as the source of the sensations flowing in upon him. He gradually learns to do so, in response to various promptings. He must be very strongly impressed by the fact that some sources of excitation, which he will later recognize as his own bodily organs, can provide him with sensations at any moment, whereas other sources evade him from time to time - among them what he desires most of all, his mother's breast - and only reappear as a result of his screaming for help. In this way, there is for the first time set over against the ego

an 'object', in the form of something which exists 'outside' and which is only forced to appear by special action.⁴

Adam develops the ability to feed himself and no longer be totally dependent on nursing. Eve gives him an apple that she already has the capacity to eat, as an adult, and which the snake has encouraged her to eat. Adam's ability to feed himself coincides with the development of self-awareness and therefore also increases awareness of others. The eating of the apple is thus equated with the acquisition of self-knowledge that makes shame possible. Without self-awareness or self-consciousness, there is no shame. As he becomes aware and begins to obtain consciousness, he becomes aware of the sexual or erotic impulses going back and forth between himself and his mother that began with nursing and were there since birth. This is the beginning of his Oedipal rivalry with his snake-father and of his shame in front of his idealized and asexual father, God. With the development of self-awareness also came the realization of the possibility of losing oneself, of death. Awareness or consciousness comes with a price!

At this point, the only solution God, the good asexual father, will allow, that also allows for the possibility of Adam to find again direct instinctual gratification, is for Adam to leave the good father behind and take his sexual mother with him! Adam is an Oedipal victor, of sorts. He leaves the home of his father and goes out from the ideal Garden relationship with Eden-Eve into the non-ideal but real world to express his creative and procreative energies.

⁴ Freud, S. (1930). "Civilization and its Discontents", *Ibid.*, Volume XXI, page 67.

The mother Eve which Adam takes with him is the final introject of his good mothering parent. Adam transfers much of the caring, loving relationship with his mother into his relationship with his true spouse and coming family that is now perceived as, again, part of himself and his new identity. It is this very process of awareness of sexuality coupled with sublimation, aided by the good "fathering" parent, that Freud maintained is the basis of civilization. As I implied earlier, the mothering and fathering of the child is not a role specifically defined by the *sex* or *gender* of the parent but rather by the *function that the adult provides for the infant!* This sublimation is also the basis of consciousness itself. Again, as Freud put it,

Civilization, therefore, obtains mastery over the individual's dangerous desire for aggression by weakening and disarming it and by setting up an agency within him to watch over it, like a garrison in a conquered city.⁵

Communicating the essence of this idea, the awareness of self and sexuality combined with sublimation, from generation to generation has been critical to human psychological development. Mental organization based on autonomy and the ability to redirect instinctual drives has allowed for the greater chance of survival and prosperity for cultures that have adopted a form of it. Religion has been the vehicle of this programming. I would argue that this is the definition of religion - a system of metaphors that produces a particular mental organization. This definition neither denies nor confirms the existence of God. These metaphors, stories, communicate consciously and unconsciously with the listener and thus provide for new mental organization much as clinical analysis operates.

⁵ Freud, S. (1930). *Ibid.*, page 123-124.

Thus, understanding the nature of metaphors becomes important for *conscious* understanding.

METAPHOR and REALITY

A metaphor is created by the brain in an attempt to condense and communicate an idea. But a metaphor is only a reflection of the "real" idea; it contains an approximation of the idea. From one perspective, all communication is a metaphor. Each word here is an individual metaphor, and combined, they attempt to define a more complex metaphor. There tends to be an inverse relationship between the clarity and complexity of metaphors. A tree is a simple metaphor. Transference is a complex one.

Plato was the first to clearly communicate the idea that human beings are only capable of consciously experiencing metaphor. We cannot experience "reality" directly. We only experience the reflections of reality similar to images being projected onto a wall from a position outside of our direct awareness. This idea is demonstrated by the fact that all external information reaches our consciousness via sensory organs. The physical event or data is first transformed into neural impulses, then sent into our brain, where it is selectively and unconsciously screened. We are not actively aware of this screening process. Only then may the stimulus be projected "into" our consciousness where we "observe" it. The source of the original stimulus may be from outside the body, in the body but outside the brain, or from inside the brain! We are unable to directly perceive the origin of any stimulus. Dreaming is an excellent example of this. Thus what we observe is not the object that initiated the sensation itself

but rather a "physiological metaphor" of the initial phenomena. The real object or stimulus has been altered by the perceptual organ because the perceptual organ only registers that aspect of the real object to which the perceptual organ is sensitive. Observer bias is impossible to avoid. The data of the perceptual organ is further filtered, subtracted from, added to, and condensed with other perceptual organ data, memories, and internally derived sensations by unconscious processes. Then determination is *unconsciously* made whether or not the new now altered stimulus will be projected into the system of consciousness. We are able to infinitely distort perceived phenomena because of this, and indeed we cannot avoid some distortion. We can also be hallucinating but be personally unaware of it.

Scientific method is the only tool we have that enables us partly to overcome this distortion and begin to determine which communicated or perceived phenomena are closest to reality. All human understanding is based on phenomena thus perceived and is inaccurate in some way. Scientific methodology offers some escape from this blindness.

Science does this by requiring that perceived phenomena be repeatable to observers with different biases. Science is predicated on a particular organization of consciousness that enables observers to differentiate between internally derived sensations and externally derived sensations. Science accepts the concepts of preconscious and unconscious mental functioning, which affects perception. Hallucinating people and people dominated by "magical" thinking are often unable to understand or share "scientific" reasoning. It recognizes that our perceptions are subjectively distorted and therefore requires that data be both

repeatably demonstrable and demonstrable to double-blinded observation when possible. These precepts of scientific awareness are often poorly understood by persons who accept science simply because they marvel at its power to alter the external world in fascinating ways that science obviously gives the scientist.

Our unaided bodies cannot perceive reality directly. Also, we are only able to perceive indirectly a tiny portion of reality. Our biologically derived sensory organs are inadequate to perceive any but the most immediate and gross phenomena. Although they were well designed to get us out of the ocean and the weather, they are inadequate to even begin to serve us as tools with which to look at the details of the universe or reality. For example, as you read this, literally thousands of radio, television, long, and short wave transmissions, and other "background" radiation from throughout the universe are passing through and saturating the space you are currently occupying, totally unperceived (unless the TV or radio is on now!). Perhaps this is part of the reason for the success of the "Walkman". From one perspective, the actual space that your body is now occupying seemingly solidly is merely an illusion. The atoms, nuclei, and electrons of our bodies are so far apart that, on the whole, we are made, by volume, mostly of empty space! But yet we feel solid. From little, but repeated, pieces of evidence, our brains construct models of reality, metaphors, that then direct our actions. Unfortunately, these models are mostly illusory in nature.

Metaphor is the tool that our brain uses to organize our experience. This experience is made up of billions of externally and internally derived pieces of data which are condensed into workable, useful, metaphorical models. We then use these models consciously and unconsciously to direct our behavior. As

Julian Jaynes eloquently argued in The Origins of Consciousness, it is our capacity to formulate metaphors that enables us to be conscious.

Subject conscious mind is an analog of what is called the real world. It is built up with a vocabulary or lexical field whose terms are all metaphors or analogs of behavior in the physical

world... It allows us to shortcut behavioral processes and arrive at more adequate decisions... And it is intimately bound up with volition and decision.⁶

Before this, we are unconscious but living biological "machines" responding to biological impulses in a rigidly programmed way with little deviation. Viewing consciousness itself as unprovable and irrelevant for actual behavior, B. F. Skinner argues in Beyond Freedom and Dignity that this state of affairs still predominates and indeed is ultimately inescapable. Along with Freud, Jaynes, and many others, I disagree with this nihilistic view and believe that behavior is gradually alterable if the metaphorical models used to generate behavior are changed. I would agree with Skinner that behavior *at all times* continues to be primarily unconsciously and preconsciously determined. It is our limited and recently learned capacity to understand the world as a metaphor that frees us to continue consciously and unconsciously to alter our models into more workable or useful forms. By turning to the scientific method for something more than subjective unconscious being, we may momentarily be able to find new solutions

⁶ Jaynes, Julian (1976). The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind, Boston : Houghton Mifflin Company, page 55.

to problems not previously solvable by older models of understanding. Science helps us escape from the subjectivity of each of our own sets of perceptions. It allows us to begin to filter the data that reaches our consciousness for validity and distortion.

CONSCIOUSNESS

In order to better understand our human condition, so that we might further transcend our physical and emotional unconscious bonds, we need to continue our efforts to expand our consciousness. We should not be loosely using chemically or other non-cognitively derived altered states of consciousness as our primary pathway to greater scientific awareness, although data from such experiments may be very useful in our scientifically and consciously determined efforts to proceed.

An area that has been under-explored as a source for new insight into the nature of being human is a re-examination of the dominant metaphorical themes that enable us to develop consciousness in each new generation. We inherit consciousness from our culture (Jaynes). Our culture programs our consciousness. The dominant metaphors of the culture are the bearers of our cultural consciousness that essentially "program" our perspectives unconsciously so that we may have our moments of consciousness that are less interfered with by unconscious themes! The current dominant metaphors of Western civilization and the metaphors that have most strongly infiltrated the Eastern world are based on Judeo-Christian paradigms. Even Karl Marx was dominantly focused on a Christian theme of communal sharing.

It is my opinion that the most consciously lucid cultural organizing metaphor or paradigm available for the extension of consciousness today is psychoanalytic metapsychological theory. Cynically, Jaynes states,

In the medical sciences, the most prominent scientism, I think, has been psychoanalysis. Its central superstition is repressed childhood sexuality. The handful of early cases of hysteria which could be so interpreted became the metaphors by which to understand all personality and art, all civilization and its discontents. And it too, like Marxism, demands total commitment, initiation procedures, a worshipful relation to its canonical texts, and gives in return that same assistance in decision and direction in life which a few centuries ago was the province of religion.⁷

Since I believe anarchy in thought or belief only leads to un-creative confusion and regressive conflicts, and since some degree of magical thinking is an inescapable consequence of being human, I see this statement as paradoxically powerfully supportive of the psychoanalytic paradigm. Psychoanalysis uniquely rejects the idea that an organ as highly organized as the brain often does things "accidentally". It opens the window of consciousness to mental events in the dark third of human existence: dreams and sleep. And it recognizes that all major changes in consciousness start as highly organized, often unconsciously derived, fantasies that are only later cognitively demonstrated. This is one reason why psychoanalysis as a therapy is not fundamentally a conscious cognitive process that could be replaced by cognitive learning anymore than the

⁷ Jaynes, Julian (1976). Ibid, page 442.

playing of a sport could be replaced by a book of instructions. As Freud stated in 1910 in " 'Wild' Psychoanalysis",

If knowledge about the unconscious were as important for the patient as people inexperienced in psychoanalysis imagine, listening to lectures or reading books would be enough to cure him. Such measures, however, have as much influence on the symptoms of nervous illness as the distribution of menu-cards in a time of famine has upon hunger. ...informing the patient of his unconscious regularly results in an intensification of the conflict in him and an exacerbation of his troubles.⁸

While later in the same paper he wrote

For as a matter of fact 'wild' analysts of this kind do more harm to the cause of psycho-analysis than to individual patients. I have often found that a clumsy procedure like this, even if at first it produced an exacerbation of the patient's condition, led to a recovery in the end.⁹

The psychoanalytic debate is still "open" as to how much cognitive learning may be helpful or injurious to the therapeutic process. Cognitive therapies, often unknowingly rooted in psychoanalytic theory, do have enviable studies validating their efficacy

⁸ Freud, S. (1910). "Wild Psycho-Analysis", *Ibid.*, Volume , page 225.

⁹ Freud, S. (1910). *Ibid.*, page 227.

The human brain is the most complex product of the known universe. There are currently two central scientific themes used to explain the functioning of the human brain: the biological and psychological. Although progress is being made, the biological theme is currently too reductionistic to usefully offer an explanation of the higher functions of the human brain such as consciousness. Among the major psychological themes, behavioral, cognitive, and psychoanalytic, only the psychoanalytic point of view offers a unifying theory of biology and psychology that accounts for consciousness at this time. This obviously provocative assertion leads to conflict between metaphors and paradigms. The problem of how to extend consciousness, of how to determine what is more "real" and therefore more useful, to help understand the past and predict and shape the future, becomes the question: how are metaphors or paradigms demonstrated to be valid? If consciousness is derived from metaphors, or even if consciousness simply relies on metaphors to communicate ideas and to experience "reality", then the validating of metaphors becomes critical to extending conscious awareness of reality. Metaphors exist as highly organized subsets of broader defined rules usually referred to as paradigms.

PARADIGMS

Paradigms are used to organize information into metaphors. Our conscious perception is affected by the paradigm(s) with which we choose to observe. Paradigms are often difficult to define and are more complex than metaphors. One demonstration of the validity of a paradigm is whether a new paradigm explains the data and observations of older paradigms as well as being able to explain phenomena previously observed but not explained by the older paradigms. As Kuhn, 1962, said,

Testing occurs as part of the competition between two rival paradigms. Probably the single most prevalent claim advanced by the proponents of a new paradigm is that they can solve the problems that have led the old one to a crisis .¹⁰

This is the *claim* of self-psychology with respect to the narcissistic and borderline conditions. Additionally, the new scientific paradigm should enable the observer to discover previously unrecognized phenomena. Again, Kuhn wrote,

...particularly persuasive arguments can be developed if the new paradigm permits the prediction of phenomena that had been entirely unsuspected while the old one prevailed.¹¹

The new paradigm should extend our ability to observe.

For example, the theory of relativity had to explain the phenomena previously understood by the paradigms of wave and particle mechanics in addition to its extending our understanding about the inter-relationship between energy and matter ($E=MC^2$). If relativity failed to explain the phenomena explained by older paradigms, it would not have been as significant a discovery and, perhaps appropriately, not taken seriously (unless it led to the discovery of new phenomena, which it also did). The value of *any* paradigm lies in its ability to organize information or phenomena, as Kant put it, so that we can predict and hopefully effect future events.

¹⁰ Kuhn, Thomas S. (1962). The Structure of Scientific Revolutions , Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pages 145 & 153.

¹¹ Kuhn, Thomas S.(1962). Ibid., page 154.

A paradigm may be first tested by taking a series of known events ($A+B=C$) and determining whether or not the paradigm can theoretically predict the already known result (C) of the first events (A+B). If the paradigm succeeds at this, then the next question is to determine whether new unknown phenomena, *which the new paradigm predicts*, are actually present. For relativity, one prediction was that light will appear to "bend" when it passes close to massive objects. This predicted that stars will appear slightly shifted if the star's light passes close to the sun on the way to Earth. No other theory predicted this. When the position of stars appearing close to the sun during a total eclipse was measured, relativity had predicted the distortion that was measured! Thus relativity explained old phenomena and predicted new phenomena. The same rules apply to all scientific paradigms: they must elucidate old phenomena and predict the discovery of new phenomena.

When older metaphors (data or observations) of the human condition are subjected to analysis by biological, behavioral, cognitive, or psychoanalytic paradigms, a psychoanalytic paradigm in the original Freudian sense, which includes the importance of biology, may elucidate these metaphors in surprising but predictable ways that generally shed different light on their contents than could the other paradigms.

DISCUSSION

There is a "primitive lyrical validity" to the story of Adam and Eve that almost all of us can feel if we allow ourselves. And there is an equally strident defense of the validity of the original, unchanged version of the story of creation that "creationist fundamentalists" passionately defend. It may be that some of the affect involved in this defense is derived from the truth that the story likely does contain about the early psychological development of each of us that is misunderstood in the typical "scientific" view of the creation story as an irrelevant myth or as an unemotional scientific condensation of what may have happened historically in the physical external world. In some way, the story *is* talking about our mothers and fathers, which often stimulates powerful reactions. The purpose of looking at the story here is to search for an understanding that could deepen our awareness of the primitive roots from which we spring, so that we might firmly but gently continue to develop toward more life and awareness.

It may be argued that this interpretation is simply "wild analysis" that has no meaning. However, that misses the challenge that the understanding of such stories offers us as a profound, though historically earlier, awareness of the nature of human existence. Could it really be that the roots which generated our consciousness are totally irrelevant? Or is it more likely that by applying our models of understanding to older metaphors, we might discover some new insights about ourselves which parts of us would prefer to continue to avoid? Otherwise, why pay any attention to history or early development?

We each came individually from the Eden of the womb and infancy, where all our needs were adequately met with little effort from ourselves. Babies are

relatively helpless. However, it is likely that *healthy* babies do not *feel* helpless but rather feel quite omnipotent— master over all the beasts. At least from an "adultomorphic" point of view, it seems so. Perhaps unfortunately¹², it is an omnipotence that continues to temper throughout our individual lives. Adam's understanding of God's punishment of the snake, to take his legs away and make him writhe on the ground less powerfully, and to make women afraid of him, presages future Oedipal struggles and forcefully confronts us with our persistent fear of our death, which was discovered via the snake.

This explanation focuses primarily on the derivation of Eve from Adam. The creation story may reflect even more broadly into our primary development. We are perhaps in some ways each our own "god," and we are propelled internally and externally into our Oedipal struggles. The second story of the Bible, where Cain slays Able, is clearly founded in murderous rage and narcissistic vulnerability in front of the exalted parent or parental introject, god.

SUMMARY

Behavioral, cognitive, and biological paradigms (as well as other religious and philosophical viewpoints) fail to elucidate the roots of their own paradigms,

¹²A colleague who reviewed this paper asked me, "Why 'perhaps unfortunately'?" to which I wish to respond. The grandiosity and curiosity of children is also found in creative people who often risk disapproval and even punishment by breaking boundaries established by their elders. This rings of omnipotence in the person breaking the boundaries. Rigid people are often not very creative. On the other hand they *are* reliable and dependable. Thus losing one's sense of omnipotence also results in a diminution of creativity even when creativity still persists to function. However, decreased omnipotence also allows for the structure necessary for the fruits of creativity to be protected, shared, and enjoyed. I do not believe it is accidental that many major discoveries are made by young persons especially in "pure" sciences such as mathematics or physics. Older people often have become too indoctrinated to be so creative. However, they provide the stable background against which the younger person creates.

which lie in Western culture. Western culture is based on the Bible, and I challenge these other paradigms to present as lucid an interpretation of the story of Adam and Eve as psychoanalytic metapsychological theory does. Psychoanalytic theory offers an interpretation of past metaphors, elucidating and retaining their fundamentally important themes. "Psychological ontogeny" recapitulates "psychological phylogeny," just as biological development does. Freud offered in Leonardo Da Vinci,

Impressive analogies from biology, which have prepared us to find that the individual's mental development repeats the course of human development in an abbreviated form13

To avoid re-inventing the wheel in our efforts to expand our conscious awareness of reality and thus to continue in our efforts to improve our condition and that of humanity, I believe it may be helpful to attempt to understand all central religious metaphors. These metaphors often contain insights and empathic understandings of the problems that we all struggle with throughout life, from birth to death. Failure to understand them, or at least to re-invent them, will surely result in our passionate animal instincts continuing to dominate too strongly our important decisions; Cain murders Able quite early in the Bible. The availability of our capacity to truly destroy all life and humanity by irrevocably polluting our environment, mismanaging nuclear power, irresponsibly using recombinant gene technology, or failing at some time to establish survivable non-terrestrial communities makes understanding the powerful themes of human experience imperative for survival. Our capacity to

simply physically overwhelm or defend against perceived "opponents" will not continue to be a viable solution to conflicts in a world that has already discovered the power of the atom! It has historically been cooperation and tolerance which, in the end, have been most powerful. Adam and God were cooperating in this way and became more "real" to each other in the process.

As we understand ourselves and each other, we are able to release the powerfully imaginative and creative abilities of our minds. We then have the wisdom to establish and maintain peace and truly move forward in our awareness. We have a powerful tool in psychoanalytic theory and raw materials in historical metaphors found in religious writing, which is derived from the nature of humanity beside currently available clinical material. These are needed to help us construct a viable future for us all.

Psychoanalytic metapsychology enhances our awareness of passionate conflicts between us and within us. It also proposes a way to move beyond this in the resolution of our fear of not being loved and our anxiety about our aggression.

Bibliography

Freud, S. (1910). The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, translated by James Strachey, "'Wild' Psycho-analysis".

Freud, S.(1913). S.E., "Totem and Taboo".

Freud, S.(1916). S.E., "Leonardo Da Vinci".

Jaynes, Julian (1976). The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1976.

Kuhn, Thomas S.(1962). The Structure of Scientific Revolution, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mahler, M.S., Pine, F. and Bergman, A. (1975). The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant, New York: Basic Books.

The New English Bible (1970). Oxford University Press.

Plato (329 BC), The Republic.

Sharpe, Ella Freeman (1937). Dream Analysis, New York : Brunner/Mazel.

Skinner, B.F.(1968). Beyond Freedom and Dignity.

Glossary

Metapsychological - using psychological principals to understand issues out side of areas normally considered by psychology

Primary narcissism - the state where any semi-conscious organism is unaware of the differences between self and non-self. Or that state where everything is experienced as a part of ones self

Secondary narcissism - the awareness of things that are not considered a part of oneself.

Pre-oedipal - early childhood development before the development of extended social relationships.

Object constancy - the awareness that things continue to exist when they are outside of our immediate sensory awareness (it's why babies love peek-a-boo... they lack object constancy so each time you reappear it is like you have been recreated)

Oedipal Rivalry - wanting to possess another person completely yourself, other relationships that the other person has are considered threatening and thus the third person(s) are considered rivals even if they may be loved otherwise

Sublimation - converting the energy of a potentially destructive wish or impulse into constructive behaviour

Transference - the *unconscious* transfer of feelings about someone from your past onto a current other person

“Adultomorphic” - exclusively understanding from the position of a mature adult - derived from anthropomorphic meaning from the point of view of humans, these positions of observation act as if they are the only possible ones

Narcissistic Vulnerability - weak self esteem, self love that is easily harmed or undermined

Ontogeny - the process and course of development of an organism

Phylogeny- the historical stages of development or evolution of a species

