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ABSTRACT

SOCIOLOGICAL IMAGINATION OF SIGMUND FREUD: AN ATTEMPT TO LOCATE FREUDIAN PSYCHOANALYSIS IN SOCIAL THEORY

TAŞ, Berke
M.S., The Department of Sociology
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Barış KUYMULU
Co-supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Çağatay TOPAL

October 2020, 115 pages

This thesis investigates the sociological imagination of Sigmund Freud and the historicity of its formation considering the ongoing importance of psychoanalysis for social theory. As a first step in this endeavor, a conceptual framework is developed out of detecting the prevalent themes in the arguments of C. Wright Mills. Then, these themes are transformed into a methodological structure in terms of operationalizing them in connection to psychoanalytic concepts of Freud. This methodological structure is composed of five dimensions which are the unconscious as a field of the most personal and impersonal; the connectedness of unconscious forces, individual symptoms, language, sexuality and history; historical specificity of the unconscious, repression and neurotic individuality; problematization of alienation from libidinal forces; and Freudian discovery as a constructive destruction. Based on them, Freud’s fundamental works are analyzed in the context of looking into linearities between the sociological imagination and psychoanalytic vision. Also, the historicity psychoanalytic discovery is reflected upon in relation to some conditions of its existence.
Keywords: sociological imagination, Sigmund Freud, psychoanalytic vision, relationality, unconscious.
ÖZ

SIGMUND FREUD’UN SOSYOLOJİK TAHAYYÜLÜ:
FREUDYEN PSIKANALİZİ SOSYAL TEORİDE KONUMLANDIRMAYA DAİR
BİR GİRİŞİM

TAŞ, Berke
Yüksek Lisans, Sosyoloji Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Mehmet Barış KUYMULU
Ortak Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Çağatay TOPAL

Ekim 2020, 115 sayfa

Bu tez, psikanalizin sosyal teori için süregelen önemini göz önüne alarak Sigmund Freud’un sosyolojik tahayyülünü ve bu bakışın tarihsel oluşumunu araştırmaktadır. Bu çabanın ilk adımı olarak C. Wright Mills’in temel argümanlarındaki yaygın temalar belirlenerek bir kavramsal çerçeve oluşturulmuştur. Daha sonra, bu temalar Freud’un kavramlarıyla ilişkilendirilerek işlevsel hale getirilmiş ve metodolojik bir yapı oluşturulmuştur. Bu metodolojik yapı beş boyuttan oluşmaktadır: En kişisel ve kişisel olmayan alan olarak bilinçdışı; bilinçdışı güçler, bireysel semptomlar, dil, cinsellik ve tarihin birbiriyle bağlantılı işleyişi; bilinçdışı, basturma ve nevrotik bireyselliğin tarihsel belirliyi; libidinal güçlerden yabancılaşmanın sorunsallanılması; ve yaratıcı bir yıkım olarak Freudyen keşif. Bu boyutlar temelinde ve sosyolojik tahayyül ile psikanalitik bakışın ortaklıklarının araştırılması bağlamında, Freud’un temel eserlerinden bazıları incelenmiştir. Ayrıca, psikanalitik keşfin tarihselliği de, kendisini oluşturan koşullar bağlamında yorumlanmıştır.
Anahtar Kelimeler: sosyolojik tahayyül, Sigmund Freud, psikanalitik bakış, ilişkisellik, bilinçdışı
to the subject of the unconscious
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Discovering the intense effects of unrealized mental processes, ideas or forces opens an immense space for multiplicity of experiences full of illumination, terror, enthusiasm, and quest for understanding. In this sense, it is not surprising to see that psychoanalysis has maintained its crucial position for social theory and therapeutic practice since its emergence (Elliott, 2004; Mitchell & Black, 2014), which calls for inquiring the sociological grounds of this achievement. Based on this kind of concern, the aim of this thesis is to explore how we can indicate the sociological imagination of Sigmund Freud concerning the importance of psychoanalytic vision for social theory and possibly fruitful outcomes of investigating the historicity of Freudian discovery. This implies a search for new modes of sensitivity towards Freudian psychoanalysis in terms of locating it in social theory and history rather than being based on a motivation to reveal essentially sociological characteristics of psychoanalytic methodology.

The problematization of the research question is based on the concept of sociological imagination which refers to the proposal that fundamental task of social scientists is to show the links between personal biographies or troubles and socio-historical structures (Mills, 1959). In this regard, as a life practice, sociological imagination implies a sense of morality, sensitivity, and responsibility to imagine and offer a social picture which enables seeing connections among different spheres of life. Thus, it basically requires acknowledging the relationality among historically specific conditions or dominant structures, connections among different social spheres, possible actions individuals can pursue in various contexts, and internal processes such as motivations or emotions. Besides, C. W. Mills calls social scientists to orient their analysis in a way to problematize fundamental issues of their historical context, which refers to questioning the position of human reason and freedom under the threat of
intense rationalization and alienation. Based on this kind of framework, the main concern of the thesis is driven by the intuition that there is a considerable amount of continuity between main structures of psychoanalytic theory and what Mills portrays as sociological imagination. This intuition relies on the capacity of psychoanalytic theory to indicate the links between personal and structural in terms of problematizing limitedness of consciousness through indicating connections among language, repressed elements of personal biography, historically inherited patterns of sexuality, and channeling of libidinal energy to cultural activity as a step for the emergence of civilization (Freud, 1962; Freud, 1989; Freud, 2010b).

Considering an example for the embeddedness of sociological imagination in psychoanalytic vision, there is a psychoanalytic tendency to investigate “normal states” of mind in relation to symptoms and modes of suffering, which overcomes the distance between normal and pathological, and enables new way of seeing how they are connected in a dynamic manner. This is argued by Freud who use the analogy of “breaking crystal” whose fragments are predetermined by the structure of crystal in terms of lines of cleavage or boundaries, indicating the structural character of individual symptoms (Olivier, 2018, p. 2). In this regard, for example, perversion can be interpreted as the typical subjectivity in neoliberal capitalist relations considering the normalization of aggressive competition, gaining economic pleasure through inflicting pain to others, and identification with the symbolic order of capitalism in terms of constant search for enjoyment through compulsive consumption of commodities (Olivier, 2018).

Besides searching for sociological imagination in Freud’s texts which are empirical objects of this thesis, a full application of sociological imagination requires one to investigate the links between personal biography of Freud, and historical structures in which psychoanalytic theory had flourished. In this sense, it is necessary to see historicity of Freud’s sociological imagination, which brings up looking into historical conditions in which psychoanalytic thinking had emerged since individuals are determined in terms of living under given social conditions and acting or thinking based on certain inherited habitual models shaped by their context (Mannheim, 2016). Thus, it is important to situate Freudian discovery in the functioning of collective
unconscious and historically specific relations, which allows one to get rid of reducing Freud’s achievement to certain conscious decisions or intellectual abilities. Manifestation of collective unconscious elements are argued to become possible only under specific circumstances shaped by increased contradictions and vertical social mobility in line with encountering different modes of thinking on the same level of credibility (Mannheim, 2016). As parallel to this line of reasoning, it would be possible to see Freudian discovery of unconscious in the light of increasing social transformation in connection to industrial capitalism bringing class struggles, emergence of big cities, rise of nationalism, Jewish question, and contradictory morals of Victorian age (Roudinesco, 2014).

Although there have been many attempts to benefit from premises and concepts of psychoanalysis for the sake of social theory, there is not much work on indicating the grounds of its sociological potentials. In this sense, depending on the fruitful perspective sociological imagination enables, this study would allow a novel understanding on contributions of Sigmund Freud in the history of psychoanalysis. In this way, it would also be possible to develop new sensations towards psychoanalysis in relation to seeing the connections between its fundamental constitutive elements and existing historical conditions, which would allow us to develop alternative pictures of the social and detect the conditions of possibility for sociological imagination to emerge.

Based on this kind of vision, the thesis continues with the second chapter which includes an examination of how Freudian imagination is situated in certain socio-historical conditions and what kind of historical path psychoanalytic theory has followed. The first section of this chapter consists of an overview of possible conceptual tools to reflect on Freud’s individuality as a relational process, how certain historical currents relate with the interpersonal milieu of Freud and the formation of psychoanalytic imagination, and reflections on the institutionalization. In the following section, the brief history of psychoanalysis is covered. The third chapter describes the details and dimensions of the sociological imagination used as the conceptual framework. In this regard, it delineates selected themes which are composed of relationality between the most personal and impersonal, connectivity
between the objects of analyses and spheres of social, linking historical specificity to types of individualities, problematization of alienation, and following the requirements of problems. Then, the following five chapters are allocated to indicate how the conceptual framework is operationalized in connection to psychoanalytic concepts and how the works of Sigmund Freud are analyzed based on those dimensions. Respectively, they include unconscious as a field of the most personal and impersonal; connectedness of unconscious forces, individual symptoms, language, sexuality, and history; historical specificity of the unconscious, repression and neurotic individuality, problematization of reason and freedom in relation to alienation from libidinal forces, and Freudian discovery as a constructive destruction compared to rigid methods. These conceptualizations are used to reflect on how to locate Freudian psychoanalysis in social theory and search for possibilities of engaging with sociological imagination of Freud. What is called sociological imagination of Freud, Freudian imagination, or psychoanalytic imagination throughout the thesis refers to something which could be constructed through different theoretical engagements rather than being essentially possessed by the individuality of Sigmund Freud. And this construction could operate in different manners in different contexts of exploration. The thesis will end with the conclusion section where the main structure of the thesis and fundamental arguments will be evaluated.
CHAPTER 2

TRACING THE RELATIONALITY BETWEEN FREUD’S PERSONAL MILIEU AND THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND A BRIEF HISTORY OF PSYCHOANALYSIS

2.1. Historicity of Freudian Imagination: Tracing the Relationality between the Personal Milieu and Social Structure

Depending on the operation of sociological imagination as portrayed by Mills (1959) requires examining the social relations in which Freudian imagination have been embedded. In this regard, since “sociological imagination enables us to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society” (Mills, 1959, p. 6), it is possible to trace how psychoanalytic discovery relates with Freud’s personal biography and historical conditions of which it has been a part. This kind of investigation is also oriented by the attention of sociological imagination towards the co-functioning of personal troubles, public issues, and social structures (Mills, 1959, p. 21). Thus, rather than reducing psychoanalytic imagination to Freud’s intellectual achievements, this analysis relies on the necessity of exploring the connectivity between “intimate realities” and “social realities”. Therefore, it aims to reveal the grift complexity composed of the relationality among psychoanalytic theoretical construction, interpersonal relations of Freud, corresponding historical circumstances, and structural processes.

Based on this kind of concern, this chapter includes three sections. The first section is composed of an overview of some conceptual tools which would be used to approach Freud’s individuality as a relational process. Also, these concepts are discussed in relation to their continuity with the framework of sociological imagination, which would enable some fruitful reflections on the sociological analysis of personal life. Then, the next section involves exploratory arguments about the
possible links among certain historical circumstances, the context of Freud’s interpersonal and affective ties, and formation of psychoanalytic imagination. Following this, the last section consists of reflections on how the institutionalization of psychoanalysis would be a crucial structural ground for the construction of Freudian vision through its allowing to various encounters, interactions, and theoretical discussions.

2.1.1. Approaching Freud’s Individuality as a Relational Process

It is possible to examine various uses of the concept of relationality with respect to sociological analysis of personal life (Roseneil & Ketokivi, 2016). According to this relational trend, individuals are not evaluated as autonomously acting entities, but as part of a certain social context which is composed of patterns of norms, values, and practices (Roseneil & Ketokivi, 2016). This relational turn owes its grounds to contributions of George Herbert Mead (1934) who is known to propose agentic reflexivity which implies that self is a dynamic process composed of interdependent phases of “I” and “me” (Roseneil & Ketokivi, 2016). In this conceptual framework, “I” refers to creative and unpredictable dimension of self in relation to its capacity to act beyond limits of social rules or expectations (Mead, 1934). Thus, it is used to describe the potential of self to reflect upon the possibilities, expectancies, or habits actively and critically. In this regard, it allows one to portray particularity of each self as part of the dynamic social relations. On the other hand, “me” refers to persons’ viewing themselves based on the crystallization of how others see them (Mead, 1934). This self-image is constructed throughout the life, firstly in connection to views of significant others, and later according to the gaze of whole social group conceptualized as “the generalized other” (Mead, 1934). Mead’s theoretical construction indicates congruence with insights of sociological imagination considering their evaluation of individuality as a relational and dynamic social process. As parallel to them, in the following pages the Freudian imagination will be approached as a phenomenon actively constituted in certain social relations and structurally determined processes,
which also include conditions for unpredictable or creative aspects of Freud’s individuality to emerge.

Another process-oriented scholar whose contributions are valuable for developing a sociology of personal life is Norbert Elias (1978) (Roseneil & Ketokiyi, 2016). According to Elias’ view, there is no social apart from particular social relations whose operation rely on figurations of interdependencies (Elias, 1978). This implies that relations are produced as dynamic processes of creation in line with various emotions, cognitive connections, and affective bonds (Elias, 1978). In this regard, Elias conceptualizes self as a continuous process or movement, which suggests that personal is directly linked to certain web of relations and general interdependencies. This kind of theoretical endeavor seems to go linear to Mills’ conceptualization of sociological imagination which is described as an inclination to search for connections among intimate details, interpersonal milieu, and structural conditions (Mills, 1959). Based on these insights, it is possible to investigate Freudian imagination not just as a personal achievement or discovery of a genius character, but also as an emerging force within affective interdependencies. Thus, it would be possible to reflect upon some intense emotional conflicts, interpersonal struggles, and transformation of affective bonds as parts of structural construction of psychoanalytic vision. In this sense, the formation of psychoanalytic imagination in relation to individuality of Freud could be evaluated as a process full of dynamic tensions, interactions, and web of interdependencies. This could enable situating sociological imagination of Freud in the operation of structural forces in various spheres. These processes would be approached in relation to dominant historical currents, and institutionalization of psychoanalysis in connection to interpersonal milieu of Freud, whose co-functioning implies an affective process as well as a structural one.

2.1.2. Freudian Imagination in relation to Dominant Historical Currents

The historical period in which Freud has lived witnessed various social conflicts and collective violence. Some of them would be mentioned as collapse of empires, world wars, economic crises, class struggles, construction of national
identities, and social movements relying on emancipatory ideals like socialism, liberalism, or communism (Roudinesco, 2016, pp. 13-17). Thus, the doors of the history have been open to various possibilities. There was a longing for revolution in scientific, artistic, political, and social domains (Roudinesco, 2016, pp. 226-227). In Althusserian terms, the accumulation of historical contradictions has formed a fruitful domain for transformations and ruptures in various spheres (Althusser, 2008). Therefore, it makes sense to explore how psychoanalytic imagination and its discoveries concerning the unconscious, sexuality, family, and culture have emerged in relation to historically specific conditions. This implies that the understanding of history in this chapter has been based on Louis Althusser’s conceptual framework which includes *historical conjuncture* and *overdetermination* as fundamental ontological dimensions to focus on in the analysis of social conditions of existence (Althusser, 2005). Therefore, the examined themes, relations, affects, and events are constructed as various determinations within the historically specific conjuncture of Freud’s era.

In this context, one of the important determinants in Freud’s life was the ambivalent situation of Jews in Europe. Coming from a Jewish family, Freud has experienced the integration of Jews into bourgeois society in line with their gaining certain civil rights, but they were also seen as a threat in terms of having an identity that cannot be restricted to national borders (Roudinesco, 2016, p. 20). Depending on social tensions and pressures, it was quite common among Jews to develop self-hatred and try their best to achieve social status in society (Roudinesco, 2016, p. 20), and choosing science rather than commerce as a vocation was a prevalent attitude to reach this goal (p. 25).

Regarding how antisemitism has operated, an instance would be the following event which had affected Freud in their childhood: A Christian tells Freud’s father to come off the pavement, and throws off his hat, upon which the father does not resist and takes the hat from the ground (Roudinesco, 2016, p. 29). Freud states that this event has stimulated feelings of revenge and resulted in his phantasies about defeating the Roman Catholic Church like Carthaginian Hannibal who had promised his father to hold a grudge against Romans forever (Roudinesco, 2016, p. 29). In this sense,
Freud’s choosing a scientific career would be interpreted in the light of these historical conditions which demand Jews to maintain their identity in alternative manners. Also, Freud’s concern about the role of sexuality and psychoanalytic deconstruction of patriarchal family would be certain ways of reckoning with dominant Christian morality or Puritan ethics (Freud, 1962). Although this sounds speculative, it offers some hints to trace the links between the structural position of Jews, corresponding interpersonal milieu, formation of certain affective ties, Freud’s personal biography, and emergence of psychoanalytic vision.

Another important social sphere which would be influential in the formation of psychoanalytic discovery is the historical operation of bourgeois and patriarchal family. One of the alterations in this domain has been the transition to love marriages from arranged marriages in addition to increasing authority and power of women in line with their involvement to socio-economic life (Roudinesco, 2016, p. 35). In this regard, there was a social and political unrest about the possible breaking down of patriarchal family, so the authorities have tried to identify women fundamentally with motherhood (Roudinesco, 2016, pp. 35-37). Thus, it makes sense to follow the connections between these historical circumstances and Freudian interest in the dialectic of eroticization of family or social relations, and increasing political sensibility to govern sexuality (Freud, 2010d).

Also, as one of the crucial themes in psychoanalytic exploration, hysteria would be conceptualized as the embodiment of reaction to patriarchal conflicts by women (Roudinesco, 2016, p. 59). In this regard, psychoanalytic investigation of hysteria would mostly be interpreted as stories of women who express their longing for freedom with symptomatic bodily acts (Freud, 2010c, Roudinesco, 2016, pp. 80-81). Therefore, constitution of Freudian imagination relates with Freud’s social position which prepares the ground for reflecting on the tensions of patriarchal family, ambivalent situation of women, and formation of psychopathological structures in connection to conflicts of modern capitalism.

Considering relevant historical conditions in the development of sociological imagination of Freud, it is impossible to disregard the effects of World War I. Firstly, the war had intense effects on the psychic life of Freud in terms of leading to increased
anxiety since his sons and closed ones had also attended (Roudinesco, 2016, pp. 196-197). Besides this affective dimension, witnessing the capacity of civilization for mass destruction has made Freud question the fundamentals of psychoanalysis with respect to revising the arguments concerning the pleasure principle (Roudinesco, 2016, pp. 197-199). Thus, Freud has argued that the formation of civilization does not destroy the aggressive inclinations or death instincts of humanity, which are always ready to come to the surface if conditions enable the suspension of their suppression (Freud, 1961). In this respect, the portrayal of the unconscious has been transformed based on the cruciality of repressive mechanisms, ambivalent drives, libidinal cathexes towards objects, condensed representations, and channels of replacement (Roudinesco, 2016, pp. 201-202; Freud, 1989). Therefore, it is possible to see how the war context has produced certain effects which transformed affective, social, and intellectual life of Freud.

Also, experiencing the violence of nation-state construction, autocratic inclinations, and leader-based movements such as Nazism has been important (Roudinesco, 2016, pp. 380-383). In this regard, during the years between the world wars, it is possible to see the rise of Freudian concern about the relationality among the operation of social power, formation of authority, functioning of civilization, and modes of governing sexuality (Freud, 1962).

2.1.3. Institutionalization as the Structural Ground of the Psychoanalytic Imagination

Since its early years, psychoanalysis have developed in institutional domains. The first instance of this tendency has been the Wednesday Psychology Society (Psychologische Mittwochs-Gesellschaft) which was founded in September 1902 at Vienna (Roudinesco, 2016, p. 131). Considering its rituals of presentations and discussions about various topics of psychoanalysis, this social sphere has allowed Freud to revise his ideas in the light of reactions from different apprentices. Then, throughout these interactions, the community has expanded, and Freudian treatment has been applied by the members to different patients (Roudinesco, 2016, p. 132). One
of the examples concerning how this spread of psychoanalysis has fed Freudian imagination includes the case of “Little Hans” which refers to a case that has been analyzed by one of the apprentices of psychoanalysis, Max Graf, under the supervision of Freud (Roudinesco, 2016, p. 132). Thus, Freud had a chance to observe child psychoanalysis, and reflect upon the possible operation of the unconscious in children, which paved the way for further discussions.

Then, in 1907, Vienna Psychoanalytic Society (Wiener Psychoanalytische Vereinigung) was founded with the participation of important figures including Sandor Ferenczi, Karl Abraham, Carl Gustav Jung, and Ernest Jones who have contributed to the spread of psychoanalytic movement in the world. Freud’s interaction with Jung is especially important to examine considering latter’s administrative role in the community and intellectually stimulating ideas (Roudinesco, 2016, pp. 145-148). Jung’s non-Jewish background has also been influential in Freud’s considering him as a valuable member who would prevent the image of Jewish science that would be attributed to psychoanalysis (Roudinesco, 2016, p. 145). This indicates how historical conditions would be linked with affective relations, intensity of interactions, evaluations, and theoretical discussions among people. On the other hand, the proximity and sincerity between Jung and Freud has included elements of conflicts or incongruences from the beginning as Jung has not accepted the centrality of sexuality for the psychic life (Roudinesco, 2016, pp. 146-149). Eventually, the intensity of conflicts between them has led to complete ending of the friendship (Roudinesco, 2016, pp. 179-180).

Considering how Jung’s companionship has possibly contributed to Freudian imagination, it would be argued that the construction of the concept of Oedipus complex is a kind of reply to Jung’s disregard of sexuality (Roudinesco, 2016, p. 186). In this sense, Freud has tried to deal with Jungian relativism and culturalism by trying to indicate the structural and historical importance of the organization of sexuality, whose product emerged as Totem and Taboo (Freud, 2001). Besides, the perspectives in this book relates with Freud and Jung’s seminars held in U.S. where there have been long discussions about the difference between the “race” and “ethnic group” (Roudinesco, 2016, 189). Thus, it is possible to observe how influential institutional
activities and relations with members of the community have been on the formation of psychoanalytic imagination.

Furthermore, it is important to realize that psychoanalysis and Freudian imagination has developed in relation to struggles with different fields of practice and discourses. In this regard, one of the crucial opponents have been the psychiatry (Roudinesco, 2016, p. 351-352). The contention between them has firstly become visible concerning the discussions about determining a criterion for being a psychoanalyst, and psychiatrists’ claiming that the medical education is necessary (Roudinesco, 2016, p. 352). Besides ongoing debates, there were some court decisions which restrict some psychoanalysts’ analytical practice, in which actions of some medical analysts had been influential (Roudinesco, 2016, p. 351). Upon these attacks on amateur psychoanalysis which implies the application of analysis without requiring some professional criteria, Freud and some other members of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society have defended the autonomy of psychoanalysis as opposed to any kind of medical or juridical restriction (Roudinesco, 2016, pp. 355-356). Through this institutional struggle, the domination of psychiatry has been partially fended off, and amateur analysis has survived. Even though it got harder to protect the autonomy of psychoanalysis after a while, this institutional resistance has opened a space for psychoanalytic imagination to keep flourishing. Thus, the institutional rejection of the medical terminology has contributed to maintenance of fundamental concerns about the language, sexuality, and the unconscious among psychoanalysts. In this way, the intellectual context of the Freudian imagination has kept growing.

2.2. A Brief History of Psychoanalysis

2.2.1. Freudian Discovery

Considering the historical conditions of Freud, we see an immense acceleration of social transformation in terms of effects of industrial capitalism creating big cities, accumulating populations, and forming various social conflicts in relation to formation of class struggles, rise of nation-states, and the Jewish question. Besides, these
developments had produced impacts on the Jewish community whose integration to society was perceived as threatening considering the image of Jews as a nation without borders (Roudinesco, 2014). Concerning specific relations of Freud, it is shown that they meet sacred texts at a quite early age, which would have effects on the identification with some mythologic figures like Hannibal as a reaction to their father’s shaken authority (Roudinesco, 2016, p. 25). Besides, it is suggested that prominent Freudian theme, the value of eroticization and the necessity of keeping it under control can be traced in the major tensions within society concerning integration of women into job market or increasing tendency to make love marriages (Roudinesco, 2016). Moreover, it is also important to realize the context of 1873 economic crisis, corresponding to increasing grievances about Jews who are held responsible for the destruction of patriarchal family. Also, the intellectual development of Freud is affected by Franz Brentano and Friedrich Herbert in terms of their theory of dynamic unconscious (Perron, 2017), and it is indicated that materialist philosophy of Feuerbach and dominance of physiology in medicine have influenced Freud’s intellectual attitude (Perron, 2017).

In this historical context, the constitution of Freudian exploration was based on reception of two important effects: The idea of potential forces which organize systems of organisms and Darwinian idea of the unity of living organism in relation to carrying the effects of history on one’s system (Perron, 2017). In this regard, the emergence of psychoanalytic vision was shaped by an approach which focuses on operation of dynamic and historical forces on mental life. Freud, through his interactions with other neurologists such as Charcot and Bernheim, realized that ideas could be responsible for some functional disabilities such as “glove anesthesia” which is a lack of feeling in the hand. Besides, they realized that ideas can also be effective cures in terms of placing patients in hypnotic trances and using hypnotic suggestions to induce and remove symptoms (Perron, 2017). Also, Breuer and Freud claimed that hysteria is underlined by memories. While Breuer linked these symptoms with registering disturbing events to altered states of mind, Freud suggested that disturbing, sexually loaded, and conflicting memories are the roots of hysteria (Breuer & Freud, 2010c). Then, Freud realized that hypnosis was not effective enough since there is a resistant
force called defense keeping disturbing memories out of awareness when the hypnotic trance ends. Working on this problem, they invented a topographical model of mind composed of consciousness, pre-conscious, and unconscious (Freud, 2010a). Also, they tried free association to encourage the patient for reporting all fleeting thoughts that would be eliminated. Then, they realized the importance of transference of conflictual thoughts and feelings to the analyst and identification of resistance which pushes disturbing thoughts and feelings away from consciousness (Perron, 2017).

Another dimension of psychoanalysis was the interpretation of dreams based on associations among the elements in the unconscious composed of various conflicting wishes, which are manifested in disguised and symbolized forms (Freud, 2010a). Moreover, Freud eliminated the idea that sexuality is introduced to the child by an external seducer after seeing that childhood sexuality includes conflicting wishes for seduction (Freud, 2010d; Freud, 2016). In this sense, characteristic of sexuality in adulthood can be traced back to childhood. This process develops through localization of sexual instincts in some erogenous zones formed by libidinal pleasures. As many of these drive impulses are unacceptable in adulthood, certain defense mechanisms are built to keep them restricted (Freud, 2016). Besides, for Freud, childhood sexuality is organized around the Oedipus complex which refers to child’s desire for genital intercourse with the parent of opposite sex. Accordingly, these oedipal ambitions are resolved through castration anxiety implying a possible punishment by the parent of same sex, which lead to internalization of parental values (Freud, 2016). After Freud proposed sexual character of childhood, intense attacks have emerged especially from the medical field, which indicates that anti-conformism and tendency to question norms of the social orders were at the root of the psychoanalytic discovery whose emphasis on sexuality has been unacceptable to various social circles including scientific community. In addition, Freud published the case analyses of Dora, Ratman, Schreber, Wolfman and Little Hans, which would seem to be rather heretical attitude considering dominance of positivism in science (Perron, 2017).

Besides, under the influence of war in 1920s, Freud suggested the importance of two conflicting secondary instincts which are life and death drives (Freud, 1961). Thus, Freud come to suggest that repression serves for maintenance of social
mechanisms and organizations in terms of allowing people to live together without destroying each other. Formulating model of mind composed of preconscious, unconscious and conscious beforehand, after realizing that patients are also unaware of their defenses besides repressed impulses, Freud has pictured a topographical model implying that unconscious is the main field of struggles among agencies consisted of id, ego, and superego (Freud, 1989).

Concerning what is called oceanic feeling and its place in formation of religious sentiments, Freud asserted that its roots can be found in the history of ego development which implies the realization of the sensory organs and limits of satisfaction in the face of external and uncontrollable forces (Freud, 1989). In line with this process, the sense of limitlessness or traces of intimate bond with the external world maintains its experiential residues in the unconscious whose formation is exemplified through an analogy with historical formation of Rome. In this regard, a city resembles the constitution of unconscious in terms of carrying various historical buildings, restored areas and artefacts, but unconscious differs from a city as it may include much larger content, which refer to potentially indestructible character of its elements (Freud, 1989). Besides, Freud sees the emergence of civilization as a similar process to libidinal development of individual considering the importance of “replacing the power of the individual by the power of community” and restriction of certain possibilities of satisfaction, which relates with formation of social laws traced back to the incest taboo (Freud, 1962, p. 42). Thus, Freud argues that renunciation of instinct and channeling of libido to cultural ideals and social relations constitute the conditions in which civilization can arise (Freud, 1962).

2.2.2. Institutional Structure of Psychoanalysis

Besides clinical experience and scientific interest in unconscious, institutional structure of psychoanalysis is also worth to examine. Psychology meetings in Vienna (1902) were crucial elements of this process, which evolved to Vienna Psychoanalysis Community (Perron, 2017). Meetings, conferences, and communities have always maintained their utmost importance for psychoanalytic practice. Besides, educational
institutes are established to determine criteria of acceptance for psychoanalytic practice. Having been analyzed and attending to intellectual activities or meetings were some of the criteria. After Ferenczi’s method based on loving the patient, some ethical questions emerged, and it is proposed that analyst needs to avoid manipulating the patient or putting themselves in the role of curing mother. Concerning the discussions regarding medical background of psychoanalyst, Freud suggested that it is not a must and interacting with social sciences would lead to more fruitful results (Perron, 2017). Whereas this suggestion was embraced in Europe, having a medical background maintained its importance in U. S. for a long time.

Moreover, history of psychoanalysis has been full of conflicts and separations in relation to diversification from orthodox Freudian discourse. First of leavers was Alfred Adler who proposed the importance of inferiority complex as a constitutive element, which puts unconscious sexual instincts in downward position. Second one was Carl Gustav Jung who also questioned the role of sexuality and ended up with different conceptualizations. Lastly, Otto Rank has left the community after proposing birth trauma as a fundamental universal principle compared to traumatic resolution of Oedipus complex (Perron, 2017).

The institutional climate was still quite contentious in Lacan’s period. In the context of struggles for power in Paris Psychoanalytic Society, Lacan had needed to leave the community as his approach was disapproved by International Psychoanalytic Association in relation to irregular structure of Lacan’s therapy sessions. Thus, Lacan had founded Ecole Freudienne de Paris and maintained public seminars (Rodriguez, 2019).

2.2.3. Kleinian View, Ego Psychology, School of Object Relations, and Interpersonal Psychology

During 1920s, Melanie Klein and Anna Freud focused on child psychoanalysis on which they had different visions (Perron, 2017). Klein focused on processes such as Oedipal conflicts or formation of infantile super-ego and made use of play activity as a tool for analyzing children considering that during the play unconscious ideas may
be symbolized (Donaldson, 1996). In addition, she had put forward the importance of interpreting the development of transference relationship between the analyst and the child since parental representations in child’s unconscious would affect the quality of this relationship (Klein, 1992). Anna Freud (1974), on the other hand, rejected Klein’s propositions and relied on Freud’s theory of child development. In this sense, she opposed application of standard psychoanalysis to children and argued that it is necessary to strengthen their ego rather than analyzing hidden unconscious motivations (Donaldson, 1996). Moreover, Anna Freud found support in U. S. whereas Klein was more powerful in Europe (Perron, 2017).

Based on Anna Freud’s arguments, ego psychology has emerged in 1930s at Vienna. They were interested in the constitution of ego in relation to development of defense mechanisms, effects of relations with caregivers, and possible constructive role of libidinal and aggressive impulses (Mitchell & Black, 2016b). Defense theory, as a part of ego psychology tradition, focused on how ego functions in terms of channeling id impulses so that there is a reasonable negotiation between superego ideals and repressed energies. In this regard, considering that psychic agencies of id, ego and superego operate in unconscious, it suggested that focusing on the release of id’s energies is not enough since defense mechanisms of ego actively and unconsciously produce reaction formations such as denial, displacement or projection. On the other hand, in line with Darwinian proposal that all organisms have an intrinsic potential to fit into their environment, Hartmann suggested that humans have some built-in conflict-free ego capacities like language, perception and thinking. Thus, they stressed the importance of looking at adaptive aspects of psychic functioning rather than seeing only conflictual elements involved (Mitchell & Black, 2016b).

Based on psychoanalytic emphasis on the role of transferring the internalized early relations to analytic relationship, object-relational approach relies on how the child’s libidinal attachment to mother is transformed into psychically loaded relations with material objects that are called “transitional objects” by D. W. Winnicott (1953). Besides, working on hospitalized children and conducting research on object relations between infants and their primary caregivers, Rene Spitz has put forward the importance of emotional connectedness finding its expression in the formation of
libidinal object as a developmental achievement. In this sense, “the mother becomes important because she provides gratification” (Mitchell & Black, 2016b, p. 39) through responding to child’s physical and emotional needs, which enables constitution of co-regulating rhythm and identification of attachment figure as libidinal object distinguished from others (Mitchell & Black, 2016b).

Similarly, interpersonal tradition is differentiated in terms of its strong emphasis on mutual interactions or the intersubjectivity in the analytic setting in connection to cycles of transference (Hirsch, 2011). Seemingly implying a relational turn, these theoretical routes reject some Freudian theoretical conceptualizations like Oedipal complex or castration anxiety, which goes parallel to their lack of interest in structural determinations over supposedly unique intersubjective realms.

2.2.4. Overview of Lacanian Turn

Having a medical background and being influenced by surrealism and structuralism, Lacan proposed the necessity of “return to Freud” by arguing that ego psychologists and school of object relations misinterpreted the fundamentals of Freudian approach since they take the illusory character of ego as reality and do not search for determining role of subject’s relation to Other (Fink, 1995).

Based on Freud’s early works such as Interpretation of Dreams, Jokes and Their Relation to Unconscious and Psychopathology of Everyday Life in which ideational representatives are accounted for the contents of unconscious, Lacan suggested signifiers for the same role. Thus, his first emphasis is on the language which implies functioning of unconscious and construction of subjectivity through Other’s discourse allowing the signification of other people’s desires, views and wishes (Lacan, 1977). The Other refers to the fact that a child is born into a preestablished symbolic universe in which its position is already prepared. Thus, possibility of becoming a subject implies passing through socialization composed of writing the body with signifiers and acquiring a position in relation to Other emerging as language, desire, demand and jouissance, which constitute the symbolic order. Reality, in this sense, is formed through symbolization of real which corresponds to the domain of
experiences yet to be symbolized. In this regard, signifying chain is “unequivocally determined by what it excludes as by what it includes, by what is within it as by what is without” (Fink, 1995, p. 27).

In this picture, ego is nothing more than accumulation and crystallization of images internalized through how others see a person, implying the inevitability of false sense of self (Lacan, 1977). Thus, rather than emerging in what is consciously said, subjectivity emerges in relation to a split between the conscious and the unconscious. In this regard, the split enables a condition for the possibility of existence of subject, where unconscious thoughts are linked up in a seemingly automatic manner. Therefore, subjectivity simultaneously requires “one’s own disappearance” (Fink, 1995, p. 51) through acquiring a position in a system and signifying the lack one holds. In addition to alienation in language, another necessary step is the separation which refers to the subject’s inability to hold part of Other’s desire or incapability to be sole object of desire for the Other considering that “man’s desire is Other’s desire”, enabling a desirousness as such. In relation to introduction of third term, paternal metaphor or name of the father, the lack in the Other’s desire enter the system and subject functions as desirous being driven by the object a which refers to “remainder produced when the hypothetical mother-child unity breaks down” (Fink, 1995, p. 59). In this sense, object a enables a search for phantasmatic sense of self as subjects organize scenarios around it to be able to get maximum excitement from an experience, which brings forth the jouissance referring to simultaneous feeling of pain and enjoyment.

Another dimension of Lacanian psychoanalytic practice is traversing of fantasy, which implies acquiring a new position in the face of Other. This is based on the importance of trauma whose subjectification would enable taking the position of one’s own cause retroactively. This implies that one needs to take responsibility for the jouissance experienced when faced the Other’s desire since this is the only way out for the possibility of acting beyond neurosis and burden of the Other in a momentary manner (Fink, 1995).

As can be seen, Lacan’s “return to Freud” includes various themes to reflect upon the position of Freudian psychoanalysis in social theory. It opens a fruitful path
to look for how psychoanalytic concepts could operate as parallel to promises of sociological imagination. Therefore, in a way, it offers instances of constructing what is called psychoanalytic imagination in this thesis. Yet, to be able to clarify the formation of this concept, it is necessary to explain on which tendencies of sociological imagination this conceptual continuity will be operationalized.
CHAPTER 3

SOCIOLICAL IMAGINATION AS THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Traces of the continuity between sociological imagination and psychoanalytic perspective could actually be found in *Sociological Imagination* where Mills argues that psychoanalysis has enabled overcoming reductionism of purely physiological view of individual through indicating importance of familial relations as an historical structure dated back to emergence of incest taboo. Also, suggesting that it is necessary to apply Freud’s work on family to other institutions, it is asserted that understanding social structures in terms of their relevance to internal life processes would allow us to see causes of individual actions, emotions and motivations in a more clear way. In addition, Mills acknowledged that this cannot be achieved by depending on self-images of individuals who are mostly unaware of how they are shaped and limited by their social conditions, which is in line with psychoanalytic emphasis on the unconscious.

Based on various features of sociological imagination portrayed by Mills (2007), main characteristics that are chosen for this thesis includes 1) indicating the relations between the closest or the most personal and the most impersonal and distant (as cited in Topal, 2017), 2) connecting the field of analysis to other spheres of social through passing from one perspective to another without sacrificing a total image of society, 3) linking the historically specific situations to types of individuals with limitations and possibilities, 4) problematizing the increased rationalization and alienation threatening the values associated with human reason and freedom and 5) following the requirements of the investigated problem rather than being limited by a rigid method. In this regard, the methodology of the thesis depends on reading fundamental texts of Freud in the light of the chosen dimensions to be able to see connections between Freud’s psychoanalytic vision and Mills’ portrayal of sociological imagination. Besides, sources on personal biography of Freud, works
concerning historical conditions in which psychoanalysis had developed, theoretical endeavors engaging with psychoanalytic imagination, and some secondary sources about sociological potentials of Freudian vision will be checked to detect historical specificity of Freudian sociological imagination and its methodological operation.

3.1. Indicating the Relations between Closest-Most Personal and Most Impersonal-Distant

C.W. Mills clarifies this dimension of sociological imagination starting from the chapter called *The Promise* which is devoted to delineating fundamental task of classical social scientists. In this sense, based on the sense of trap referring to feeling of anxiety in the face of inability to make sense of newly emerging modes of existence, sociological imagination is put forward as an attitude enabling us to “grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society” (Mills, 1959, p. 6). Thus, the task and promise of sociological imagination lies on its capacity to indicate the links between personal troubles or immediate relations with others and structural processes that are not easily accessible to experience. In other words, “it is the capacity to range from the most impersonal and remote transformations to the most intimate features of the human self and to see the relations between the two” (Mills, 1959, p. 7). Therefore, sociological imagination implies a potential to see the connections among inner motivations, personal experiences and social positions of individuals in relation to historical conditions of their life period which would include wars, economic crisis or revolutions bringing multiplicity of transformations in everyday life (p. 9).

Besides, Mills suggests that formulation of issues and troubles could be achieved through investigating cherished values and possible threats on them. Thus, as an inquiry to enlarge the limits of sensing the world, sociological imagination

---

1 Although this kind of conceptualization seems to indicate that I also rely on personal-impersonal dichotomy to make sense of the social, the reason why I use this dichotomy is to refer C. W. Mills’ emphasis on the cruciality of overcoming these commonsensical notions. Also, I mostly use adjectives such as seemingly or supposedly before them to indicate that I use the categories of personal and impersonal in relation to deconstructing them and reaching more relational conceptualizations.
operates in line with problematization of common indifference and uneasiness, referring to unawareness of cherished values that are threatened and feeling of anxiety in the face of threat without realizing its destructive effects on values (Mills, 1959, pp. 11-12). In this sense, it functions on the same ground with psychoanalytic imagination in terms of emphasizing that “people do often have the increasing sense of being moved by obscure forces within themselves which they are unable to define” (Mills, 1959, p. 13). In this regard, one of the fundamental aims of sociological imagination is revealing the linkages between seemingly most personal troubles and their direct relevance to public issues or supposedly impersonal structural processes, which would allow people to acquire “new ways of sensibility, suitable ways of feeling, styles of emotion, and vocabularies of motive” (Mills, 1959, p. 17).

3.2. Connecting the Field of Analysis to Other Spheres of Social

This theme is elaborated especially in the section called on Intellectual Craftsmanship where characteristics of sociological imagination are summed up. In line with the utmost cruciality of looking for linkages among personal troubles, biographies and history, Mills asserts that “imagination is often successfully invited by putting together hitherto isolated items, finding unsuspected connections” (Mills, 1959, p. 199). Thus, it implies a continuous inclination to focus on interplay of various facts, practices, and individualities in terms of relating them to structural processes, modes of transformation and characteristics of epoch. Depending on the “playfulness of mind” and “truly fierce drive to make sense of the world”, “the sociological imagination in considerable part consists of the capacity to shift from one perspective to another, and in the process to build up an adequate view of a total society and of its components” (Mills, 1959, p. 211). As the emphasis on approaching through multiplicity of viewpoints and linking detailed facts to totality of social relations implies, sociological imagination relies on looking for connections among seemingly unrelated or isolated varieties of troubles, issues, types of individuals and structures (Mills, 1959, pp. 225-226). Besides, some of the strategies to achieve this includes “considering extremes”, “trying to contrast objects”, “shuttling between attention to
different dimensions of problem and to the concrete types”, “examination of historical materials for trend analysis or typology of phases”, “making trans-historical constructions”, “building models” and “benefiting from the insights, perspectives, ideas and methods of all reasonable works on humanity” (Mills, 1959, pp. 213-225).

3.3. Linking the Historically Specific Situations to Types of Individuals

In line with the manner of problematizing intersectionality of socio-historical structures and individual biographies, the section Uses of History is based on a special attention to cruciality of considering historical specificity in connection to social structures and their enactment in accordance with psychologies of certain types of individuals. In this sense, the problem of our time is described as dependent on the necessity “to develop psychology of man that is socially grounded and historically relevant” (Mills, 1959, p. 143). To be able to indicate this relationality, Mills suggests that it is necessary to make comparisons in accordance with investigating range of variation of whatever we are interested in (Mills, 1959, pp. 147-148). Thus, considering various historical or contemporary social structures in relation to different human types is argued to be fundamental for operation of sociological imagination.

Besides allowing to see specific character of the social formation we are studying, this kind of approach also enables examining mechanics of change since it problematizes persistence of certain relations in connection to varying degrees of change in functioning of power and history-making (Mills, 1959, pp. 151-154). Also, examination of variations in structure of an epoch and emergence of different historical types are argued to be considered together with conditions of possibilities in individuals’ lives. In this regard, the viewpoint of sociological imagination implies that “historical transformation carries meanings not only for individual ways of life but for the very character- the limits and possibilities of human being” (Mills, 1959, p. 158). Moreover, based on the insights of psychoanalysis which portrays family structure as intrinsic to inner development of individual, Mills emphasizes necessity of examining social structures in relation to psychological processes, interpersonal relations, and practices (Mills, 1959, p. 160). According to this vision, institutions are continuously
constituted through enactment of biographies which refer to “acquiring, dropping, modifying, and in a very intimate way, the moving from one role to another” (Mills, 1959, p. 161). In addition, beyond performing certain social roles, institutional and structural processes are also intertwined with psychological experiences including multiplicity of emotions, nervous apparatuses and motivations whose operation are embedded in the social context composed of “vocabularies of motive” (Mills, 1959, p. 162). In this sense, since “even quite intimate features of man’s inner life are best formulated as problems within specific historical contexts” (Mills, 1959, p. 164), sociological imagination allows one to see how historically specific social structures function through certain individual types with possible range of psychological experiences, motivations, feelings and enactments of various roles, whose characteristics depend on the interplay among varying social spheres.

3.4. Problematizing the Increased Rationalization and Alienation in relation to Position of Reason and Freedom in Human Affairs

Based on the proposition that the fundamental promise of classical social science had been to explore main characteristics of its epoch, in the section called on *Reason and Freedom*, Mills puts forward the cruciality of problematizing the relationship between reason and freedom in relation to weakening power of assumptions, expectations and categories of the Modern Age (Mills, 1959, p. 165). This problematization, intertwined with the feeling of insufficiency to explain what is going on, directs attention to collapse of liberal and socialist axiomatics grounded by the assumed connectivity between increased rationality and freedom (Mills, 1959, p. 166). In this sense, formation and functioning of rational organizations or bureaucracies are suggested to end up with individuals acting without an awareness or control over the consequences of their actions. In accordance with this process, it is argued that rational organizations could operate “as a means of tyranny and manipulation, a means of expropriating the very chance to reason, the very capacity to act as a free man” (Mills, 1959, p.169).
Considering the continuous regulation of impulses, thoughts, emotions and motivations according to demands of organizations, the conceptualization of the issue is described as “rationality without reason”, possibility of human as the “Cheerful Robot”, and the “triumph of alienated man” as opposed to the “Western image of free man” (Mills, 1959, pp. 170-172). In this regard, Freud’s “id”, Marx’ “Freiheit”, George Mead’s “I” and Karen Horney’s “spontaneity” are all portrayed to be concepts used for investigating alienation as the trouble of individual, which also have implications concerning the issue of democratic society (Mills, 1959, pp. 170-172). Depending on their legacy, the promise of social science is depicted as clarification and exploration of the problems about “the crisis of individuality”, “the crisis of history-making” and “the role of reason in free individual life and in the making of history” (Mills, 1959, p. 173). Moreover, as Mills describes freedom in relation to capacity to form and evaluate available choices, which requires considering the way decision about human relations are made, active integration of human reason to decision-making mechanisms is argued to be inevitable. In the light of these concerns about the conditions of possibility for human freedom and reason to be integrated in social relations, an important dimension or promise of sociological imagination is suggested to be characterized by its problematization of alienation and rationalization.

3.5. Following the Requirements of the Investigated Problem

Another relevant dimension of sociological imagination chosen for this thesis concerns the emphasis on following the requirements of investigated problem rather than being limited by a rigid method. Considering common methodological tendencies in social sciences and their effects on formulation of problems, Mills builds up some arguments in various sections of the book. In Grand Theory, for instance, there is a fierce critique of Talcott Parsons’ model of society which depends on commonly accepted values, norms, role expectations and motivations as founding elements of social order. Besides putting forward the fetishized character of its concepts in relation to proposal of universal model of society (Mills, 1959, p. 48), Mills criticizes grand theory in terms of assuming harmony of interests, ignoring operation of power and
consequently taking existing values for granted without further problematization. In this sense, “kinds of problems that will be taken up and the way in which they are formulated are quite severely limited by The Scientific Method” (Mills, 1959, p. 57). This kind of methodological inhibition is also elaborated on in the section called Abstracted Empiricism where Mills portrays the dominance of certain kind of ethos structured by psychologism, preoccupation with finding statistical relations and facts by using certain variables, specialization based on a definite method and emphasis on contemporary.

After evaluating existing forms of tendencies in practicing social science in relation to their use of rigid methods as parallel to dependency on statistically measurable facts, a-historicized and isolated examination of variables and limited horizon of the milieu, the book continues with discussing how sociological imagination offers a different social science. In this sense, making use of various viewpoints, methods, and broad historical materials to deal with “problems of structural significance” characterize the proposed methodological tendencies of sociological imagination (Mills, 1959, p. 68). This implies the importance of having a “sense of real problems”, which requires one to see the relevance of themes or set of problems to social structure (Mills, 1959, p 73). In this regard, the section Uses of History includes further clarifications on the cruciality of formulating the problem through considering its position in totality of historical relations and its potential to enable exploring specificity of certain phases or structures of transformation. Thus, as put clearly by Mills, “requirements of problems, rather than limitations of any one rigid method, should be and have been the classical social analyst’s paramount consideration” (Mills, 1959, p. 146). Concerning how requirements of problems could be followed, the section of on Intellectual Craftsmanship offers some hints such as acquiring a habit of playful mind (Mills, 1959, p. 211), benefiting from capacity of “vague images” or “notions” to be “receptive to unforeseen and unplanned linkages” (Mills, 1959, p. 212), and “trying to think in terms of variety of viewpoints and in this way to let your mind become a moving prism catching light from as many angles as possible” (Mills, 1959, p. 214).
These kinds of tendencies are also taken as guidelines throughout the thesis. So, following the problems of how to locate Freudian psychoanalysis in social theory and how to construct sociological imagination of Freud in this context, the next step emerged as conceptualizing sociological imagination in a way to operationalize it. The aim of this operationalization was to enable possibilities to clarify vague images, reach unplanned connections and approach the issue from different perspectives when analyzing Freud’s writings.
CHAPTER 4

UNCONSCIOUS AS A FIELD OF THE MOST PERSONAL AND IMPERSONAL\(^2\)

As parallel to Mills’ emphasis on the importance of exploring the intersections between immediate biographical experiences and assumedly distant historical processes (Mills, 1959, pp. 7-8), one of the first instances which indicate the tendency of Freudian imagination to problematize the relationality between seemingly most personal and impersonal could be examined in *The Interpretation of Dreams* (Freud, 2010a). It includes portrayal of how a so-called personal process like a dream formation cannot be understood in isolation from multiplicity of socio-historical determinations composed of ambivalent interactions, conflicting unconscious processes, and linguistic symbolizations. In this regard, in line with an insight concerning the structural constitution of inner processes and methodological sensitivity to ontological grounds of immediately available sensations, Freud builds up a method of interpretation which rely on the investigation of how *manifest* dream-contents composed of succession of images emerge as distorted forms of *latent* dream-thoughts mainly shaped by unconscious wishes (Freud, 2010a, p. 160). Social character of distortion in dreams is explained in relation to embeddedness of censorship and repression in everyday life as a mode of interaction. This is elaborated on through examples such as inclination to show increased affection or politeness in ambivalent relations underlaid by power asymmetry or disguised manner of writing adopted by political writer in the face of threatening authority (Freud, 2010a, pp. 166-167). This sociality also indicates itself in dreams whose functioning as wish-fulfilment follows multiplicity of hidden paths such as transferring psychical value of

---

\(^2\) Rather than implying that there are separate fields such as personal and impersonal, this conceptualization aims to indicate the social operation of the unconscious, which signifies that processes argued to be personal and impersonal are actually parts of a certain social mechanism whose functioning cannot be separated from the domain of unconscious.
a significant memory or train of thought to recently experienced indifferent impressions through work of displacement (Freud, 2010a, pp. 199-203), or work of condensation achieved by setting various links among dream-thoughts and manifest content (p. 295). Also, inhibition or transformation of socially unacceptable affects (Freud, 2010a, p. 477), forgetting as a determined event in connection to conflicts among psychic forces (pp. 518-521), and use of different means of representations and symbolizations rooted in cultural repertoire of individuals (p. 365) could be included as traces of sociality in dreams.

Besides showing structural determinations and historical crystallizations inherent in seemingly personal capacities like thoughts, affects, wishes and forgetfulness, in accordance with the tendency of sociological imagination to explore linkages between social circumstances of individuals and their inner realities (Mills, 1959, p. 15), Freudian vision elaborates on possible death-wishes against parents in dreams in relation to historically structured position of authority held by father. This relates with how father’s use of power had co-functioned with contentious interactions with the son concerning the struggles for ruling and conflict between mother and daughter in connection to mother’s claims over sexual satisfaction of the daughter (Freud, 2010a, pp. 273-275). In this regard, traces of death-wishes in dreams are investigated based on qualities of familial composition which is characterized by relations of authority, ambivalent exchanges of affects and repressive production of sexuality in both ancient families and middle-class families of Freud’s age (Freud, 2010a, pp. 274-275). It indicates a similarity with Mills’ suggestions regarding the fruitfulness of making trans-historical constructions or comparisons to understand the interplay between personal experiences and structural mechanisms (Mills, 1959, p. 224). As can be seen from this instance in which psychoanalytic perspective looks for the relationality between operation of unconscious wishes in dreams and historical constitution of family with respect to certain forms of interactions, sociological imagination of Freud interprets dreams as a manner of search for connections. These connections mainly consist of seemingly personal impressions, unconscious productions of thoughts, wishes and affects, intersubjective domain of symbolization,
and cycles of tensions\(^3\) in social formations, which problematizes the dichotomous conceptualization of “personal” and “impersonal”.

Moreover, an analogy used by Freud is of importance to understand the relational manner of theoretical construction in psychoanalytic imagination. In this analogy, dream formation is explained in terms of its resemblance to relations in which capitalist and entrepreneur act (Freud, 2010a, p. 561). In this sense, a daytime thought is identified as an entrepreneur considering its initiative role in dream construction, and based on its dependence on unconscious wish to reach required psychic energy, the unconscious wish is depicted as the capitalist who provides the capital. Even though this seems to be an insignificant exemplification used for the convenience of explanation, it offers crucial insights to approach ontology of Freudian methodology since it signifies how sociological imagination of Freud operates as a mode of constructing objects of analysis, either concerning psychic agents or social positions, via focusing on dynamic relations which have relatively autonomous functioning irreducible to its elements, agents and individuals. Thus, as parallel to its drawing attention to mutual constitution of capitalist and entrepreneur based on types of interactions in the market, the analogy indicates that formation of dreams relies on sociality of psychic forces, which is portrayed as an impersonal process as well as a personal one.

Another instance which could be mentioned concerning the Freudian emphasis on the relationality among history, language, and the unconscious is *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* (2010b). It offers an appropriate context to investigate Freudian sociological imagination considering its exemplification of how a supposedly personal case of forgetting the name *Signorelli* and wrongly remembering it as *Botticelli* and *Boltraffio* would relate to repression processes. These processes operate on the basis of relationality among customs of Turks living in Bosnia and Herzegovina, great confidence of them in their doctor, their “placing a higher value on sexual enjoyment than anything else”, their resembling sexual disorders to

\(^3\) I refer to centrality of Oedipal tensions for Freud considering the constitutive position of unconscious ambivalent thoughts, simultaneity of conflicting affects such as love and hatred, and unconscious sense of guilt in psychoanalytic construction of relations of authority in family and in society (Freud, 1962).
death, and Freud’s learning in Trafoi that one of their patients had committed suicide because of an incurable sexual disorder (Freud, 2010b, pp. 1103-1105). In this regard, it constitutes a crucial empirical tool to explore how psychoanalytic imagination functions as a mode of looking for links between seemingly personal parapraxis like forgetting and “impersonal” or “distant” processes such as cultural valuation of sexuality or socially prestigious position of doctors. Thus, Freudian vision goes parallel to sociological imagination with respect to examining “little facts and their relations” in addition to relating them “continuously and closely to the level of historical reality” (Mills, 1959, p. 224).

Furthermore, an important source to examine Freudian imagination is *Totem and Taboo* (Freud, 2001) considering its concern about the similarities between functioning of taboo as a social institution and mechanism of obsessional neurosis. In this sense, Freudian vision reflects upon how both are underlaid by unconscious ambivalent wishes, which is explained in the following passage:

But the strongest support for our effort to equate taboo prohibitions with neurotic symptoms is to be found in the taboo ceremonials themselves, the effect of which upon the position of royalty has already been discussed. These ceremonials unmistakably reveal their double meaning and their derivation from ambivalent impulses, as soon as we are ready to allow that the results which they bring about were intended from the first. The taboo does not only pick out the king and exalt him above all common mortals, it also makes his existence a torment and an intolerable burden and reduces him to a bondage far worse than that of his subjects. Here, then, we have an exact counterpart of the obsessional act in the neurosis, in which the suppressed impulse and the impulse that suppresses it find simultaneous and common satisfaction (Freud, 2001, p. 59).

What these expressions imply is that sociological imagination of Freud looks for connections between a seemingly personal neurotic symptom and supposedly impersonal regulations of taboo institution. This connectivity is explored based on the continuous unconscious associations among repressed impulses, ambivalent affects, and internalized censoring agency of social rules, whose operation is embodied in symptoms and ceremonial acts. In this regard, psychoanalytic imagination is in accordance with Mills’ suggestions concerning the necessity of investigating the linkages between psychic realities embedded in interpersonal milieu and structural processes characterized by certain historical conditions (Mills, 1959, pp. 7-8).
Another point of agreement between the formation of taboo and neurosis includes their relationship with the words in terms of treating them as things (Freud, 2001, p. 65). In this respect, it is argued that members of a clan take the name of a person as an important part of their personality, and avoid the name of a dead person since they fear that person’s ghost might inflict some harm to them (Freud, 2001, p. 64). In a similar manner, the words and names constitute a crucial place in unconscious mental activities of neurotics considering their connotations with affectively loaded representations or memory traces (Freud, 2001, p. 65). This indicates that Freud evaluates a seemingly external mechanism like language as both the fundamental structuring force of mental life and one of the primary building blocks of cultural formations. In this regard, psychoanalytic construction of the relationality between neurosis and taboo imply a continuous striving for overcoming dichotomous conceptualizations such as personal and impersonal. Thus, as in the case of looking into effectivity of linguistic elements in taboo and neurotic structure, Freudian imagination opens a path to investigate various associations among seemingly isolated spheres. This is in line with the sensitivity of sociological imagination to explore the sociality of ‘inner’ realities (Mills, 1959, p. 15).

Furthermore, as parallel to its inclination to depict the unconscious as a field of the interplay between most ‘personal’ and ‘impersonal’ forces, psychoanalytic imagination portrays neuroses as social structures (Freud, 2001, p. 85). Although it is admitted that neuroses imply a dominance of erotic instincts simultaneously with a kind of attempt to flee from an unsatisfying reality, it is argued that “they endeavor to achieve by private means what is effected in society by collective effort” (Freud, 2001, p. 85). Thus, the operation of neuroses is suggested to signify resemblance to cultural institutions such as art, religion, and philosophy considering that they could be seen as strivings to deal with uncanny character of reality as in the cases of neuroses but in a more social manner (Freud, 2001, pp. 85-86). In this sense, Freudian vision problematizes the personalization of psychopathologies and interprets them as modes of dealing with structural conflicts, which indicates the psychoanalytic insight concerning the necessity of overcoming abnormal and normal, personal and impersonal, or social and asocial.
Although it is quite elusive in terms of the impossibility of marking its borders, in *The Ego and The Id*, Freud mainly conceptualizes the domain of unconscious as constituted by struggles between repressed and repressing forces (Freud, 1989). Thus, the mechanism of repression and the way it is organized forms the ontological ground on which various types of agents, functions and qualities emerge out of dynamic relations. In this sense, one of the most striking features of the unconscious seems to be its power to portray the mind in terms of continuous operation of psychic forces, implying that “very powerful mental processes or ideas exist, which can produce all the effects in mental life though they themselves do not become conscious” (Freud, 1989, p. 4). This kind of insight, firstly, allows one to overcome the wholistic image of mind corresponding to personal awareness or abstracted consciousness since it introduces systematic interactions among unconscious forces as the founding elements of an individual’s reality. In this regard, it directly problematizes the dichotomy of personal and impersonal in terms of picturing unconscious in relation to personal biography composed of various experiences whose inscription to individual’s system operate according to structural processes. In line with the proposition that “anything arising from within that seeks to become conscious must try to transform itself into external perceptions” (Freud, 1989, p. 10), memory traces and word presentations constitute the domain of unconscious which is continuously re-shaped by ideational representatives corresponding to condensed forms of repressed thoughts and wishes. It implies that besides being rooted in personal milieu of the individual, thought processes, feelings and motivations are also characterized by their loaded representations via words composed of various connotations depending on the structure of corresponding language, sociality, and history.

Concerning Freudian emphasis on structural and systematic character of unconscious, we see a portrayal of topography constituted by intertwined psychic agents called id, ego, and superego. Among them, the ego is conceptualized as the “part of the id which has been modified by the direct influence of the external world through the medium of the perceptual consciousness; in a sense it is an extension of the surface differentiation” (Freud, 1989, p. 15). As the representative of outer world in the face of id’s unrestricted instincts, it tries to sustain reality principle over pleasure
principle in terms of channeling unshaped desires into socially acceptable demands or acts (Freud, 1989, p. 15). Capturing this process also requires considering the superego whose formation imply “transformation of an erotic object choice into an alteration of the ego” as a “method by which ego can gain control over id” (Freud, 1989, p. 20). In this regard, history of object choices and patterns of dealing with their sexual character constitute multiplicity of tensions including Oedipal complex during whose resolution superego emerges in connection to identification with father or mother as reaction formation to earlier erotic interactions with objects. Thus, it becomes possible to channel libidinal energy to “formation of the ideal” which can acquire various forms since “as a child grows up, the role of father is carried on by teachers and others in authority, their injunctions and prohibitions remain powerful in the ego ideal and continue, in the form of conscience, to exercise moral censorship” (Freud, 1989, p. 27). As the very connectedness of superego to id implies, formation of personal history or construction of ego cannot be isolated from the structural character of socialization process composed of systematic encounters with authority and power, leading to subjectification based on social codes, manners of acting and ways of relating to others. Besides, most of the seemingly personal feelings have a social aspect since they “rest on identifications with other people, on the basis of having the same ego ideal” (Freud, 1989, p. 27). Moreover, “the ideal itself can to a great extent remain unconscious and inaccessible to ego” (Freud, 1989, p. 29) since there is a continuous interaction between unconscious instinctual impulses and superego. This implies that the domain of unconscious is spread over the experiences of personal feelings or thoughts whose emergence relate with the structural manner of dealing with sexual or libidinal energy throughout the history of object relations, confrontations with authority and identifications.

In Civilization and its Discontents, one of the themes indicating the connectivity of most personal and impersonal concern the role of “oceanic feeling” or sense of limitlessness in emergence of religious sentiments. Trying to explore roots of this relationship, Freud puts forward the interactional character of ego development:

Child…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 and only reappear as a result of his screaming for help (Freud, 1962, p. 14).

In this regard, ego is formed and differentiated though repetitive cycles of mostly unpleasurable sensations or disturbing feelings and getting rid of them through external sources, implying that personal field would not be distinguished without experiencing effectivity of impersonal forces. Thus, before these patterns of sensations structure the difference between inner and outer, ego is argued to include everything and “our present ego-feeling is, therefore, only a shrunken residue of a much more inclusive feeling which corresponded to a more intimate bond between the ego and the world about it” (Freud, 1962, p. 15).

Besides showing the links between the oceanic feeling and role of interactional patterns or cycles in ego formation, which would be seen as an attempt to indicate structural character of religious sentiments, Freud elaborates on the historical constitution of unconscious in terms of emphasizing the preservation of past in mental space (Freud, 1962, pp. 16-19). In resemblance to city of Rome, it is argued that in domain of unconscious “nothing that has once come into existence will have passed away and all the earlier phases of development continue to exist alongside the latest one” (Freud, 1962, p. 17). This kind of imagination enables a new way of sensibility since the sense of limitlessness or oceanic feeling has been explored in the light of repetitive interactions and maintenance of past experiences in mental sphere, which imply the socio-historical formation of ego and the unconscious. Even though this socio-historicity seems to be restricted with personal biography of the individual, it covers structural or seemingly distant mechanisms with regard to including systematic encounters in familial formation and historical reproduction of this entity in connection to certain patterns of interactions, roles and feelings, which can be exemplified as “infant’s helplessness”, “need for a father’s protection” or “fear of the superior power of the Fate” (Freud, 1962, p. 19). Furthermore, relational aspect of psychoanalytic vision could be observed regarding its portrayal of “civilized man” whose satisfactions follow the model of “cheap enjoyment” such as “enjoyment obtained by putting a bare leg from under the bedclothes on a cold winter night and drawing it in again” (Freud, 1962, p. 35). Another statement describing how civilization shows itself in everyday
life includes the following: “If there had been no railway to conquer distances, my child would never have left his native town I should need to telephone to hear his voice…” (Freud, 1962, p. 35). The vividness of expressions depends on their power of picturing inherent conflicts of civilized world which is characterized by intensification of capital/trade networks, ever-increasing speed of transportation systems, emergence of populated cities and spread of science/technological developments in everyday life as parallel to transformation of anxieties, feelings, concerns and ways of enjoyment. In this regard, they are condensed forms indicating the interrelatedness between personal milieu or most immediate experiences and historical transformations, which implies alterations in structuring of the unconscious.

Reflecting upon how Herbert Marcuse engages with psychoanalytic vision also offers a good investigatory field to situate Freudian discovery in social theory. This kind of attempt does not aim to picture Marcuse’s contributions as direct outcomes of Freudian theory but try to indicate fruitfulness of engaging with psychoanalytic ontology. Actually, as opposed to my motivation, Marcuse claims the necessity of revealing inherent socio-historical perspective in Freud’s theoretical framework considering the assertion that “their historical substance must be recaptured, not by adding some sociological factors, but by unfolding their own content” (Marcuse, 1987, p. 35). Yet, it is still valuable to examine how this kind of theoretical concern has operated and what kind of paths it has followed. So, it is possible to see that Eros and Civilization (Marcuse, 1987) includes many fruitful themes such as sociality of inner processes or historicity of instincts in Freudian vision, elaborated through stating that in psychoanalysis “the instincts are defined no longer in terms of their origin and organic function, but in terms of a determining force” (p. 27). Also, it is suggested that this operates in line with “repressive organization of instincts” alluding to “historical fact that civilization has progressed as organized domination” (p. 34). Thus, reflections in the book indicate that Freudian imagination or conceptual construction relies on looking for connectivity between the closest and most distant with regard to portraying the “power of the universal in and over the individual” via “dissolving the idea of the ego-personality into its primary components”. These components include “historical modifications”, “experience of domination” in the face of “Oedipus situation” and
“suppression of pleasure” enabling “disciplined labor force” in connection to “sublimation in work” and “reproduction of whole” (pp. 57-65).

Looking into Althusser’s dealing with Freudian vision would also be fruitful considering that they both problematize the relationality between inner and outer, or material and imaginary in the context of socio-historicity of subjectivity. In this regard, Althusser’s crucial thesis about the material existence of ideology, in relation to imaginary relationship of individuals to their conditions of existence shaped by the connectivity between their ideas and material actions, practices and rituals embedded in material ideological apparatus (Althusser, 2008, pp. 38-43), functions on the basis of intense interactions with Freudian imagination which portrays the materiality of unconscious in connection to ideological configurations in family (Althusser, 2008, p. 50). Therefore, psychoanalytic insights over the pre-appointed character of subjectivity finding its expression in activities such as rituals surrounding “expectation of a birth” and manners of child rearing, whose material formation goes in line with structuration of unconscious and organization of pleasure or stages of sexuality (Althusser, 2008, p. 50), enables a ground for reflecting on the historical and material currents of ideology or structural determinations of desire (p. 165). This kind of exploration of how unconscious is constituted by socio-historical, material and conflictual forces is also argued to reveal specificity of bourgeois ideological conception of unified, self-conscious and morally autonomous subject (Althusser, 2008, pp. 114-116), which points to historical struggles over the constitution of types of individualities (Mills, 1959, pp. 158-159).

Lacan’s return to Freud is another important context to consider when investigating sociological imagination of Freud. In line with Freud’s remarks on the structural character of unconscious in relation to the order of “ideational representatives” co-functioning with sexual, affective, imaginary, linguistic, cultural and symptomatic spheres (Freud, 1989; 2010a; 2010b), Lacan (1977) puts forward that conditions of possibility for existence of the subject requires a positioning in a pre-established structure, corresponding to a “split between conscious and unconscious, between an ineluctably false sense of self and the automatic functioning of language (the signifying chain)” (Fink, 1997, p. 45). Thus, subject can only emerge as a
placeholder and signifier of the lack of subjectivity. In this scenario, even something presumed to be most personal such as a phantasy is pictured to be constituted as a field emerging out of relations between subject and the Other whose instances are portrayed in connection to domains of language, desire, demand and jouissance (simultaneous experience of pain and enjoyment combined with maximum excitement concerning the search for imaginary sense of completeness). In this regard, personal biography of an individual is structured by the forms of alienation in language and forms of separation from Other’s desire (Fink, 1997, pp. 49-55), portraying subjectification as a process operating on the basis of continuous tensions in the face of interactions, significations and associative organizations of desire. Their conceptual construction indicates exploration of radical sociological imagination embedded in Freudian vision considering its capacity to describe how an institutional formation like family operates through structuring of certain inner character, possible life conditions, movements among social roles or enactments, forms of affections and ways of sensations (Mills, 1959, pp. 159-162).

Conceptual constructions of Cornelius Castoriadis (1987) constitute another example to examine traces of Freud’s sociological imagination in the case of its proposing radical unconscious imagination as a productive force in social relations. For instance, in line with Freudian emphasis on the connectivity between “libidinal development of the individual” and the “process of civilization” (Freud, 1962, p. 44), theoretical framework of Castoriadis attempts to overcome dichotomous conceptualizations of self and society in terms of proposing that “fundamental deadlock or antagonism” is underlaid by “fluidity, conflict and division of the unconscious mind and with it that of the distribution of psychic energy in self/society interlockings” (Elliott, 2004, p. 17). Besides portraying linkages between seemingly most inner processes and supposedly most distant mechanisms, theoretical endeavor of Castoriadis (1987) also pictures a relational subjectivity constituted by co-productions of unconscious radical imaginary, self-creating representations of primordial fantasy, biological properties and symbolically structured socio-historicity (Elliott, 2004, pp. 82-83). Also, they are depicted to function in relation to each other in the context of intersubjectivity depending on interrelatedness of the psychic space.
and field of otherness (Castoriadis, 1987; Elliott, 2004, p. 98). This implies a congruence with Freud’s reflections on how the ego is formed out of historical accumulation of identifications, crystallization of how others see us and social organization of sexuality whose operation is continuously intensified through ever-growing libidinal ties and unconscious creative fantasies (Freud, 1962; 1989).

Looking into theoretical endeavors of Judith Butler is crucial considering how works such as Gender Trouble (1999) and The Psychic Life of Power (1997) implies open engagement with both Freudian vision and its connections with different paths in social theory such as Nietzschean and Foucauldian explorations. One of the dimensions of interaction could be examined in Butler’s reflections on productivity of prohibition. It refers to how emergence and maintenance of subjectivity is interwoven with subordination to power (Butler, 1997, pp 8-10), whose psychic operation depends on a “more insidious route for regulatory power than explicit coercion” (p. 21). Underlaid by constitutive character of subjugation, this insight is elaborated on through putting forward the “reiterated ambivalence” (Butler, 1997, p. 18). This signifies the dynamic and performative construction of subjectivity irreducible to a-priori functioning power, but operating based on active modalities of power produced in various manner like “reflecting back upon itself” (p. 22) in connection to mechanism of conscience structured by organization of love, aggression and guilt (pp. 22-26). In this framework, repression is formulated as a libidinal activity since “desire is never renounced but becomes preserved and reasserted in the very structure of renunciation” (Butler, 1997, pp. 55-56). Although this kind of conceptual construction differs from Freud’s vision with regard to its clear concern about functioning of power, they share a considerable degree of ontological ground considering how psychoanalytic imagination constructs its object of analysis through problematizing distinctions between inner and outer in terms of exploring production of “external” authority, institutional formations and communal bonds as parallel to unconscious productions depending on various organizations of repression (Freud, 1962; Freud, 2012).

Through investigating Freud’s works and some reflections on Freudian psychoanalysis, it was aimed to indicate that the concept of unconscious is still relevant for social theory in terms of its potentials to overcome the dichotomy of personal-
impersonal. In this endeavor, various uses of the concept were investigated and their theoretical continuity with promises of sociological imagination was discussed. In the following section, the similar kind of motivation will be followed. But this time, the concept of unconscious will be approached with respect to another dimension of sociological imagination. So, its capacity to function as a mode of connecting various spheres of analysis such as symptoms, language, sexuality, and history will be explored. They are not taken as given entities interacting afterwards, but as fields of social forces which co-produce each other.
CHAPTER 5

CONNECTEDNESS OF UNCONSCIOUS FORCES, INDIVIDUAL SYMPTOMS, LANGUAGE, SEXUALITY AND HISTORY

According to Freud, seemingly irrational processes do not function in opposition to normal processes but operate in connection to disruptions in the inhibitory mechanism of psychical apparatus (Freud, 2010a). In this sense, an individual symptom is an indicator of an underlying conflict in the unconscious which has a law-like structure implying an “order of the non-realized” spread over everything (Lacan, 1998, pp. 22-24). Thus, manifesting itself in the rupture and discontinuity, functioning of the unconscious and its structural production mechanism could be reflected upon through relating symptoms to other unconscious representations accumulated in the personal biography of individual. Besides, individual symptoms and unconscious representations indicate themselves in language as a field of their signification (Freud, 2010b). In this regard, it is argued that cases of tongue slip and forgetting would show the existence of suppressed element which creates a pressure on consciousness and activates associated connections therein. Furthermore, sexuality is a fundamental element in all these spheres of psychic organization considering the Freudian emphasis on pleasure principle which refers to cruciality of the organization of the way people gain pleasure for socialization process (Freud, 1962). In this regard, as language is a space for channeling repressed sexual energy or unconscious contents, the way language functions indicate traces of symptoms since a word or a symbol would be accounted for condensation or replacement of conflicting repressed elements (Freud, 2010a). As can be seen, Freud flexibly changes sphere of analysis through looking from multiple perspectives to be able to see various connections. This enables a sharp and detailed analysis of the unconscious phenomena without losing sight of the total and comprehensive image on the issue since all the categories have historical trajectories connecting them in a dynamic manner. In this regard, unconscious
elements, linguistic acts, emergence of symptom and operation of sexuality are grounded in the relations between personal biography and structural reality rooted in the familial formation (Freud, 1962).

One of the striking features of Freud’s methodology is its power of portraying everyday mental life as composed of multiplicity of irrational or uncontrolled forces whose operation depend on functional necessities, complex determinations, and developmental processes (Sugarman, 2010). In line with Mills’ depiction of sociological imagination as a mode of “putting together hitherto isolated items by finding unsuspected connections” (Mills, 1959, p. 201), for instance, *The Interpretation of Dreams (2010a)* indicates how “processes which are described as irrational are not in fact falsifications of normal processes-intellectual errors- but are modes of activity of the psychical apparatus that have been freed from an inhibition” (Freud, 2010a, p. 601). This kind of insight enables new dimensions of sensibility for different linkages considering its emphasis on total operation of psychical apparatus in which seemingly irrational or abnormal processes are also part of dynamic relations, co-functioning processes, and systematic determinations. The inclination of its methodology to explore associative productions among forces is also put forward with respect to insufficiency of “even the most painstaking investigation of dreams or of any other mental function taken in isolation” and the necessity of correlating “all the established implications derived from a comparative study of a whole series of such functions” (Freud, 2010a, p. 515).

Based on this kind of methodology, the book depicts dream formation as a process of overdetermination consisting of condensation of ever-growing connections among unconscious thoughts (Freud, 2010a, p. 298), displacement of psychical intensities attached to certain elements and transference of that energy to create new values for elements having low psychical value (pp. 324-325), and constitution of multiplicity of linkages between dream-thoughts and dream-content (p. 302). Besides, the work of distortion or censorship over unconscious wishes (p. 325-326), inhibition and transformation of affects as parallel to functioning of suppression in everyday life (pp. 473-477), and various means of representation in line with historically accumulated channels of symbolization (p. 365) are other processes described to be
part of this overdetermination. Thus, Freudian imagination follows co-functioning of multiple determinations in terms of investigating the interplay of daily interactions, productions of psychic forces, and repressive structuring of unconscious wishes, whose crystallization indicate itself in distorted, condensed, and displaced character of dream-content. In addition, these determinations are pictured in relation to operation of psychic systems differentiated in line with continuous reception of perceptual stimuli and transformation of these immediate sensations into permanent records in the form of memory-traces, which function based on principles of association such as simultaneity in time or relations of similarity (Freud, 2010a, pp. 539-541). In this regard, psychoanalytic vision conceptualizes mental apparatus as composed of systematic productions in which any kind of element is determined according to “intimate details of its relations to the different elements of the raw material of memory” (Freud, 2010a, p. 541). This kind of theoretical endeavor bears strong similarities with sociological imagination put forward by Mills who emphasizes the importance of investigating connections between seemingly irrelevant elements (Mills, 1959, p. 201) through shuttling among perspectives without losing sight of a comprehensive view (p. 211).

Also, concerning the analysis of dream processes, sociological imagination of Freud indicates its tendency to “think in terms of a variety of viewpoints” which enables “catching light from as many angles as possible” (Mills, 1959, p. 214) regarding how it evaluates dreams in connection to psychopathological structures like psychosis (Freud, 2010a, p. 117) and neurosis (p. 129). In line with Freud’s proposition that “the subject to which these dreams of my patients lead up is always, of course, the case history which underlies their neurosis” (Freud, 2010a, p. 129), psychoanalytic vision thus operates on connected domains of discoveries whose objects are analyzed in relation to each other. In this regard, the method of interpreting dreams and analyzing pathological processes are linked in terms of operating based on the Freudian ontology which treats phenomena as symptoms of structural determinations whose functioning are observed in psychical chains, affectively loaded relations among memory-traces, conflicts in the history of individuals, and ambivalent character of repressed unconscious wishes (Freud, 2010a, pp. 126-127). Thus, psychoanalytic
reflections on the affinity between dreams and mental pathologies constitute a fruitful sphere to observe how Freudian imagination approach social reality as fundamentally composed of relations. What is important to see is not only its tendency to look for connections among seemingly irrelevant objects but also how it constructs its objects of analysis based on structural relations, historical conditions of existence, and multiplicity of determinations; whose total operation is investigated in relation to supposedly micro processes like dream-formation and psychopathological structures.

Since psychoanalysis suggests that dreams are formed out of suppressed unconscious wishes indicating themselves as condensed and distorted forms of representations, examining words, names or other linguistic expressions is one of the crucial dimensions when analyzing and interpreting a dream (Freud, 2010a, pp. 312-313). Therefore, as “nodal points of numerous ideas” (Freud, 2010a, p. 355), words operate as unified elements of psychic forces which on the other hand enables fields of break, escape or disguise in the face of censorship over dream-thoughts (p. 363). Besides exploring the linkages between formation of dreams and potentials of linguistic domain, psychoanalytic vision of Freud also reflects upon how unconscious symbolizations relate with cultural constructions such as myths, idioms, legends, and jokes (Freud, 2010a, p. 365). This tendency offers a good case to investigate how Freudian imagination is in accordance with Mills’ conceptualization of sociological imagination regarding its examination of details of personal milieu simultaneously with relating them to historical formations (Mills, 1959, pp. 224-225).

According to Freud, mental sphere is produced out of conflicting forces composed of impulses seeking satisfaction and resistances to them, resulting in mostly unconscious determinations which sometimes indicate themselves in the form of symptoms (Sugarman, 2010). Depending on this line of reasoning whose portrayal of repressive organization of unconscious implies dynamic formation of desiring processes, socialization of impulses, ambivalent interactions and functional emergence of symptoms, The Psychopathology of Everyday Life (2010b) reflects how Freudian imagination operates as a continuous search for connections among different processes. In line with Mills’ emphasis on the importance of looking for novel connections among various components in their total operation (Mills, 1959, pp. 211-
212), for instance, Freud puts forward that an apparently trivial event of forgetting could imply multiplicity of associations between the forgotten element and unconscious thoughts, distressing affects, repressed wishes or psychically valued memories (Freud, 2010b, pp. 1114-1117). Also, the way forgetting occurs is argued to rely on personal, professional, or familial complexes (Freud, 2010b, pp. 1118-1119). This indicates that psychoanalytic vision evaluates a supposedly accidental phenomenon in terms of its structural co-functioning with various processes including historical accumulation of experiences, stock of ideational representatives, and productions of different unconscious conflicts in connection to varying social contexts like work, family and intimate relationships. Thus, in addition to investigating unconscious motivations behind forgetting, it reflects upon how a seemingly occasional action would be interpreted as a part of mechanism whose operation signifies a chain of associations among words (Freud, 2010b, p. 1126), traces of childhood memories and their determining influence, or production of connections between indifferent experiences and repressed impressions (1139-1140).

Reflections upon slips of the tongue constitute another sphere of examples which show how sociological imagination of Freud functions in similar to what Mills describes as exploring relations among different facts, details of interpersonal milieu and features of biographical components simultaneously with a search for comprehensive images or structural tendencies (Mills, 1959, pp. 224-225; Freud, 2011). In this regard, Freud argues that an emergence of parapraxis cannot be isolated from linguistic associations among sounds or words (Freud, 2010b, 1147), formation of compromise idea and condensation in connection to modification of repressed unconscious elements (1149), and temporary weakening of inhibitory psychic mechanism (1152). Besides examining how structural operations within language and unconscious are effective on slips of the tongue, Freudian vision relates these apparently chance events to unconscious processes, affectively loaded representations, and neurotic symptoms as in the case of following elaboration:

In the psychotherapeutic procedure which I employ for resolving and removing neurotic symptoms I am very often faced with the task of discovering, from the patient’s apparently causal utterances and associations, a thought-content which is at pains to remain concealed but which cannot nevertheless avoid
unintentionally betraying its existence in a whole variety of ways. Slips of the tongue often perform a most valuable service here, as I could show by some highly convincing and at the same time very singular examples. Thus, for instance, a patient will be speaking of his aunt, and without noticing the slip, will consistently call her ‘my mother’; or another will refer to her husband as her ‘brother’. In this way they draw my attention to the fact they have ‘identified’ these persons with one another- that they have put them into series which implies a recurrence of the same type in their emotional life (Freud, 2010b, p. 1171).

In this sense, psychoanalytic methodology developed by Freud constructs its objects of analysis in the context of ontological domain composed of various connections whose composition goes parallel to dynamic formation of each object. Therefore, a slip of the tongue emerges as a crystallized form of associations produced out of continuous interaction among significant memory-traces, linguistic interplay among inscribed experiences, ambivalent unconscious motives, repressed distressing affects, and ever-growing interpersonal relations based on identifications with others. As the aforementioned passage suggests, Freudian emphasis on identifications indicates that psychoanalytic imagination sees everyday relations or apparently irrelevant actions like parapraxis as linked with historical formation of unconscious since childhood, role of repetitive cycles of emotions in sociality, and functioning of structural determinations in accordance with imaginary productions corresponding to them. Also, the inclination of sociological imagination of Freud to operate as parallel to Mills’ emphasis on approaching an issue from multiplicity of perspectives could be observed in its portrayal of what kind of “structural and functional relations” are necessary for an unconscious thought or wish to express itself in symptomatic acts and parapraxis (Mills, 1959, p. 215; Freud, 2010b, p. 1340). Thus, Freud argues that besides unconscious motives, physiological processes and linguistic laws, many factors would be involved in the emergence of parapraxis like forgetting, slips of the tongue or clumsy actions (Freud, 2010b, p. 1340). What is striking about these kind of arguments is not their comprehensive description of some everyday psychic phenomena but their implication that psychoanalytic methodology constantly problematizes seemingly isolated causal mechanisms or objects and looks for simultaneous activity of various determinations in a relational manner. This line of
theoretical construction could also be examined through looking into how Freudian imagination conceptualizes symptoms in relation to expressions of unconscious impulses, representations of repressed wishes, indications of conflict among psychic agencies, and suppression of sexual currents (Freud, 2010b, p. 1344).

Furthermore, Freudian vision elaborates on the structural connectivity which underlies acts of parapraxis, mechanisms of dream-formation, and neurotic symptoms. This implies that supposedly isolated psychic spheres are evaluated in terms of their shared context of relational construction composed of manifestations of condensation of psychically loaded representations, modification of unconscious thoughts into supposedly indifferent elements, and formation of associative paths among repressed ideational elements, distressing affects and recent experiences (Freud, 2010b, pp. 1346-1347). Based on this kind of analogy, Freud argues that apparent absurdity of dreams, seemingly inconceivable character of psychopathological symptoms and supposedly accidental nature of parapraxis in everyday life owe their functioning to certain mode of mental apparatus regarding its repression of psychic material to some extent but inability to prevent capacity of suppressed material to express itself in different manners (Freud, 2010b, pp. 1346-1347). It signifies that psychoanalytic imagination problematizes dichotomous conceptualizations such as functional and malfunctional, normal and abnormal, or even wakefulness and sleeping since it focuses on how these seemingly isolated spheres share a psychic field of interactions formed out of unconscious conflicts, modifications, condensations and compromises.

As can be seen in The Ego and The Id (Freud, 1989), besides the way id, ego and superego co-produce each other, sociality of unconscious is conceptualized in terms of various viewpoints and spheres, which allows one to see historical, emotional, practical, and linguistic domains altogether. For instance, concerning how transgenerational repetition of experiences could be preserved in the unconscious, Freud suggests that “in the id, which is capable of being inherited, are harbored residues of the existences of countless egos; and, when the ego forms its superego out of id, it may perhaps only be reviving shapes of former egos and be bringing them to resurrection (Freud, 1989, p. 28). In this sense, dynamic structure of unconscious directly implies repetition, accumulation, and transmission of various social
interactions, which characterize inner tensions, complexes and conflicts indicating themselves in the co-functioning of id, ego, and superego. In addition to connecting inner life to historically repetitive experiences, psychoanalytic vision enables passing among perspectives and exploring “unforeseen and unplanned linkages” (Mills, 1959, p. 212) in terms of its emphasis on the “displaceable energy of libido” (Freud, 1989, p. 34). Allowing the ego to work on qualitatively different instincts, displaceable character of this energy stems from de-sexualization achieved through taking back the libido from cathected objects of id and using it to form ego-libido by means of identification (Freud, 1989, p. 36). Also described as sublimated energy in relation to serving the ego for establishment of unity, these displacements include thought processes since “the activity of thinking is also supplied from the sublimation of erotic motive forces” (Freud, 1989, p. 35). As can be seen, the conceptualization of libido based on displaceable and de-sexualized energy opens an immense ontological ground on which connections among multiplicity of social spheres could be reflected upon in relation to each other. This implies that “sublimation, identification, and introjection have not only a psychical but also a social content: they terminate in a system of institutions, laws, agencies, things, and customs that confront the individual as objective entities” (Marcuse, 1987, p. 197). Therefore, psychoanalytic imagination enables portrayal of the ego formation through tracing the history of early sexual interactions with objects and following their transformation in terms of sublimation based on identifications with social codes, values and prohibitions encountered via confrontations with authority starting in family:

As the child grows up, the role of father is carried on by teachers and others in authority, their injunctions and prohibitions remain powerful in the ego ideal and continue, in the form of conscience, to exercise moral censorship (Freud, 1989, p. 27).

Considering socio-historical and dynamic operation of unconscious, the sphere of feelings is another dimension affecting and being affected by the manners of governing sexuality. In this regard, unconscious sense of guilt is argued to be quite typical of common neurotic anxiety rooted in Oedipus complex and its resolution through repression and identification, in parallel to internalization of cultural ideals and continuous efforts of ego to channel id’s unrestricted impulses into socially
acceptable demands. Besides carrying connections with the id, as superego operates as a mechanism turning outward aggressiveness toward ego into a conscience to check its actions, there emerges a constant tension which co-functions with the unconscious sense of guilt. Freud elaborates on the structural and social character of unconscious sense of guilt by asserting that “the more a man checks his aggressiveness towards the exterior the more severe he becomes in his ego ideal” (Freud, 1989, p. 44). Thus, modes of managing sexuality go hand in hand with feeling patterns and how they are dealt with, which indicates the sociality of emotion regulation in connection to total structure of society. These kinds of insights concerning the social organization of sexuality allows one to see interconnectedness of inner tensions, thought processes, feelings, linguistic patterns, and conflicts in social structures. The capacity of psychoanalytic imagination to discover these seemingly unrelated connections would be argued to depend on its constant shift of attention to different domains of social without giving up an image of totality. Therefore, even though objects of analysis seem to vary, they are always considered, examined, and interpreted in relation to each other.

Considering main determinants of civilization, Freud reflects on co-functioning of various social inclinations. In this sense, we see how psychoanalytic imagination is capable of tracing connections among seemingly unrelated phenomena such as sense of beauty, cleanliness and order (Freud, 1962, pp. 39-41), whose elaboration allows one to reach a comprehensive perspective on “vocabularies of motive” prevalent in civilization (Mills, 1959, p. 162). Thus, caring about what has seemingly no practical value is argued to be fundamental element for this kind of social formation (Freud, 1962, p. 39), and interwovenness of being concerned about beauty, cleanliness, order and higher mental operations like philosophy or art is discussed in relation to cruciality of attempts to regulate social relations (Freud, 1962, p. 42). These regulations include primary steps for the constitution of civilization since they structure the “relationships which affect a person as a neighbor, as a source of help, as another person’s sexual object, as a member of a family and of a state” (Freud, 1962, p. 42). In line with shifting its attention between modes of sensations, organization of valuations, regulation of social relations and formation of social, sexual, and institutional roles; Freudian vision continuously follows connections among different social spheres in their total
operation. Also, it sheds light on the manner in which these dimensions of sociality are interconnected in terms of exploring how “the replacement of the power of the individual by the power of a community” creates certain tensions, conflicts and ambivalences” (Freud, 1962, pp. 42-44). In this regard, it puts forward the importance of restrictions on impulses and instinctual satisfactions in accordance with sublimation of them, which implies the correspondence between “libidinal development of the individual” and the “process of civilization” in relation to social organization of pleasure (Freud, 1962, p. 44). Based on the primary role of renunciation of instincts and immediate satisfactions for the operation of social rules, regulations and manners of relating to each other, tendencies such as caring about beauty, trying to maintain order, intense concern for cleanliness and being interested in art or philosophy are interpreted as attempts for sublimation and channeling the repressed energy into socially valued activities. This kind of inclination for intensification and diversification of social ties are suggested to be essential features of civilization:

Civilization…aims at binding the members of community together in libidinal way…and favors every path by which strong identifications can be established between members of the community, and it summons up aim-inhibited libido on the largest scale so as to strengthen the communal bond by relations of friendship” (Freud, 1962, pp. 55-56).

In addition to tracing sociality of libidinal development in various relations, psychoanalytic imagination also investigates historical trajectory of these processes. In this sense, replacement of the olfactory stimuli by the visual excitations and transition to upright bodily posture are put forward as some elements leading to feelings of shame and continuous sexual stimulation, which are followed by dependence on sexual objects as a source of immediate satisfaction (Freud, 1962, pp. 46-48). These developments are argued to result in primitive family led by unrestricted father whose tyranny is argued to be overthrown by sons killing him and forming a communal life based on restrictions and regulations. Although these arguments seem to involve a speculative aspect, they reflect the openness of psychoanalytic horizon to various historical materials as a means to pass through different perspectives, whose examples can be seen in elaborations reflecting links among biological alterations, social feelings such as shame and structural transformations.
Furthermore, sociological imagination of Freudian discovery could be seen considering its views on the centrality of sense of guilt in the development of civilization (Freud, 1962, p. 81). Emergence and functioning of the sense of guilt is explained based on the interwovenness of dependence on others bringing fear of losing their love (p. 71), fear of expected aggression from authority simultaneously with suppression of an aggressive impulse towards it (pp. 76-77), continuation of unconscious wishes despite instinctual renunciation and eventually constitution of internal authority in the form of superego which directs aggressive energy for checking the ego (pp. 81-85). In this sense, these insights allow one to see immense sociality of a seemingly personal feeling like sense of guilt in terms of reflecting on multiplicity of relations in which it emerges and interacts with other feelings, expectations, and tensions. Through drawing attention to dynamics of operation of fear, love, aggressiveness, instinctual renunciation and unconscious impulses in the context of relations of authority, this kind of vision enables finding connections among historical maintenance of certain feelings, cycles of affects, libidinal interrelatedness of individuals, intensification of relations and reproduction of social formations.

Considering how to interact with Freudian imagination in terms of its relational ontology, Wilhelm Reich’s The Mass Psychology of Fascism (1946) offers some interesting insights. Reich’s conceptualization operates on the basis of Freudian path which had revealed the dynamic productions of unconscious in connection to relations among co-constituted forces such as repressive structures over sexuality, Oedipalization of sociality and fantasmatically formed interactions (Freud, 1962; 1989; 2010a). In this sense, the book proposes a framework composed of interconnectedness among distinctive practices of lower-middle classes in relation to agricultural mode of production, reduction of sexuality to procreation via patriarchal family formation, sanctions of morals identified with honor and duty, feelings of helplessness and guilt in the face of repressive cycle, and identification with “greatness of nation” or Führer; whose total operation is embodied in the form of struggles between revolutionary and reactionary elements in the psyche (Reich, 1946, pp. 44-57).
Also, Althusser elaborates on how Freudian vision constructs its object of analysis through connecting them to other social spheres in their total operation. This is exemplified based on how “mechanisms and laws of dreams” are pictured in relation to “failures, jokes and symptoms” functioning as signifiers “inscribed in the chain of an unconscious discourse” (Althusser, 2008, p. 159), or how family, morality and religion are examined in their co-functioning with unconscious sexuality, repression and ideological apparatuses (pp. 98-99). Thus, considering its capacity to pass through multiplicity of perspectives without losing sight of the total image of society (Mills, 1959, p. 211), this kind of sociological imagination allows an immense space for any kind of social theory to produce critical remarks, problematizations and instantiations, which is seen in the case of On Ideology (Althusser, 2008) with regard to delving into ideological formation of web of relations.

Exploring Lacanian psychoanalysis could be another way which would be helpful in locating Freudian imagination. Reflecting upon Freud’s sociological imagination characterized by its looking into linkages among various processes in milieu (Mills, 1959, p. 11) such as historical formation of ego depending on crystallized views of others, continuous production of unconscious sense of guilt in the face of ambivalent or conflictual experiences, and sublimation of repressed sexual energies (Freud, 1962; 1989), Lacan’s framework proposed that subjectivity is acquired in the context of socialization processes. Accordingly, they are composed of various domains like exposition to structuring of language, emergence of demands through cycle of interactions, functioning of desire in connection to relations with others, and experience of jouissance as a mode of looking for imaginary sense of completeness conflicting with structural inscription of lack (Fink, 1997). In this regard, being born into language and assimilating to its structure are initial steps for an individual to be able to express certain needs and demands. Before acquisition of this ability, needs of the baby are regulated in a way to synchronize its crying with a satisfying stimulus, which creates a ground for further specification of demands as social acts. Also, discontinuities in the process of demand-satisfaction chain enables a break of hypothetical child-mother unity perceived by an inborn, so it becomes possible for a child to realize that he or she is not the only object of desire for Other
which has a lack that cannot be fulfilled by them (Fink, 1997, pp. 51-61). This lack serves for the operation of desirousness having no specific object, moving along differential positions in reference to Other’s desire, and being driven by a search for initial sense of completeness (acting for maximum excitement ending up with jouissance as a painful enjoyment). As can be seen, delving into ontological grounds of Freudian imagination, Lacan’s schema employs multiple perspectives as they enable shifting among different spheres of socialization and detecting constructions of subjectivity, which allows one to see various connections co-constituting subjectivity in relation to subject’s position in the face of Other’s discourse, desire, demand and jouissance.

As the concern of this thesis is not to reveal essential sociological imagination of Freud but to reach new sociological sensitivities based on an engagement with Freudian psychoanalysis, examining reflections of Deleuze and Guattari (1983) could also offer crucial contexts. Therefore, their insights are applied as valuable sources to approach psychoanalysis and try to construct new grounds of interaction with it. Based on this kind of motivation, it is possible to see that arguments of Deleuze and Guattari (1983) on psychoanalysis opens up new horizons which would allow us to see how Freudian discovery had been constructed in accordance with the sociological imagination whose promises include “understanding of intimate realities of ourselves in connection with larger social realities” (Mills, 1959, p. 15). Considering its exploration of “how social production and relations of production are an institution of desire, and how affects or drives form part of the infrastructure” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 63), which indicates co-functioning of most personal and impersonal mechanisms, we can approach psychoanalytic operation of concepts in the light of machines connected to other machines produced by constitutive interactions between flows and breaks (Deleuze & Guattari, pp. 36-37). In line with breaks or interruptions as integrated to functioning, Freud interprets seemingly irrational processes or symptoms as part of the inherent conflicts and disruptions of the unconscious (Freud, 1962; 2010a), resembling a breaking crystal whose manner of shattering depends on the structure of the crystal (Olivier, 2018, p. 2). Thus, psychoanalytic imagination conceptualizes personal symptoms as constructive breaks operating as embodiments.
of conflicting flows, whose traces could be found in the unconscious production of socio-historical structuring of personal milieu. In this regard, considering the Freudian emphasis on the continuity between the emergence of civilization and process of libidinal development of individual (Freud, 2010, p. 42), this kind of insight about the structural formation of symptoms could be reflected upon in relation to how “social repression needs psychic repression precisely in order to form docile subjects and to ensure the reproduction of the social formation, including its repressive structures” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 118). As indicated by Deleuze and Guattari (1983) in terms of its manners of conceptualizing libidinal development, desire, symptom and repression; psychoanalytic construction of objects of analysis shows immense continuity with visions of sociological imagination with regard to its capability to portray modes of subjectivity as connected to “linkages among a great variety of milieu” (Mills, 1959, p. 11).

Another fruitful encounter to locate Freudian imagination would be examining theoretical construction of Julia Kristeva (2000) whose context of discussion could offer new ways to make sense of psychoanalysis. It is theoretically interesting to investigate the emphasis of Julia Kristeva (2000) on the cruciality of systems of representation irreducible to linguistic signification in terms of putting forward how heterogeneity of psychic representations are articulated through a “semiotic signifying process” which depends on the “realm of pre-discursive experience” (Elliott, 2004, p. 69). According to Kristeva, the zone of various representations includes “affects”, “bodily dispositions”, “silences” and “rhythms” emerging out of “heterogeneous play of unconscious forces -of drives and desires- which exert a pulsional pressure within language itself, and which may be discerned in the rhythm, tone and disruption of speech” (Elliott, 2004, pp. 86-87). In this regard, based on Freud’s drawing attention to productive capacity of unconscious fantasies in relation to psychic constitution of intersubjectivity, Kristeva’s theoretical construction enables additional sensibilities to make sense of sociality of unconscious representations or inscriptions beyond language. Thus, it allows one to reflect on multiplicity of affects, rhythms of feelings, tones of voice or bodily gestures in terms of associations among creative unconscious
imaginations, socio-historical constitution of subjectivity and structural interactions (Kristeva, 1997).

In this chapter, reflecting on these theoretical works and Freud’s texts was used as ways to locate Freudian psychoanalysis and openness of the concept of unconscious. This openness implies its usefulness for making sense of various connections and relational construction of different social spheres like symptoms, language, and sexuality. What is aimed by this kind of attempt also includes looking for sources of stimulating sociological imagination. And examining its continuities with Freudian methodology has been the main strategy that was followed. In the next chapter, another domain of this examination will be offered. This domain will basically include exploring historical specificity of the unconscious, repression, and neurotic individuality. So, based on Mills’ arguments concerning the importance of historical perspective (Mills, 1959, pp. 152-162), the concept of unconscious will be investigated with respect to possibilities of analyzing historically specific formation of repressive mechanisms, motivations, affects, and neurotic symptoms.
CHAPTER 6

HISTORICAL SPECIFICITY OF THE UNCONSCIOUS, REPRESSION AND NEUROTIC INDIVIDUALITY

One of the impressive features of sociological imagination of Freud is its inclination to analyze its objects of analyses in the context of historically specific circumstances. The exemplifications of this tendency could be observed in *The Interpretation of Dreams* (Freud, 2010a) which includes elaborations on how certain structural public issues could relate with a supposedly personal or inner process like dream formation. For instance, concerning one of the dreams in which Freud visits the city of Rome, they interpret it in relation to symbolization of the conflict between Jewry and organization of Catholic church, Freud’s identification with the historical figure of Hannibal as the conqueror of the city, and effects of anti-Semitic movement on their thoughts, intense wishes or affects (Freud, 2010a, pp. 217-219). Besides, considering how this dream about Rome relates with the anti-Semitic context and its effects on the emotional life of them, Freud mentions one of their affectively loaded childhood memories which includes an act of humiliation against their father in the street (Freud, 2010a, p. 218). Thus, in accordance with Mills’ reflections on the cruciality of investigating dynamics of history-making, modes of transformations and structuring of inner processes (Mills, 1959, pp. 152-162), Freudian imagination portrays how phantasies in dream-life are not exempt from historical constitution of anti-Semitism. The multiple determinations of this kind of a dream include discriminatory acts against Jews in everyday life, affective reactions of Jews accumulated since childhood, and contentious unconscious wishes or latent dream-thoughts showing themselves in various manifest contents. In this regard, an instance

---

4 The concept is used in relation to C. W. Mills’ emphasis on the importance of investigating the connections among historical conditions, mechanics of change, structural issues, and types of individualities (Mills, 1959, pp. 152-162).
would be how “the Jewish problem, concern about the future of one’s own children, to whom one cannot give a country of their own, concern about educating them in such a way that they can move freely across frontiers” exemplify some of the historically specific dream-thoughts psychoanalytic interpretation proposes (Freud, 2010a, pp. 449-450).

Also, concerning the historical relevance of dreams, Freud claims that they offer important materials to reflect on since crucial dimension of their construction rely on repressed impulses of childhood, regression to early conditions of life and revival of those unconscious wishes (Freud, 2010a, p. 550). Besides, it is argued that “behind this childhood of the individual we are promised a picture of phylogenetic childhood- a picture of the development of the human race” (Freud, 2010a, p. 550), which implies that Freudian imagination seeks to detect how historically specific life circumstances, structural repetition and transformation of them since earliest periods of humanity and personal biography of an individual intersect in dream formation. This indicates how psychoanalytic vision goes in line with sociological imagination in terms of exploring the manner in which historical transformations, modes of social reproduction and functioning of institutional mechanisms are interlinked with inner processes, character or life-path of individual (Mills, 1959, pp. 158-160).

Besides, as parallel to Mills’ assertion that “even quite intimate features of man’s inner life are best formulated as problems within specific historical contexts” (Mills, 1959, p. 163), in The Interpretation of Dreams (2010a) Freud delves into socio-historicity of typical dreams. An example content of these dreams include the death of parents, which is argued to be underlaid by unconscious wishes for having a sexual affair with opposite-sex parent and adopting an ambivalent hostility toward the other, whose traces are explored in terms of comparing Sophocles’ tragedy of Oedipus and Shakespeare’s Hamlet (Freud, 2010a, pp. 278-283). In this sense, it is argued that even though stories of both heroes imply historically repeated character of sexual tensions, ambivalent interactions, and cycles of intense affects towards parents, in the Oedipus the child’s fantasy is revealed and came true as if it had been a dream whereas in Hamlet it remained repressed and obscure in similar to neurosis whose existence could only be deduced through inhibitory effects of symptoms (Freud, 2010, p. 282).
Therefore, psychoanalytic vision operates as parallel to tendency of sociological imagination to make use of comparisons among historical types of social structures in line with investigating variation of human types (Mills, 1959, pp. 147-148). It differentiates the story of neurotic individuality of Hamlet who is dominated by constant hesitations, conflicts and questionings when expected to take revenge of their father from the story of Oedipus whose unconscious wishes are realized, and interprets the different structuring of them in relation to increasingly repressive quality of civilization over emotional life and sexuality\(^5\) (Freud, 2010a, p. 282).

In accordance with Mills’ emphasis on the cruciality of exploring how the most intimate details or psychological processes are related with historical specificity of social structures (Mills, 1959, pp. 162-163), in The Psychopathology of Everyday Life (Freud, 2010b) Freudian imagination proposes that times of war would produce various parapraxis. One of the examples about this issue include forgetting of Italian place names during the war between Italy and Germany in relation to changing affects, thoughts or motives concerning the significant memories corresponding to those locations (Freud, 2010b, p. 1127). Expressed by Freud as “what appears to other people as disorder is for me order with a history behind it” (Freud, 2010b, p. 1223), this kind of historical sense of psychic processes indicates that psychoanalysis directs its attention to everyday becoming and seemingly incidental actions without giving up on the comprehensive image of mental apparatus. This can also be deduced from the fact that it simultaneously relates symptomatic productions of unconscious to “macro” events, epochal transformations, and social conditions of existence. Besides parapraxis of forgetting, traumatic war neuroses are argued to be expressed in the form of slips of the tongue (Freud, 2010b, p. 1162), whose example would be observed in the case of an old soldier who reads a poem which alludes to going back to military service (1200).

Another indication of how Freudian imagination operates as parallel to tendency of sociological imagination in terms of looking into socio-historical grounds

\(^5\) Even though Freud’s reflections on Oedipus and Hamlet are insufficient in terms of their lack of taking into account various historically specific circumstances producing these characters, I argue that their comparative analysis bears inspirational elements with respect to enabling a ground to explore how certain social types (Simmel, 1971) would be located in relation to historicity of affective styles, which is also in accordance with promises of sociological imagination (Mills, 1959).
of the psychology of individuals (Mills, 1959, p.143) and examining human types in connection to historical struggles over certain kind of individualities (158), could be observed in its reflections upon the parapraxis of members of aristocracy (Freud, 2010b, p. 1174). In this regard, Freud argues that individuals from aristocratic class are particularly inclined to distort the names of their doctors, signifying that “inwardly they despise them in spite of the courtesy they habitually show them” (Freud, 2010b, p. 1174). When considered in the light of Freud’s stating that “nothing in the mind is arbitrary or undetermined” (Freud, 2010b, p. 1314), it makes more sense to see how analysis of forgetting a name or slip of the tongue could be linked to class distinctions. Thus, in the case of its attention to parapraxis of individuals from aristocracy, it is possible to examine how psychoanalytic vision could trace historically specific formation of apparently trivial everyday phenomena in terms of elaborating on the multiple determinations composed of the continuity among daily interactions full of symptomatic events, mutually interfering affects, psychic conflicts, habitual practices and structural production of different classes.

Example concerning the co-functioning of Anti-Semitic historical context with psychic processes is also a good case to examine the way Freudian imagination follows social traces embedded in the repressive organization of unconscious. In this sense, Freud mentions an instance in which an individual converts from Judaism to Christianity for the purpose of marriage without religious conviction, continues to acknowledge his Jewish background, and has two sons who were given Christian baptism (Freud, 2010b, p. 1182). Then, during a holiday, in a conversation held with the host of location, the father is exposed to Anti-Semitic statements about Jews and suppressed his negative reactions to keep their holiday in peace. Yet, considering the impulse to defend Judaism in front of his children he says “Go into the garden, ‘Juden’” and then correcting it to “Jungen”, through which parapraxis he was able to express the courage of his convictions (Freud, 2010b, p. 1182). What this analysis shows is that psychoanalytic methodology applied by Freud is characterized by continuous search to discover how historically specific conditions are linked with structuring of inner details, unconscious motivations, ambivalent affects and manners.
of dealing with the repressive organization of libidinal energy, for which looking into everyday parapraxis offers of a fruitful domain.

Furthermore, Freudian vision indicates its inclination to investigate historicity of unconscious processes in relation to its reflections about the congruence between national affective reactions and an individual’s psychic mechanism in terms of dealing with distressing memories:

It is universally acknowledged that where the origin of a people’s traditions and legendary history are concerned, a motive of this kind, whose aim is to wipe from memory whatever is distressing to national feeling, must be taken into consideration. Closer investigation would perhaps reveal a complete analogy between the ways in which the traditions of a people and the childhood memories of the individual come to be formed (Freud, 2010b, p. 1230).

As the instance implies, it is possible to see how psychoanalytic imagination portrays the sphere of unconscious as a structurally specific and intersubjective level of reality in which dynamic co-constitution of historical processes and individualities operate. This relationality is based on crystallized experiences of society, shared productions of myths or stories, and collective repressions of disturbing memories simultaneously with subjective inscriptions of childhood memories, various biographical impressions, and their unconscious organizations (Freud, 2010b, p. 1230).

What is also striking about Freudian imagination is its reflexive historical sensitivity to its construction of objects of analyses, which implies that it does not isolate conceptualizations, valuations, or viewpoints from the historical conditions of existence. For instance, Freud suggests that the formation of what is called superstition owes its existence to projection of psychic and unconscious relations to external word. This occurs in the face of need for explanations concerning the external world since pre-scientific times, and our evaluation of this mental process as “superstition” relies on dominance of certain kind of modern and scientific Weltanschauung (Freud, 2010b, p. 1328). In this regard, mythologically originated components such as interpreting of chance events as manifestations of supernatural actions, personification of some natural processes, or belief in immortality are argued to be consistent and justified actions according to certain type of historical structure, whereas they are suggested to operate as superstitious qualities or belief systems separated from institutional
regulations in the context of modern-scientific historical composition. This indicates that psychoanalytic vision historicizes not in the sense of assuming a value-free observer exploring the “external reality” but it also reflects upon how historical conditions of possibility lead certain types of theoretical constructions making use of conceptualizations such as superstitious, neurotic, repressed, and the unconscious in the case of Freudian methodology.

In *Totem and Taboo* (*Freud, 2001*), it is possible to find further instances to examine how Freudian imagination historicizes systems of thought in relation to structural transformations in the conditions of existence and unconscious operations. Thus, on the one hand, animistic, religious, and scientific views of the universe are approached as modes of struggles to control the environment and maintain domination (*Freud, 2001, p. 90*). On the other hand, they are interpreted as results of changing unconscious mechanisms. In this regard, it is argued that whereas animistic thinking ascribes omnipotence to thoughts prevalent in a clan, scientific view differs from it in terms of taking laws of reality and nature into account (*Freud, 2001, pp. 102-103*). Although this kind of perspective seems to imply modernist linear understanding of history, it is important to see how psychoanalytic vision also considers reproduction of various forms of thinking, feeling, or desiring in different styles (*Freud, 2001, pp. 102-105*). Also, according to psychoanalytic imagination, these intimate processes always operate in connection to certain historical currents, webs of relations, and cycles of interactions (*Freud, 1962*). In this respect, in line to Mills’ suggestion for investigating the connections between historical transformations and alteration of possible motivational structures (*Mills, 1959, p. 162*), the emphasis of Freudian vision is on the links between transformation of worldviews and libidinal development of individuals as in the following example:

The animistic phase would correspond to narcissism both chronologically and in its content; the religious phase would correspond to the stage of object-choice of which the characteristic is a child’s attachment to his parents; while the scientific phase would have an exact counterpart in the stage at which an individual has reached maturity, has renounced the pleasure principle, adjusted himself to reality and turned to the external world for the object of his desires (*Freud, 2001, p. 105*).
According to Mills’ portrayal of sociological imagination, it is crucial to explore the links between intimate details of psychological processes and corresponding historical conditions (Mills, 1959, pp. 163-164). In accordance with this, Freudian imagination elaborates on the communal eating of totem animal accompanied by mourning as a phenomenon composed of certain historical and psychological background (Freud, 2001, pp. 163-165). In this regard, this collective event is argued to imply a representation of the triumph over the primary father who is killed, consumed, and mourned by bands of brothers (Freud, 2001, pp. 163-164). Thus, it is asserted that by this sacrificial feast, members of clan strengthen their identification with the community, deal with their ambivalent feelings like love, hatred, sense of guilt, or remorse, and assure the law of incest which binds them as a social organization (Freud, 2001, pp. 165-167). Even though these arguments would seem speculative, they indicate how psychoanalytic vision operates as a way of looking for historical specificity of social institutions such as primal horde and band of brothers. In addition, they signify that Freudian methodology investigates linkages among historical transitions in relations of authority, repressive organizations of unconscious forces, and social regulations over sexuality. Besides, it is crucial to observe how psychoanalysis reflects upon the role of social rituals in maintenance of communal bonds in relation to management of unconscious affects, desires, and ambivalences.

Sociological imagination of Freud could also be reflected upon regarding its continuity with Mills’ remarks on the necessity of investigating historically specific varieties of social structures, mechanisms of change and types of individualities simultaneously (Mills, 1959, pp. 147-150). For instance, the inclination to focus on historically specific social formations and unconscious forces could be examined concerning how it portrays the constitution of patriarchal family. In this sense, Freud argues that structural transformation of primal horde into band of brothers through overthrowing the unrestricted father goes parallel to emergence of another kind of authority institutionalized as family structure (Freud, 2001, pp. 173-174). This change is argued to be accompanied by differentiation of social institutions including the emergence of divine kings, monarchical states, and priests, as well as restoration of
former primal horde in the form of patriarchal family (Freud, 2001, pp. 173-174). Thus, psychoanalytic vision argues that unconscious complexes about the killing of primary father maintain their effects on further construction of social institutions. What is striking about this argument is not its validity, but its power to allow one to reflect on the possible links among historical processes, systematic regulations, and unconscious mechanisms. Therefore, it opens a space to discuss co-functioning of multiple determinations spread over psychic processes, social practices, and systematic production of historical structures. It achieves this through evaluating a structural change in connection to unconscious motivations such as inclination to aggression towards authority, fear of losing its love and continuous unconscious sense of guilt in the face of this ambivalence.

Furthermore, considering how psychoanalytic vision functions in accordance with Mills’ portrayal of sociological imagination which emphasizes examining associations between varieties of individualities and historical types of social structures (Mills, 1959, pp. 143-148), Civilization and its Discontents (Freud, 1962) depicts the historically specific organization of repression and formation of neurotic character. In this regard, psychoanalytic imagination sees development of civilization as connected to changes “in the familiar instinctual dispositions of human beings, to satisfy which is, after all, the economic task of our lives” (Freud, 1962, p. 43). Thus, the emergence of modern individual who values parsimony, sense of order and cleanliness is argued to operate as transformed form of anal erotism referring to obtaining pleasure from controlling excretory functions during childhood (Freud, 1962, p. 44). The organization of “economics of libido” or “distribution of libido between ego and objects” (Freud, 1962, p. 88), is therefore, a crucial process to consider if one would like to reflect on how libidinal development and channeling the sexual energy are intertwined with development of civilization, whose outcomes include constitution of “anal character” as one of the “human types” (Freud, 1962, p. 44; Mills, 1959, p. 148). As can be seen, Freud directly links the formation of certain type of character to historically specific social process in relation to renunciation and organization of libido in accordance with demands of civilization.
Moreover, concerning the conceptualization and construction of neurosis, psychoanalytic imagination puts forward that “neurotic symptoms are, in their essence, substitutive satisfactions for unfulfilled sexual wishes” and “every neurosis conceals a quota of unconscious sense of guilt” (Freud, 1962, p. 86). In the light of the connections among repressive mechanisms of civilization, role of sense of guilt in identifications, social ties and maintenance of authority, importance of channeling the libido to culturally acceptable activities, and unconscious maintenance of aggressive or sexual wishes, insights on neurotic type indicate the historically specific constitution of individuals and their symptoms. Therefore, according to Freudian vision, seemingly very intimate or personal troubles carry the traces of socio-historical structure whose restrictions and forming power on libidinal functioning result in certain tensions, anxieties, compulsions, and ambivalent forces embodied by neurotic character. In this sense, conditions of possibility concerning how to gain pleasure produces neurotic human type characterized by unconscious sense of guilt constituted by historically specific conflicts. This implies that symptoms are indications of economic discharge in terms of reflecting civilization’s excessive restrictions or demands imposed on individuals. Thus, so called inner processes are evaluated in the light of inclination of Freudian vision to construct its objects of analysis not as realizations of certain kind of psychological essence but as operating agents which are parts of historical determinations, multiplicity of transformations and interfering conflicts.

To be able to engage with historical specificity of Freudian conceptualizations, Herbert Marcuse’s *Eros and Civilization* (1987) offers fruitful themes. In this book, one of the important concepts is the surplus-repression which implies how repression functions through social relations, institutional rules, and prevalent values, which shape the instinctual structure (Marcuse, 1987, p. 37). Based on Freudian vision describing the historical continuation and reproduction of domination in relation to repressive organization of instincts, this kind of insight concerning the historical specificity of psychic mechanisms had also allowed Marcuse to build up the concept of performance principle. It refers to structurally determining force of competitive economic performances as a mode of stratification (p. 44). Depending on the rationalization of domination, this principle operates in line with channeling the
restricted libido to alienated labor “in which the individual works for himself only insofar as he works for the apparatus, engaged in activities that mostly do not coincide with his own faculties and desires” (p. 45). This is a process maintained and reproduced through internalization of social authority in the form of conscience, structuring morals, desires, and gratifications of workers according to rationale of exploitation (p. 46). This relationality is also argued to be supported by “socially necessary de-sexualization of the body”, which refers to concentration of libido on genitals and making use of the rest for labor power (p. 48). As can be seen, theoretical construction of Marcuse operates on the grounds of Freudian sociological imagination whose exploration also implies an emphasis on alienation from libidinal forces. This can be seen in the problematization of prevalent unconscious sense of guilt in civilization in connection to strict restrictions over the libido as means for exploiting the sexuality and forming a certain “economics of libido”, which functions in accordance with socially sublimated activities such as working for the whole which had usually corresponded to structure of domination (Freud, 1962).

Investigating the conceptual links between Lacanian theory and Freudian vision could also enable important insights to situate psychoanalytic discovery. Their concern for historical specificity of individual types, which is a theme emphasized by Mills regarding cruciality of examining character types in connection to structural conditions of history-making (Mills, 1959, pp. 149-159), is one of the domains to reflect upon. In this sense, for instance, Lacan proposes that functioning of structures cannot be isolated from street events in 1968 since appearing mode of subjectivities imply existence of historical antagonisms, tensions and range of resistances embedded in conditions of possibilities within structural determinations (Tomsic, 2018, pp. 33-36). Shuttling the attention from linguistic structure of unconscious to historicity of unconscious operations in respect to suggesting dominance of capitalist discourse as a mechanism exploiting desire through channeling it to specific demands to be satisfied by commodities (Vanheule, 2016), this kind of transformation had allowed Lacanian theory to situate changing forms of subjectivity. Thus, it is possible to trace the link between Lacan’s second return to Freud and emphasis of Freudian imagination on interrelatedness among unconscious mechanisms, conflictual production of historical
structures, and signification of bodies (Tomsic, 2018, pp. 35-40). Based on the attention to interwovenness of representation and production, structure and history or repetition and transformation, this kind of theoretical positioning also operates in line with Marxian sociological imagination with regard to its emphasis on decentralized structural antagonisms in connection to opposing the reduction of subjectivity to consciously acting individuals (Tomsic, 2018, pp. 76-77) and its relational perspective concerned about the totality of sociality. In this regard, this sociality is argued to be constituted by capitalist organization of labor as parallel to management of surplus jouissance (manners of enjoyment) in the context of obsessive automatic search for value production (Tomsic, 2018, p. 80).

Although Foucault criticizes Freud’s hypothesis of repression in terms of problematizing it as part of the “regime of power-knowledge-pleasure that sustains the discourse on human sexuality” (Foucault, 1978, pp. 10-11), it could be argued that investigating this contentious interaction would be a fruitful domain to reach novel points, concepts, and problems. One of the domains to reflect upon this issue would be Foucault’s and Freud’s ontological claims concerning the productive, constitutive, and regulatory functions of repression (Butler, 1997, p. 60; Tomsic, 2017, p. 104-105). In this sense, proposal of Foucault regarding “the proliferation of discourses concerned with sex” and “institutional incitement to speak about it” (Foucault, 1978, p. 18), whose emergence is reflected upon through examining confession rituals in Christian penance (p. 19), emergence of population bringing forth governmental attention to sexuality (pp. 25-26), education on sexuality in schools (p. 29), and various bureaucratic procedures such as judicial actions, medical interventions and clinical examinations (p. 31), implies a kind of shared vision with Freudian imagination. This similarity could be examined in relation to psychoanalytic interest over the historical formation of repression and emergence of neurotic character in connection to development of modern civilization composed of libidinal ties, new fields of social relations, modes of regulations and correspondingly transformed or multiplied tensions, anxieties and ambivalences (Freud, 1962).

Moreover, Foucault’s theoretical construction concerning how power operates signifies a dialogue with psychoanalytic vision which underscores the reliance of
civilization on exploitation of sexuality as a means to channel psychic energy to socially productive, valued and bond-making acts (Freud, 1962, pp. 51-55). As parallel to this kind of insight about multilayered production of social relations in terms of dynamics among organization of “inner” life, constitution of valuations and structuring of modes of enjoyment via certain interactions as connected to alienation from libidinal forces, methodology of Foucault problematizes how machinery of power functions in relation to “isolation, intensification and consolidation of peripheral sexualities” (Foucault, 1978, p. 48). Accordingly, this functioning relies on co-construction of principles of classification, regulated bodies, modes of practices and varieties of individualities (pp. 43-48). Although it is interesting to follow their resembling ontological operations, it is also crucial to examine the points of conflicts between them. As aforementioned quotations indicate, Foucauldian conceptualizations imply a tendency to overcome Freudian portrayal of unconscious in which desiring process seems to rely on familial tensions. In this sense, Foucault tries to decipher complex functioning of power in specific contexts, interactions, regulations, bodily dispositions. Thus, it would be a worthwhile endeavor to see how desire, unconscious, and power operate in different manners in their conceptualizations. This could enable locating the possibly reductionist and essentialist elements in Freudian theory whose inclination to search for Oedipal tensions in all social relations is widely criticized (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983). Through this kind of attempt, it would be possible to reach novel reflections concerning the historical specificity of unconscious, sexuality, and neurotic individuality.

Based on examining these theoretical constructions, historically specific operations of the concept of unconscious has been explored. The aim of this kind of engagement was to locate if Freudian psychoanalysis would offer some possibilities for social theory in terms of its conceptualization of unconscious in relation to historical forces such as repression. In the next chapter, the attention will be drawn into another theme of sociological imagination. Considering Mills’ insights concerning the cruciality of investigating alienation as both historical and individual phenomenon (Mills, 1959, pp. 170-172), the Freudian psychoanalysis will be approached in terms of its possibility of offering some tools to problematize alienation
from libidinal forces. This conceptualization relies on the intuition and claim that Freudian psychoanalysis could enable some grounds to problematize structural functioning of motivations, impulses, and affects. So, the “position of reason and freedom” or the “problematization of alienation from libidinal forces” will be taken as conceptual tools to explore the grounds of this kind of claim and intuition.
CHAPTER 7

PROBLEMATIZATION OF REASON AND FREEDOM IN RELATION TO ALIENATION FROM LIBIDINAL FORCES

Considering the emphasis of psychoanalysis on the unconscious as a mechanism organizing libidinal energy, alienation seems to be one of the fundamental themes of Freudian theory. In fact, since renunciation of satisfaction and investment of psychic energy to social life were presented as main grounds of modern civilization, Freud seems to suggest that alienation and rationalization are the very constitutive elements of modern subjectivity as they enable power of community to take over individual limitlessness (Freud, 1962). On the other hand, the tension between individual freedom and pressures of social organizations were also problematized based on the unavoidable discontent of individuals frustrated by restrictions of cultural ideals. In this sense, Freud in a way points out the contradictions embedded in modern bureaucratization, rationalization, and alienation, without necessarily depending on the reason and freedom as alternatives but opening a space to discuss systematic control on desire or libidinal forces.

In accordance with Mills’ emphasis on the importance of problematizing how human reason and freedom are threatened by intensified alienation, in Civilization and its Discontents Freudian vision delves into the ways in which civilization exploits sexual energy (Freud, 1962, p. 51). As parallel to the sociological imaginative insight that “an individual comes systematically to regulate his impulses and his aspirations, his manner of life and his ways of thought, in rather strict accordance with the rules and regulations of the organization” (Mills, 1959, p. 170), psychoanalytic imagination puts forward that “civilization is obeying the laws of economic necessity since a large amount of the psychical energy which it uses for its own purposes has to be withdrawn from sexuality” (Freud, 1962, p. 51). Therefore, the book constitutes an appropriate case to investigate sociological imagination of Freud as it indicates how development
of civilization had been based on a certain kind of “economics of libido” (Freud, 1962, p. 88). In this sense, renunciation of immediate satisfactions or prohibitions on certain ways of obtaining pleasure goes hand in hand with sublimation process which refers to channeling the psychic energy into socially acceptable and culturally valued acts, producing libidinal ties across the community (Freud, 1962, pp. 44-55). Thus, according to Freud, production of social relations cannot be isolated from organization of inner processes, regulations over manners of enjoyment and structuring of feelings. This implies that growing of social relations, intensification of web of associations among people, and ever-expansion of institutional rituals function as more or less autonomous mechanisms which are irreducible to decision making capacity attributed to human reason or freedom. In this regard, Freudian portrayal of social control over libidinal activity opens a space to discuss what Mills puts as dichotomy between the “alienated man” and “Western image of free man” (Mills, 1959, p. 172).

“The compulsion to work” and “the power of love” are suggested to be two fundamental affective themes which accompany intensification of social ties and emergence of civilization (Freud, 1962, p. 48). The insight concerning the relationality between necessity to work and inclination to regulate sexual life draws attention to structural totality of relations of production considering that “desire always remains in close touch with the conditions of objective existence” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 27) and “social production is purely and simply desiring-production itself under determinate conditions” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 29). In this regard, as Marx’ sociological imagination reveals that separation of workers from products or isolation of workers from production process functions in line with objectification of labor in products as loss of reality for workers in terms of producing value for capitalists while spending the life activity of workers (Marx, 2010), psychoanalytic imagination discovers the cruciality of exploiting libidinal labor for social production of reality. Although Freudian perspective seems to equate whole humanity with workers who are oppressed and exploited by civilization whose conceptualization is rather fetishistic and culturalist in terms of isolating the modernization process from some dimensions of relations of production, its emphasis on the co-constitution of libidinal development and “civilized world” widens our horizon. In this respect, it indicates how alienation
implies an interplay among unconscious production or organization of desire, separation of social acts from libidinal flows, and Oedipal management of sexual freedom in accordance with intensified institutional rationalization.

Also, psychoanalytic reflections over the tension and connectivity between individual and civilization enables problematization of reason and freedom in relation to possibility of “neurotic civilizations” (Freud, 1962, p. 91). Besides, concerning the multilayered character of alienation composed of increasing bureaucratic rationalization, lack of reason in human affairs and systematic restrictions on freedom in accordance with social production of unconscious, Freud’s elaborations about how Jews had turned into “an agent of economic discharge” for Aryan ideal exemplify the socio-historical dynamics of alienation from libidinal forces. In this regard, Freudian problematization allows one to consider historical position of reason and freedom in relation to excessive institutional rationalization, burdensome demands of civilization and ever-increasing conflicts connected to continuous alienation from libidinal processes, which imply unconscious production of labor and its sociality.

Mills describes the cruciality of problematizing alienation in relation to how antagonisms of modernity had produced ever-growing rational organizations and bureaucracies simultaneously with restricting individuals’ capacity to reason and freedom (Mills, 1959, p. 169). In this social structure underlaid by the “rationality without reason”, alienation is argued to be fundamental mode of existence since it is the main type of interaction in relations of production and consumption (Mills, 1959, p. 170). These sociological imaginative insights imply a similarity with Freudian vision considering the psychoanalytic concern about how development of civilization is linked with organization of libidinal energies in certain ways whose operation on individuals would constitute certain psychic conflicts, tensions, or ambivalences:

The demands made on the efficiency of the individual in the struggle for existence have greatly increased and it is only by putting out all his mental powers that he can meet them. At the same time the individual’s needs and his demands for the enjoyments of life have increased in all classes; unprecedented luxury has spread to strata of the population who were formerly quite untouched by it; irreligion, discontent and covetousness have grown up in wide social spheres. The immense extension of communication which has been brought about by the network of telegraphs and telephones that encircle the world has completely altered the conditions of trade and commerce …The
exhausted nerves seek recuperation in increased stimulation and in highly-spiced pleasures, only to become more exhausted than before (Freud, 2010d, p. 1949).

As can be seen, Freud reflects upon the demands of culture over individuals in the light of co-constitution of increasing needs, differentiation of enjoyments, and higher standards of living as parallel to increasingly contentious struggles for existence. In this regard, it is possible to examine how psychoanalytic imagination problematizes the totalizing power of civilization which functions through alienating individuals from their life expectancies, needs, and manners of obtaining pleasure. Besides, it indicates the tendency of psychoanalysis to investigate connections between socio-historical issues, structural conflicts, and transformation of individualities or psychic processes, which signify its interest in situating the conditions of possibility for human reason and freedom to operate.

Furthermore, Freudian imagination problematizes how the development of civilization goes in line with the intensification of modern nervous illnesses in connection to restrictions over sexual life. In this sense, it discusses the ways in which sexual aims are displaced with culturally valued goals or standards such as following a certain type of monogamic marriage, practicing abstinence, or valuing virginity (Freud, 2010d). Thus, psychoanalytic vision is concerned about how a form of institutional structure like family or marriage functions as parallel to organization of inner processes, modes of enjoyment, and psychic composition of an individual. This indicates a congruence with Mills’ assertions concerning the necessity of exploring the regulatory power of institutions over motivations, expectancies, affects, and thoughts of individuals (Mills, 1959, p. 170). In addition, considering how it links the operation of this kind of cultural mechanism to formation of neuroses shows a Freudian interest in alienating effects of social organizations whose operation imply destructive results on human potentials, spheres of affects and dimensions of freedom:

It is clear that education is far from underestimating the task of suppressing a girl’s sensuality till her marriage, for it makes use of the most drastic measures. Not only does it forbid the sexual intercourse and set a high premium on the preservation of female chastity, but it also protects the young woman from temptation as she grows up, by keeping her ignorant of all the facts of the part she is to play and by not tolerating any impulse of love in her which cannot lead to marriage. The result is that when the girl’s parental authorities suddenly
allow her to fall in love, she is unequal to this psychical achievement and enters
marriage uncertain of her own feelings (Freud, 2010d, 1959).

Considering the tendency of sociological imagination to investigate main
characteristics of its historical conditions and Mills’ emphasis on the cruciality of
problematic structurally significant issues such as rationality without reason,
collapse of modern axiomatics, ambivalent position of freedom in social affairs and
domination of alienation (Mills, 1959, pp. 170-172), it is possible to see that these kind
of methodological concerns and sensitivities also exist in psychoanalytic imagination.
For instance, reminding of Mills’ emphasis on investigating the conditions of
alienation with respect to “crisis of individuality” and “crisis of history-making”
(Mills, 1959, pp. 172-173), Totem and Taboo (2001) includes some themes such as the
emergence of law which restricts and regulates libidinal activities of individuals.
Regarding how it describes the process of forming different set of relations after the
deed of overthrowing the tyrannical figure, the book seems to indicate how Freudian
sociological imagination problematizes alienation in connection to certain historical
determinations, regulatory power of social bonds, structuring forces over affects and
changing cycle of interactions.

In this regard, it conceptualizes taboos as autonomous restrictive regulations
whose power is portrayed by the members of clan as “sacred”, “uncanny”,
“forbidden”, or “dangerous” (Freud, 2001, pp. 22-23). Based on the emotional and
social significance of taboos, Freud overviews how they have a crucial role in
regulating all the sociality of a clan including relations of authority, arrangement of
marriages, and interactions with enemies (Freud, 2001). In addition, the unconscious
character of functioning of taboos is expressed by stating that “every sort of thing is
forbidden; but they have no idea why and it does not occur to them to raise the
question” (Freud, 2001, p. 25). What is striking in this analysis is not just Freud’s
anthropological insights but how sociological imagination of Freud could be examined
in arguments concerning the links between taboos and our conventions, customs, or
regulations (Freud, 2001, pp. 26-28). In this picture, as in the case of taboos,
emergence of cultural institutions and organization of social life are described as
modes of dealing with certain unconscious ambivalent motivations composed of
repressed hostilities, desires, aggressive inclinations as parallel to ongoing love, attachment, and responsibility towards closed ones (Freud, 2001, pp. 182-185). Even though this argument seems to disregard the complexity of social relations, its drawing attention to dynamic co-constitution of inner processes and social mechanisms or taking phantasies as part of structural processes is quite valuable. Also, this indicates a psychoanalytic attention towards how alienation is at the center of both early historical traces of sociality and contemporary modes of individuality. In a way, this kind of insight indicates an accordance with Mills’ emphasis on the importance of problematizing the position of human reason, freedom, and individuality in the face of increasing rationalization, regulatory power of institutions, or structuring of motivations (Mills, 1959, pp. 168-170). On the other hand, it challenges Mills’ conceptualization of alienation as a force against individual human reason or freedom by pointing out the structural embeddedness of alienation in different historical formations. Thus, Freudian vision opens a space to discuss alienation without relying upon modernist axioms portraying human reason and freedom as possessions of individuals, and it constructs an ontology in which alienation, reason, and freedom operate as structurally determined realities.

What is also fruitful to examine in _Totem and Taboo (2001)_ includes how Freudian imagination looks for the links between functioning of taboos and obsessional neurosis. In this respect, the following passage constitutes a good example to reflect upon the ways in which psychoanalytic vision problematizes alienation in such a context even though it is not much clear:

Obsessional patients behave as though the ‘impossible’ persons and things were carriers of a dangerous infection liable to be spread by contact on to everything in their neighborhood. I have already [p. 21] drawn attention to the same characteristic capacity for contagion and transference in my description of taboo. We know, too, that anyone who violates a taboo by coming into contact with something that is taboo becomes taboo himself and then no one may come into contact with him (Freud, 2001, p. 32).

As can be seen, Freud emphasizes the theme of contagion as a way of relating to others and surrounding objects in both the taboo and the neurosis. In this sense, extreme sensitivity towards coming into contact with anything reminding of taboo or avoiding anything related with the repelled object in obsessional neurosis is argued to
imply that prohibition is accompanied by an unconscious desire embodied in obsessive symptomatic acts (Freud, 2001, pp. 35-36). Besides pointing to underlying alienation from libidinal forces, this ambivalence is exemplified by suggesting that “anyone who has violated a taboo becomes taboo himself because he possesses the dangerous quality of tempting others to follow his example” (Freud, 2001, p. 38). In this regard, the emphasis of Freudian vision on displaced character of actions, possibility of discharging ambivalent motivations through social practices, and the role of repressive organization of affects in social relations are crucial to examine. This examination allows one to see alienation in the context of what Mills portrays as the relationality between “crisis of history-making” and “crisis of individuality” (Mills, 1959, p. 173). Thus, the psychoanalytic imagination depicts the structural limits of human reason or decision making in relation to dominance of phantasies, unconscious forces, and ambivalent wishes, whose operation allude to alienation from one’s desires and how to relate with others. Besides, the attention towards contagious character of taboos and obsessed elements imply some connotations with how ideology functions. Ideology is argued to enable connecting immensely irrelevant themes, creating phantasmatic objects to discharge conflicts, and referencing sublime objects to justify one’s actions (Zizek, 2008). As parallel to this conceptualization, Freudian vision seems to problematize multiple determinations among alienated individualities, ambivalent unconscious forces, phantasmatic constitution of institutions or social bodies, and maintenance of antagonistic social relations.

Also, some reflections upon psychoanalysis are worthwhile to examine since they allow one to elaborate on different aspects, operations, and applications of Freudian imagination. For instance, in an article overviewing the relevance of psychoanalytic insights for socio-historical analysis, Fuks and Rudge (2018) argues that “symptom must also be considered as an act of protest against the action of civilizational coercion” (p. 4). In this regard, they suggest that symptoms imply reactions to social context, historical conditions, or conflicts embedded in relations of production. An example they use to explain how functioning of capitalist relations is linked with psychopathologies concerns the depression:
Depression involves a refusal and rebellion against the stimulus to consumption and overvaluation of the possession of the objects as signs of success and of power and ultimately, to the objectification of the subject (Fuks & Rudge, 2018).

This kind of theoretical engagement with Freudian imagination alludes to Mills’ putting forward the importance of problematizing the links between “crisis of individuality” and “crisis of history-making” in connection to role of human reason in social affairs (Mills, 1959, p. 173). Thus, seemingly personal malfunctioning of psychic mechanism is conceptualized in the light of reactions, resistances, and manners of flight against alienating power of capitalist relations. In this sense, psychoanalytic vision enables evaluating symptoms in relation to subjects’ search of freedom or emancipation from antagonisms of capitalist sociality and rationality.

Looking into theoretical endeavors of Frankfurt School thinkers is crucial for examining how Freudian sociological imagination had constructed a ground for alternative routes in social theory. Its traces could be seen in School’s attempts to explore social repression or capitalist organization of unconscious, domination of exploitative reason over cultural life, Oedipal production of authoritarian social relations, alienating consummation of sexuality, and possibility of liberating libidinal forces (Elliott, 2004, pp. 29-34). In this regard, the context of their investigation is in line with the connectivity between visions of Mills and Freud, which indicates itself in psychoanalytic interest in exploitation of sexuality by civilization (Freud, 1962, p. 51), historicity of repression based on the role of Oedipal tensions in reproduction of social formations (Freud, 1962, pp. 78-79), and the function of sublimation in constituting libidinal ties among members of community (Freud, 1962, p. 55). This kind of conceptual operation implies a search for connections among various social spheres in the context of dynamic co-constitution of personal milieu, history, and structural conditions (Mills, 1959).

Lacan’s engagement with Freudian discovery also offers important domains to examine how to locate and make sense of psychoanalytic imagination. In similar to Freud’s reflections on the necessity of repression and exploitation of sexuality by culture for the emergence of civilization (Freud, 1962), conceptualized as “alienation from libidinal forces” in this thesis, Lacan also seems to problematize reason and
freedom in a rather pessimistic manner considering the emphasis on alienation in language and separation from Other’s desire as preconditions for subjectivity (Fink, 1997, pp. 49-53). However, as parallel to Freudian sociological imagination, conceptualizing seemingly negative theme such as alienation as the positive necessity for the emergence of subject enables a quite fruitful perspective since it allows one to question modernist assumptions about reason and freedom. In this regard, emphasizing the inevitability of acquiring a position in language and being mostly part of Other’s discourse (Fink, 1997, pp. 51-53), Lacan’s approach pushes the limits of subjectivity without referring to essential human nature and opens a space to consider alternatives in the light of restrictions embedded in existing forms of social organizations. Based on this kind of insight, Lacanian imagination also investigates co-constitution of socio-historical structures and unconscious productions in relation to organization of desire in capitalist discourse (Tomsic, pp. 77-80). This implies that it problematizes reason and freedom with regard to discussing if they were really enough to picture unalienated subject or else we need to consider alienation, reason, freedom, desire and subjectivity via different structure which changes their operation and creates different forms from each one of them. In this sense, it allows us to use sociological imagination to see alternative total images of society full of different sensations and connections not because of reversing alienation but through forming different structural relations.

What was aimed in this chapter was to locate possibilities of problematizing alienation from libidinal forces out of theoretical engagements with Freudian psychoanalysis. This attempt was inspired from Mills’ emphasis on the structural significance of problem of alienation (Mills, 1959, pp. 170-173). In the next chapter, Freudian methodology will be examined in terms of another inclination of sociological imagination which is following the requirements of the investigated problem (Mills, 1959, p. 146). So, various expressions in Freud’s texts will be investigated with respect to analyzing their possibility of operating as a mode of continuous questioning of existing notions or constant search for original discoveries. Also, some reflections in the social theory will be used as tools to make sense of this inclination in the context of epistemological and ontological features of Freudian psychoanalysis.
CHAPTER 8

FREUDIAN DISCOVERY AS A CONSTRUCTIVE DESTRUCTION
COMPARED TO RIGID METHODS

Considering its manner of approaching to reality, I propose to conceptualize originality of Freudian discovery as “constructive destruction” based on its inclination for continuous questioning of notions or assumptions and re-formulation of the phenomena in the light of experience. Besides, the use of “constructive destruction” as a conceptual tool is inspired from Friedrich Nietzsche’s portrayal of “philosophizing with a hammer” in accordance with “transvaluation of all values” (Nietzsche, 1997). Nietzsche’s mode of deciphering ontological grounds of valuations alludes to sociological imagination of Freud since it also explores operation of unrealized forces, unconscious desires and sociality of psychic forces as a manner of revealing the historical processes inherent in the most unquestioned domains like formation of sexuality or limits of consciousness.

Based on this kind of image, psychoanalytic imagination could be reflected upon in terms of its continuity with Mills’ emphasis on the importance of following “the requirements of problems rather than limitations of any one rigid method” (Mills, 1959, p. 146) and studying on the “problems of structural significance” (p. 68). In this sense, The Interpretation of Dreams (2010a) constitutes a good investigatory tool with respect to offering an immense amount of detail reflecting how Freudian vision operates based on its sense of real problems and applying a constructive-destructive style. As parallel to Mills’ advise concerning the importance of acquiring a “playfulness of mind”, following “vague images and notions” in the name of reaching

6 Although the concept alludes to “creative destruction” used by Werner Sombart (2018) and Joseph Schumpeter (2003) who described the operation of capitalism in the light of reflections of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (1997), the current usage is based on the impression concerning the ontological similarity between the works of Friedrich Nietzsche (1997) and Sigmund Freud (1962; 1989; 2001; 2010a; 2010b) in terms of their interest in reaching novel concepts simultaneously with destroying assumedly given objects, values, and viewpoints.
original ideas and being receptive to “unforeseen and unplanned linkages” (Mills, 1959, p. 212). Freud suggests that “there is no possibility of explaining dreams as a psychical process, since to explain a thing means to trace it back to something already known, and there is at the present time no established psychological knowledge” about the problematization of dreams (Freud, 2010a, p. 515). According to Freud, this makes it necessary to “set up a number of fresh hypotheses which touch tentatively upon the structure of the apparatus of the mind and upon the play of forces operating in it” (Freud, 2010a, p. 515). In this regard, examining this book would allow one to reflect on energetic, exploratory and lively character of Freudian imagination indicating itself in constant questioning of assumptions and repeated re-formulations of problems in the light of novel experiences, conflicting deductions and elusive explanations.

In this sense, it is crucial to remember Mills’ emphasis on the importance of experimenting with various ideas, trying novel notions in the face of new problems and being sensitive to unexpected connections (Mills, 1959, pp. 211-214). This inclination could be observed in various statements of Freud such as the following one:

When, after passing through a narrow defile, we suddenly emerge upon a piece of high ground, where the path divides and the finest prospects open up on every side, we may pause for a moment and consider in which direction we shall first turn our steps. Such is the case with us now that we have surmounted the first interpretation of a dream. We find ourselves in the daylight of a sudden discovery. (Freud, 2010a, p. 147)

These expressions indicate the exploratory character of Freudian imagination in terms of implying its openness to multiplicity of paths, connections and impressions, whose construction goes hand in hand with following a certain problem and continuous re-formulation of it based on looking into historical becoming of phenomena. Moreover, tone of writing makes the reader feel the livelihood of discovery, which is in accordance with Mills’ putting forward the cruciality of the manner of presenting ideas, insights, or discoveries. The process of presentation is fruitful since it allows one to reflect on the concerned issue or problem and develop more original approaches, concepts, and theories (Mills, 1959, p. 222). In addition, it is possible to observe that the vividness of being concerned about a problem is accompanied by constant questioning of the notions rather than sticking to a rigid methodology:
We must not delude ourselves into exaggerating the importance of these considerations. We have done no more than give a name to an inexplicable phenomenon. We call it ‘regression’ when in a dream an idea is turned back into the sensory image from which it was originally derived. But even this step requires justification. What is the point of this nomenclature if it teaches us nothing new? (Freud, 2010a, p. 545).

As can be seen, Freudian methodology operates based on an open ontological sphere in which existing concepts are always re-evaluated and checked over in the name of reaching a novel point of understanding or explanation. It signifies an inclination to search for original ideas and “unforeseen and unplanned linkages” (Mills, 1959, p. 212). The tendency of psychoanalytic vision to destroy for reaching more comprehensive constructions is asserted by Freud as “we must always be prepared to drop our conceptual scaffolding if we feel that we are in a position to replace it by something that approximates more closely to the unknown reality” (Freud, 2010a, p. 605). In accordance with this kind of interest in original discoveries, considering how to maintain the investigation of a field like dreams in which no sign of established knowledge or convincing explanation exists, Freud argues that it is necessary to propose some original hypotheses to be able touch upon various aspects of the problem in their total functioning (Freud, 2010a, p. 515). This kind of theoretical endeavor shows that psychoanalytic mode of discovery follows what Mills describes as following “problems of structural significance” rather than restricting the horizon of the problem according to limitations of previous methods (Mills, 1959, p. 68). In this regard, Freudian vision is like sociological imagination which takes advantage of fruitfulness of creative thought-experiments, vague impressions, or incomplete ideas as building blocks of original theories (Mills, 1959, pp. 211-212), whose exemplification include:

This view, as we shall soon discover, is a most inadequate one. But we may take it as a provisional starting-point and go on to a further question. If only a few elements from the dream thoughts find their way into the dream-content, what are the conditions which determine their selection? (Freud, 2010a, p. 299)

Besides the reflexiveness of its methodology which enables ever-growing problematizations, reflections, and elaborations about objects of analyses, an important aspect of Freudian imagination is its capacity to find new dimensions of observing, evaluating, and making sense of reality. As parallel to sociological
imagination which is concerned about newly emerging “orienting values”, “ways of feeling” and “vocabularies of motive” (Mills, 1959, p. 17), the inclination of psychoanalytic vision to go after requirements of problems allows it to contact multiplicity of complex phenomena embedded in the interplay between the personal milieu and historical structures. Also, it enables reaching original epistemological or ontological grounds like the unconscious and its multifaceted operations such as familial interactions, historical transformations, psychopathological structures, formations of sexuality, repressive development of civilization, and construction of dream processes (Freud, 1962; 1989; 2001; 2010a; 2010b). Emergence of these kinds of new contexts of exploration concerning the analysis of dream-formation is also reflected upon by Freud:

We have introduced a new class of psychical material between the manifest content of dreams and the conclusions of our enquiry: namely, their latent content, or (as we say) the ‘dream-thoughts’, arrived at by means of our procedure. It is from these dream-thoughts and not from a dream’s manifest content that we disentangle its meaning. We are thus presented with a new task which had no previous existence: the task, that is, of investigating the relations between the manifest content of dreams and the latent dream-thoughts, and of tracing out the processes by which the latter have been changed into the former. (Freud, 2010a, p. 295)

Another example which indicates how Freudian imagination looks into significant problems based on its sensitivity to new dimensions of approaching to reality in its richness rather than using a restricted method concerns the engagement of psychoanalytic methodology with everyday life in terms of its tendency to “collect everyday material and turn it to scientific use” simultaneously with “a search for far-reaching correlations” (Freud, 2010b, p. 1239). In this sense, it tries the capture reality in its dynamic character and multiplicity of determinations with respect to reflecting upon everyday operations of unconscious processes. This implies its congruence with Mills’ remarks on the importance of intense passion for understanding the world (Mills, 1959, p. 211) as opposed to inclinations for psychologism (p. 59), or methodologically inhibited manner of following statistical rituals (pp. 71-72). Also, Freud’s drawing attention to cruciality of studying what is familiar to everyone and things that everyone understands signifies its accordance with Mills’ description of working “in the context of presentation” which refers to paying attention to quality of
communication with the reader since it allows social scientists to clarify and revise their thoughts in a constructive way (Freud, 2010b, p. 1239, Mills, 1959, p. 222).

An important feature of sociological imagination is its tendency to reflect upon “the perspectives and materials, the ideas and methods, of any and all sensible studies of man and society” (Mills, 1959, p. 225). Based on a similar kind of tendency to make use of various historical materials, psychoanalytic imagination often benefits from themes, concerns, and issues in the literary works (Freud, 2010b, p. 1282). In this way, it acquires a chance to examine multiplicity of interactions, events and affective processes described in detail, and relates them to unconscious processes. For instance, Freud mentions how forgetting associated with the marriage ring is widely used in the literature as parallel to its symbolic significance in social life (Freud, 2010b, p. 1282). Considering how it benefits from different components of historical and cultural heritage with respect to evaluating them with a constructive-destructive framework which does not rely on a rigid method, it is possible to see the manner in which Freudian imagination follows problems. In this regard, psychoanalytic interest concerning the symptomatic acts or parapraxis like forgetting constructs and re-formulates its objects of analyses not only in the light of clinical practice, but also through interpreting the insights embedded in cultural artefacts like stories or mythologies.

Also, the tendency of psychoanalytic imagination to make use of various historical materials in its problematizations or constructions of objects could be examined in *Totem and Taboo* (Freud, 2001). Besides, these materials are not taken as given facts but as phenomena to reflect upon. Thus, it constitutes a good case to examine how Freudian vision formulates its problems and deals with them through constantly questioning existing explanations in line with what Mills describes as looking for novel connections (Mills, 1959, p. 212). An instance concerning this constructive destructive tendency would be the following one:

It is true that we have accepted the presence of demons, but not as something ultimate psychologically unanalyseable. We have succeeded, as it were, in getting behind the demons, for we have explained them as projections of hostile feelings Harboured by the survivors against the dead (Freud, 2001, p. 72).
As can be seen, sociological imagination of Freud relies on the anthropological insights to deal with the question of possible historical continuity or reproduction of unconscious complexes. In this respect, it is open to variety of influences from different disciplines, but it also follows a certain problem without restricting its borders according to methodological limitations. In this regard, it is possible to see that psychoanalytic vision goes parallel to Mills’ assertion that “every social science requires a historical scope of conception and a full use of historical materials” (Mills, 1959, p. 145). Therefore, its receptors are always ready for interactions with different domains of studies or investigations as far as they enable fruitful discussions and results. The following passage constitutes a good example concerning these tendencies:

If psychoanalysis is compelled -and is, indeed, in duty bound- to lay all the emphasis upon one particular source, that does not mean it is claiming either that hat source is the only one or that it occupies first place among the numerous contributory factors. Only when we can synthesize the findings in the different fields of research will it become possible to arrive at the relative importance of the part played in the genesis of religion by the mechanism discussed in these pages (Freud, 2001, p. 116).

Moreover, the flexibility of Freudian methodology and its inclination to reformulate its conceptual framework based on new findings co-function with what Mills portraits as the sociological imaginative sensitivity for sticking to imprecise ideas or playing with notions to reach originality (Mills, 1959, pp. 211-212). In accordance with this, Freud evaluates the psychoanalytic view on the possible resemblance between taboos and neuroses as a fresh hypothesis which is necessary for this kind of object of analysis:

The lack of precision in what I have written in the text above, its abbreviation of time factor and its compression of the whole subject-matter, may be attributed to the reserve necessitated by the nature of the topic. It would be as foolish to aim at exactitude in such questions as it would be unfair to insist upon certainty (Freud, 2001, pp. 165-166).

In the same vein with how Mills describes sociological imagination in terms of emphasizing the importance of “playfulness of mind” and “clinging to vague images and notions” as steps for reaching original ideas (Mills, 1959, pp. 211-212), in *the Ego and the Id*, Freud suggests that “when we find ourselves thus confronted by the
necessity of postulating a third unconscious, which is not repressed, we must admit that characteristics of being unconscious begins to lose significance for us” (Freud, 1989, p. 8). Although the unconscious has always maintained its importance for psychoanalysis, these kinds of expressions imply that psychoanalytic operation of concepts depend on constant questioning, destruction, re-construction, and re-formulation based on novel problems, dimensions or observations encountered.

Also, considering how tracing the requirements of problems and avoiding dependence on rigid methods indicates themselves in Freud’s thinking, investigating and analyzing, an instance could be the following: “We can come to know even the unconscious only by making it conscious. But stop, how is that possible? What does it mean when we say making something conscious? How can that come about?” (Freud, 1989, p. 9). Besides implying the continuous questioning of methods and underlying assumptions in their content, these sentences consist of certain mode of writing, style of arousing feelings and manner of communicating with the reader. In this sense, the vividness of expressions composed of humanely voice and temperate spontaneity enables multiplicity of interactions between the reader and the text. In line with Mills’ suggestion for working “in the context of presentation” which would allow a social scientist to “get new ideas” in an ever-growing “context of discovery” (Mills, 1959, p. 222), Freudian discovery operates on the basis of creating novel dimensions, problems and fields of exploration as well as destroying previously accepted notions, categories and assumptions.

Regarding the congruence between sociological imagination and Freudian discovery in terms of having a “sense of real problems” implying the importance of working on issues which “have genuine relevance to our conception of a social structure and to what is happening within it” (Mills, 1959, p. 73), we see that psychoanalytic imagination enables problematizing the prevalent discontent within civilization as a socio-historical phenomenon. Also, it allows us to explore the structural character of unconscious sense of guilt through inquiring its historical formation with respect to repeated interactions, tensions, and ambivalences. In this sense, as parallel to Mills’ emphasis on studying “problems of structural significance”, Freud’s sociological imagination indicates its inclination to detect and explore
phenomena whose investigation would shed light on historical specificity of relations and modes of transformation. This tendency is also reflected upon in Civilization and its Discontents (1962):

One of the aims of the paper is... to “represent the sense of guilt as the most important problem in the development of civilization 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 (Freud, 1962, p. 81).

Thus, the problem is formulated in direct relevance to a historically specific process described as the “development of civilization”. Besides, rather than applying a rigid method chosen beforehand, the object of analysis is constructed in relation to its various dimensions of sociality such as preservation of earlier phases, feelings and thoughts in unconscious (Freud, 1962, pp. 16-17), exploitation of sexuality (p. 51), and function of sublimation in binding members of community in libidinal way (p. 55). In addition, historically repeated conflicts due to ambivalence of love and inclination to aggression towards father (Freud, 1962, p. 79), connectivity between reinforcement of sense of guilt and (re)production of social ties (p. 80), emergence of neurotic symptoms as substitutions for unfulfilled sexual wishes (p. 83), and the economics of libido (p. 88) are some other conceptualizations which signify how Freudian imagination problematizes the sociality of unconscious.

This kind of insight concerning the historical, relational and multidimensional operation of the sense of guilt shows that psychoanalytic vision is receptive to “unforeseen and unplanned linkages” (Mills, 1959, p. 212), dependent on “playfulness of mind” combined with “fierce drive to make sense of the world” (p. 211), and it uses “variety of viewpoints” allowing it to “catch light from as many angles as possible” (p. 214). Also, it relies on “constructive destruction” in terms of constantly questioning the conceptualization of its objects and making new formulations of problems in line with novel insights, observations, and deductions. For instance, even though theory of Oedipus complex seems to depend on transmission of certain instinctual base leading to killing the primordial father, Freud considers the possibility of its fictional character, which enables differentiating the “remorse” caused by aggressive action from “conscience” and “sense of guilt” whose existence do not require the deed of killing or other violent acts (Freud, 1962, pp. 77-80). In this regard, destroying its reliance on
the assumption of killing the father, psychoanalytic imagination becomes able to construct sense of guilt in relation to historical repetition of ambivalence resulting from the tension between love and aggression. According to this view, the antagonisms of the unconscious reproduces and enlarges itself in connection to identifications with varying forms of authority, suppression of destructive instincts, and creation of social ties through structural channeling of libidinal forces to institutionally regulated spheres.

For locating psychoanalytic discovery in social theory, examining Althusser’s reflections on psychoanalysis are also quite useful. Besides indicating fruitfulness of engaging with psychoanalytic imagination to build up alternative theoretical routes and contexts of exploration, Althusser’s *Writings on Psychoanalysis* (1996) delineates epistemological implications of Freudian methodology. In this regard, it explains how specificity of psychoanalysis’ object and mechanisms peculiar to it had required construction of specific concepts (Althusser, pp. 158-159), and abstractions “which contain within them the index, measure and basis for the necessity of their abstraction” (p. 167). Reflecting on the continuity between the originality of object of analysis discovered by psychoanalysis and corresponding particularity of conceptual construction, Althusser in a way uncovers how sociological imagination of Freud operates in accordance with Mills’ proposing that “requirements of problems, rather than limitations of any one rigid method, should be and have been the classical social analyst’s paramount consideration” (Mills, 1959, p. 146). Furthermore, the book includes depictions of Freudian imagination in relation to its continuous recasting of thoughts, concepts and hypotheses as parallel to its being “prodigiously attentive to every detail, curious about every novelty, and in perpetual motion” (Althusser, 1996, p. 92). In this regard, the manner in which psychoanalytic theory is described seems to bear strong similarities with the “constructive destruction” aspect of Freud’s sociological imagination, proposed within the conceptual framework of this thesis based on the reliance of Freudian discovery to constant examination of concepts or assumptions and re-construction of descriptions, conceptual links and problems according to novel findings (Freud, 1989).
Reflecting upon Deleuze and Guattari (1983) also offers crucial insights to make sense of Freudian ontology not as an essentially sociological imaginative entity but as a methodological sphere which could enable theoretically fruitful engagements. In this line of reasoning, it is possible to observe that even though Deleuze and Guattari (1983) criticizes Freudian psychoanalysis in terms of its reducing the process of desiring-production to Oedipal triangulation or familial complex, they admit the greatness of how psychoanalysis discovers production of desire and productions of the unconscious (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 24). Thus, as their emphasis on the continuity between the “social production” and “desiring-production under determinate conditions of existence” implies (p. 29), we can see how Freudian imagination opens up a horizon for exploring the sociality of desire in relation to its capability of problematizing “unforeseen and unplanned linkages” (Mills, 1959, p. 212) among various historical currents including language, sexuality, symptoms, social regulations and unconscious forces. This kind of problematization functions in line with the “Freudian discovery of domain of free syntheses” composed of “endless connections, nonexclusive disjunctions, nonspecific conjunctions, partial objects and flows” in relation to “direct confrontation between desiring-production and social production” or between “symptomological and collective formations” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 54). Therefore, in accordance with Mills’ emphasis on shifting among perspectives to construct a comprehensive image of society (Mills, 1959, p. 211) and as parallel to portrayal of Deleuze and Guattari (1983), psychoanalytic vision operates as a machinery of synthesis. This can be examined with respect to its producing concepts and elaborations which shed light on the relationality among various historical flows or structural breaks whose constitution are analyzed in connection to various social spheres and their total conditions of existence. Concerning the way psychoanalytic machinery works, it would be fruitful to investigate how it portrays “unconscious libidinal investment of social field” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 104). Its indications could be found in relational construction of unconscious based on how multiplicity of forces like unconscious sense of guilt, historically repeated conflicts or ambivalences, and emergence of neurotic symptoms co-produce each other (Freud, 1962). Based on this kind of synthesizing vision on Oedipalization of social
relations in terms of linking psychic repression to social repression with respect to unconscious structuring of desire, Freudian machinery could be argued to open up a space for exploring how family operates “as an agent for mass psychological reproduction of the economic system of a society” (Deleuze & Guattari, p. 118).

In this chapter, Freud’s writings and some routes in social theory were examined to locate how Freudian psychoanalysis deals with its problems or objects of analysis. In the light of these examinations, it is possible to argue that the psychoanalytic imagination offers a reflexive attitude with its readiness and flexibility for conceptualizing novel notions or dropping some assumptions in the light of new encounters, experiences, and investigations.
CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSION

The concept of sociological imagination offers crucial insights about what social science is, what kind of objects it analyzes, and how it explores the social. In this sense, as portrayed by C. W. Mills (1959), it offers certain modes of looking into social reality and certain ways of constructing the objects of analysis. One of the important features of looking in line with sociological imagination implies going after vague images and notions since they are the pathway for original ideas (Mills, 1959, p. 212). The concern of this thesis has developed as parallel to this kind of inclination. It was basically formed out of the impression that the operation of sociological imagination bears strong similarities with the functioning of psychoanalytic methodology invented by Sigmund Freud.

Going deeper in this curiosity has resulted in the formation of certain methodological framework to search for the traces of sociological imagination in Freud’s texts. This sociological imagination is not argued to be essentially inherent in these texts, but the attempt was to construct it through a theoretical engagement with them. The reason for calling it sociological imagination of Freud or psychoanalytic imagination implies the claim of the thesis that Freudian psychoanalysis opened an ontological ground in social theory, and critical interactions with this ground allows one to make use of sociological imagination in a fruitful manner. Based on this kind of motivation, a conceptual framework is formed out of some dimensions of sociological imagination. They include indicating the relationality between the most personal and impersonal, connecting the field of analysis to other social spheres, linking historically specific situations to individual types, problematizing increased alienation, and following the requirements of problems rather than a rigid method. Then, this framework is operationalized to situate the conceptual context of their application to Freud’s works. Therefore, the synthesis of those dimensions with
corresponding psychoanalytic concepts has emerged. The new conceptual domain composed of the unconscious as a field of the most personal and impersonal; connectedness of unconscious forces, individual symptoms, language, sexuality and history; historical specificity of the unconscious, repression and neurotic individuality; problematization of reason and freedom in relation to alienation from libidinal forces; and Freudian discovery as a constructive destruction compared to rigid methods.

Concerning how to observe Freudian sociological imagination in relation to conceptualization of the unconscious as the field of most personal and impersonal, the *Ego and the Id* (1989) is an important source to examine. It includes a structural portrayal of the unconscious as constituted by struggles among different psychic agents called id, ego, and superego. The ego tries to adapt socially unacceptable wishes of id to moral judgments of superego. What is striking about this is the picturing of this process without referring to personal agency, rational control, or consciously acting subject. Rather, it implies an unconscious process which already is part of socio-historical determinations, so the categorical distinctions like personal and impersonal melt away. Also, *The Interpretation of Dreams* offers a good case to investigate. In this book, Freud evaluates dreams in relation to ambivalent unconscious wishes, memory traces of daily impressions, socially repressed organization of sexuality, cultural representations, and relations of authority in family formation (Freud, 2010a). Therefore, seemingly personal fantasies are evaluated in connection to structural constitution of the unconscious whose operation is directly linked to historically repeated conflicts, affects, symbolizations, and interactions.

Tendency of Freudian imagination to connect various spheres like the unconscious, symptoms, language, sexuality, and history could be examined in The *Psychopathology of Everyday Life* (Freud, 2010b). It includes reflections on the everyday parapraxes such as forgetting a name and suggests that they could be evaluated as symptomatic acts whose emergence relate with unconscious conflicts and organization of repressive forces. In this regard, the linguistic expressions and daily actions are interpreted as potential spheres to channel repressed sexual energy in the form of condensed significations or replacement of inhibited motivations. Thus, a seemingly trivial event is approached as part of a structural mechanism composed of
various dimensions. Also, the dynamic co-functioning of different spheres is conceptualized as a historical process including certain type of familial composition, cultural formation, and specific mechanisms of repression. Therefore, the connectivity among those processes are investigated in relation to certain modes of sexual, social, and linguistic organization, whose interplay produce determinations in the unconscious. In this respect, psychoanalytic vision looks for linkages among seemingly irrelevant spheres.

Another important feature of the psychoanalytic imagination is its inclination to explore historical specificity of its objects of analysis. In this regard, the unconscious forces, repressive mechanisms, and types of individuality such as neurotic are explored in relation to certain historical formations. For instance, in Totem and Taboo (Freud, 2001), historical formation of obsessional neurosis is explored in connection to functioning of taboo institution. Constitution of clans knitted together by a taboo is argued to be a result of overthrowing previous social organization depending on the ruling of tyrannical father figure. After killing this primary father, Freud suggests that bands of brothers were organized based on certain restrictions, rules, and regulations over their sexual and aggressive tendencies, which enable them to maintain their communal bonds. Thus, totemic formation is claimed to provide an organizing principle which regulate relations of sexuality and authority. On the other hand, it is stated that the transformation of the relations of authority ended up with alterations in psychic life, which implies constitution of the unconscious sense of guilt, remorse, and ambivalent co-existence of love and hatred towards father. It is asserted that the obsessional neurosis includes some points of agreement with mental life of the members of those clans, whose connectivity relies on historical reproduction of repressive impulses and unconscious sense of guilt in variety of social relations throughout the history. Even though these arguments are not valid, they are valuable in terms of looking for links among historical formations, modes of social change, repressive structuring of unconscious and sexuality, and character types like neurotic individual.

Problematization of the increased rationalization and alienation from libidinal forces could especially be observed in Civilization and its Discontents (Freud, 1962).
The book involves reflections upon how the civilization exploits sexuality in terms of channeling the repressed energy into formation and maintenance of social relations. In this sense, it indicates signs of sociological imagination with respect to exploring how repressive organization of sexuality and regulation of impulses go parallel with structuring of social organizations and institutional mechanisms. Yet, through this problematization, Freud does not imply that there would be a social formation in which free actualization of impulses or unrestricted individualities is possible. Rather, the crucial point of Freudian problematization of alienation lies in focusing on the inherent antagonisms of modern civilization which unavoidably creates tensions between individual freedom and systematic restrictions. In this sense, repression of sexuality and alienation from libidinal forces are evaluated as inevitable determinations of existing historical formation called civilization. In a way, it draws one’s attention to structural character of alienation and libidinal organization, which opens a path not for unrepressed individuality but a repressed individuality with a different kind of structure.

Sociological imagination of Freud also indicates itself in terms of following the requirements of problems in a constructive destructive fashion rather than applying a rigid method. This tendency could be examined in almost all of Freud’s texts. In this regard, it is not surprising to see a questioning of a so fundamental concept like unconscious or a confession about the haphazard character of elaborations on the dream process (Freud, 1989; Freud, 2010a). In line with sociological imagination, the vividness of descriptions and arguments convince one about the existence of passion, openness to novelty, and striving for originality. It is possible to sense the ongoing discussions and suspicions concerning the issue even in the context of presenting the ideas. In this regard, going after what the problematization requires, constantly questioning assumptions or notions, and re-formulating them in the light of new experiences or reactions are important qualities of the Freudian imagination. Thus, it prioritizes reaching a novel point of understanding or original discovery over any kind of limited method. Its exploratory character, openness to different paths, and multiplicity of connections offers inspiration for any social scientist. Also, its bravery for delving into the unknown, producing fresh hypothesis concerning the problem, and
not hesitating to rely on vague impressions encourage one to follow problems of structural significance by taking the risk of losing one’s way.

It is important to note what kind of limitations and possibilities this kind of conceptualization and analysis imply. Firstly, the conceptual framework I follow throughout the thesis operates as a template to justify my claims concerning the cruciality of Freudian psychoanalysis as an ontological ground. On the one hand, using this kind of bounded conceptual tools enabled pointing out important theoretical contexts and themes to engage with psychoanalytic vision. They allowed me to reach a clear-cut methodology in which links between conceptual dimensions of sociological imagination and psychoanalytic methodology were easily visible. In a way, they also enabled clearly observable application of methodological tools to Freud’s texts. Also, through this framework, I was able to indicate similarities between psychoanalytic methodology of Freud and sociological imagination as pictured by C. W. Mills in terms of reflecting upon various dimensions. On the other hand, in this endeavor, even though I sometimes reflect on some reductionist or essentialist potentials of Freudian approach, the story I portrayed seems to indicate well-operating sociological imagination embedded in Freud’s writings. Therefore, I construct a writing style and mode of analysis which mostly disregard contradictions between sociological imagination and the texts I have analyzed. Because of this kind of attitude, arguments concerning the potentials of Freudian imagination look shallow and insufficiently substantiated. In this sense, further studies which would like to investigate or construct Freudian sociological imagination could go into more detailed analysis of contradictions between promises of sociological imagination and what they encountered in Freud’s writings. This kind of attitude could contribute to developing more substantiated, detailed, and grounded analysis of Freudian psychoanalysis. It would also enable more fruitful discussions for locating psychoanalytic methodology in social theory and reaching novel modes of engaging with social.

Lastly, what is valuable about the kind of investigation pursued in this thesis could be explained based on the ongoing importance of the psychoanalysis for social theory and lack of research about why this is the case. Thus, reflections upon the links between the Freudian theoretical construction and sociological imagination would
offer fresh insights about both how to approach social and how to make use of psychoanalysis during this endeavor. This investigation is also supported by examining the traces of sociological imagination of Freud in various social theories, which would offer seeing possible ways of engaging with psychoanalytic vision. Also, in terms of sketching out the possible relations between historical circumstances and Freudian imagination, this thesis involves a striving to penetrate sociological determinations embedded in everyday life, interpersonal milieu, modes of thinking, and affective processes. Through all these efforts, it basically aims to stimulate novel sensations, problematizations, and ways of looking in analyzing the social.
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A: TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

SIGMUND FREUD’UN SOSYOLOJİK TAHAYYLÜ: FREUDYEN PSİKANALİZİ SOSYAL TEORİDE KONUMLANDIRMAYA DAİR BİR GİRİŞİM

1. Giriş

Psikanaliz, insan failliğinin oluşumunu; farkında olmadığımız zihinsel süreçleri, fikirleri ve güçleri inceleyerek veya sorunsallaştırmak anlayışına dair teoriler sonucunda sosyal teori için hep önemli bir konum teşkil etmiştir. Psikanalizin süreçlerine etkisi sosyolojik zeminlerini tespit etmek de bu anlamda önemli bir araştırma konusudur. Bu tarz bir motivasyon temelinde, mevcut tezin amacı Sigmund Freud’un sosyolojik tahayyülünü kavramsal düzeyde göstermek ve inşa etmekle birlikte Freudyen psikanalizi sosyal teoride konumlandırılmıştır. Ayrıca bu tarz bir çaba, psikanalize ilişkin olan sosyolojik özü açığa çıkarmaktan ziyade Freudyen keşfe dair yeni duyarlıklar geliştirme ve onun tarihselliğini araştırma amacı taşımaktadır.

psikanalizi ortaya çıkaran tarihsel koşullar incelenmiş ve psikanalizin tarihi gözden geçirilmiştir. Daha sonra, sosyolojik tahayyül bir kavramsal çerçeve olarak inşa edilmiş ve beş adet araştırma düzlemi belirlenmiştir. Bu düzlemler, psikanalitik kavramlarla ilişkilendirilerek işlevsel hale getirilmiş ve metodolojik bir yapı halini almıştır. Bu yapıyı oluşturan boyutlar şu şekildedir: En kişisel ve kişisel olmayan alan olarak bilinçdışı; bilinçdışı güçler, bireysel semptomlar, dil, cinsellik ve tarihin birbiriyile bağlantılı işleyişi; bilinçdışı, bastırma ve nevrotik bireysellik tarihsel belirliliği; libidinal güçlerden yabancılaşmanın sorunsallığı; ve yaratıcı bir yıkım olarak Freudyen keşif. Bu bağlamda Freud'un temel eserleri incelenmiş, sosyolojik tahayyül ile iliskisi kapsamında psikanalitik bir tahayyûlünün olanakları araştırılmış ve sosyal teoride psikanalize dair yapılan incelemeler veya teorik sorgulamalar göz önünde bulundurularak bu olanaklığa dair açıklamlarda bulunulmuştur.

2. Freud’un Kişisel Ortamı ile Toplumsal Yapı Arasındaki İlişkiselliiğin İzini Sürmek Ve Psikanalizin Kısa Tarihi

2.1. Freudyen Tahayyûlün Tarihselliği: Kişisel Ortam ile Toplumsal Yapı Arasındaki İlişkiselliiğin İzini Sürmek

Mills’in ortaya koyduğu sosyolojik tahayyûl bağlamında, kişisel deneyimler içinde bulundukları tarihsel koşullar çerçevesinde anlamlandırılır (Mills, 1959, p. 21). Bu açıdan, Freudyen tahayyûlün işleyişiini açıklarken onun parçası olduğu toplumsal ilişkileri de incelemek gerekir.

Bu bölüm üç kısımdan oluşmaktadır. İlk kısımda sosyal teoride kullanılan bazı kavramlar, Freud’un bireysellikini ilişkisel bir süreç olarak anlamaya hizmet etmeleri ve sosyolojik tahayyûl ile ortaklıkları bakımından tartışılmıştır. İkinci kısımda bazı tarihsel olaylar ile psikanalitik tahayyûl, Freud’un kişisel yaşamı ve duygusal süreçler arasındaki bağlanılar incelenmiştir. Son bölümde ise psikanalizin kurumsallaşmasının Freudyen tahayyûlün oluşumu ve gelişimindeki rolü araştırılmıştır.
2.1.1. Freud’un Bireyselliğine İlişkisel Bir Süreç Olarak Yaklaşmak


2.1.2. Baskın Tarihsel Cereyanlar Bağlamında Freudyen Tahayyül


kısısel motivasyonlarının oluşma sürecini de etkilediği hem Freud hem de çeşitli kaynaklar tarafından aktarılmaktadır (Freud, 2010b; Roudinesco, 2016).


2.1.3. Psikanalitik Tahayyülün Yapısal Zemini Olarak Kurumsallaşma


Söz konusu etkileşimlerin en önemlilerinden biri Jung ile Freud arasında olmuştur. Jung'un Yahudi olmayışi, psikanalizin Yahudi bilimi imajını yokabilecek bir figür olması açısından Freud'un ona daha fazla değer atfetmesinde ve yönetim roller vermesinde etkili olmuştur (Roudinesco, 2016, s. 145). Ayrıca, Jung ile Freud
arasındaki entelektüel etkileşim psikanalitik tahayyülün gelişiminde önemli bir yer tutar. Totem ve Tabu’nun ortaya çıkışı, Jung’un kültürel rölativizmine karşı cinsel bastırma ve Ödipus kompleksinin genel-geçer tarihselliğini ortaya koyma amacı taşır (Roudinesco, 2016, s. 186; Freud, 2001).

Ayrıca kurumsal ortam, psikanalizin psikiyatri gibi diğer alanlar, tıbbi kriterler veya hukuki düzenlemeler karşısında özerkliğinin savunulmasında önemli bir yere sahiptir (Roudinesco, 2016, ss. 351-352). Bu açıdan kurumsallık, amatör psikanalizin sürdürülmesinde ve Freudyen tahayyülün oluştuğu entelektüel çeşitliliğin korunmasında bir mücadele alanı sağlamıştır.

2.2. Psikanalizin Kısa Tarihi

2.2.1. Freudyen Keşif

2.2.2. Psikanalizin Kurumsal Yapısı


2.2.3. Kleinney Görüş, Ego Psikolojisi, Nesne İlişkileri Okulu ve Kişiler-arası Psikoloji


2.2.4. Lacanyen Dönüşün Değerlendirilmesi


3. Kavramsal Bir Çerçeve Olarak Sosyolojik Tahayyül

3.1. En Kişisel-Yakın Olan ile En Kişisel Olmayan-Uzak Arasındaki İlişkileri Göstermek

Sosyolojik tahayyülün bu boyutu, C. W. Mills’in sosyal bilimcilere yüklediği temel görevle yakından bağlantılıdır (Mills, 1959). Buna göre, tarih ile kişilerin özyaşamöyküleri arasındaki ilişkileri araştırmak ve bunları toplumun yapısal işleyişine bağlarını gözetmek klasik sosyal bilimin temel işlevlerinden biridir (Mills, 1959, ss. 6-7). Yani sosyolojik tahayyül, en kişisel gibi görünen dertlerin

---

7 Keyif ve acının bir arada oluşunu imleyen Lacanyen kavram (Fink, 1995).
arkasındaki yapısal süreçleri açığa çıkarmaya dair bir yakınlık içerir. Bu bağlamda bireylerin motivasyonları ve duygulanımları, içinde bulundukları tarihsel koşullara ve toplumsal konumlara dayanarak sorunsallaştırılır. Sosyolojik tahayyülün bir boyutunun bu şekilde kavrumsallaştırılması Freudyen psikanalitik metodolojinin de benzer bir eğilimi olduğu dair bir izlenimde kaynaklanmaktadır.

3.2. Araştırma Alanını Diğer Toplumsal Sahalara Bağlamak

Mills’e göre sosyal bilimci; kişisel dertler, özyaşamöyküleri ve tarih arasındaki ilişkileri incelerken sürekli olarak yalıtılmış halde işlediği varsayılan alanlar arasında hiç aklı gelmeyecek bağlantıları keşfetme amacı taşımalıdır (Mills, 1959, s. 199). Bu anlamda sosyolojik tahayyül; çeşitli olgular, eylemler ve bireysellikler arasındaki bağlar odaklanarak bunları yapısal süreçler, toplumsal değişim mekanizmaları ve dönemin tarihsel koşulları ekseninde değerlendirir. Bu eğilimin uygulanması esnasında; çeşitli bakış açıları arasında mekik dokumak, muğlak izlenimleri cesaretle takip etmek ve tarihsel karşılaştırmalardan veya modellerden faydalanmak gibi stratejiler uygulanabilir (Mills, 1959, ss. 211-225). Kaotik ve deneyel bir çalışma tarzını çağırıştırsa da son kertede amaç toplumu bütünsel bir şekilde kavramaya çalışmakta.

3.3. Belirli Tarihsel Koşulları Bireysellik Tipleriyle İlişkilendirmek

Sosyolojik tahayyülün bir diğer boyutu; sosyo-tarihsel yapılarla bireylerin özyaşamöyküleri arasındaki bağıların araştırılması ekseninde, bireysellik tiplerinin ve psikolojik yapıların tarihselliliğinin incelenmesine dayanır (Mills, 1959, p. 143). Bu ilişkisellinin incelenmesi, belirli tarihsel koşullar ve yapıların belirli tip insanlar ürettiği savı üzerinde temellenir. Bu anlamda sosyolojik tahayyül; çalışılan toplumsal oluşumun tarihsel olarak spesifik karakteri, bu toplumda iktidarın kuruluş biçimleri ve tarih-yapımı şekilleri düşünülüğünde, bu süreçleri bireylerin yaşam koşullarındaki sınırlılıklar ve olanaklar ekseninde inceler (Mills, 1959, ss. 151-158). Yani sosyolojik tahayyül perspektifinden, kurumsal ve yapısal süreçlerin işleyişi belirli toplumsal
rollerin yanı sıra çeşitli motivasyonlar, amaçlar ve duygulardan da bağımsız düşünülemez.

3.4. Akıl ve Özgürliğin İnsan İlişkilerindeki Konumu Bağlamında Yoğun Rasyonalizasyon ve Yabancılaşmanın Sorunsallaştırılması


3.5. Araştırılan Sorunsalın Gerekliliklerini Takip Etmek

kavramları sürekli sorgulayarak yeni bulgular ışığında değerlendirilmek klasik sosyal bilimin ve sosyolojik tahayyülü temel işleyiş biçimi olarak resmedilir.

4. En Kişisel Olan Ve Kişisel Olmayan Bir Alan Olarak Bilinçdışı


5. Bilinçdışı Güçler, Bireysel Semptomlar, Dil, Cinsellik Ve Tarihın Birbirlerine Bağlılığı

Freudyen tahayyülü bilinçdışı, semptomlar, dil, cinsellik ve tarih gibi çeşitli alanları birbirlerine bağlı biçimde ele alma eğilimini gözlemlemek için The Psychopathology of Everyday Life (Freud, 2010b) önemli bir kaynak teşkil eder. Bu kitap, bir ismi hatırlayamama gibi gündelik edim hatalarını ve süreçleri inceleyerek

6. Bilinçdışı, Bastırma ve Nevrotik Bireysellikin Tarihsel Olarak Spesifik Karakteri

süreçlerine benzeyen bazı boyutlar içerdiği savunulur. Bu argümanlar geçersiz bile olsa; Freudyen psikanalizin tarihsel yapılar, toplumsal değişim biçimleri, bilinçdışının be cinselliğin bastırma mekanizması temelinde yapılanması ve nevrotik bireysellik gibi süreçler arasındaki ilişkiye araştırması sosyolojik tahayyül açısından değerlidir.

7. Libidinal Güçlerden Yabancılaşma Bağlamında Akıl Ve Özgürlüğün Sorunsallaştırılması


8. Katı Metotlar Karşısında Yaratıcı Bir Yıkım Olarak Freudyen Tahayyül

Freudyen tahayyülün bu boyutunu Freud’un birçok metninde gözlemlemek mümkündür. Bu bağlamda bu metinlerde, psikanalizin en temel kavramlarından biri olan bilinçdışının sorgulanmasına veya rüya sürecine dair incelemenin gelişigüzel

9. Sonuç

Öncelikle, bu tezin birçok sınırlılıklar ve olanaklar taşıdığını belirtmek önemlidir. Olanaklar konusunda, kullanılan kavramsal araçların açık ve anlaşılır bir şekilde işlediğini, sosyolojik tahayyül ile Freudyen psikanaliz arasındaki bağlantı noktarının güçlü bir şekilde göstermeye imkan verdiğini söylemek mümkündür. Ayrıca sınırları belirli bir metodoloji izlemek, Freudyen psikanalizi sosyal teoride konumlandırımın açısından ve oldukça geniş bir literatürü belirli boyutlar üzerinden incelemek bakımından kolaylık sağlamıştır.

Sınırlılıklar konusunda ise, tez boyunca takip edilen kavramsal çerçeveın yoğunlukla argümanları meşrulaştırma yönünde işlediği ve bu bağlamda Freudyen psikanalizinin ontolojik açıdan verimli yönerine odaklandığı söylenebilir. Bu açıdan bu tezin, Freudyen sosyolojik tahayyülü betimleme girişiminde Freud’un indirgemeçi ve özcü yönerini görmeyen gelerek pürüzsüz biçimde işleyen bir psikanalitik metodoloji izlenimi uyandırmadığı gözükılmektedir. Yine bu sebepten, Freud’un
sosyolojik tahayyülüne dair argümanlar çoğunlukla yetersiz kalmış ve derinlemesine tartışılamamıştır. Bu bağlamda, Freudyen tahayyülü inceleme veya inşa etme amacı taşıyan sonraki çalışmaların sosyolojik tahayyül ve Freudyen psikanaliz arasındaki çelişkilere de odaklanması önerilir. Bu tarz bir analiz, Freudyen psikanalize dair yeni duyarlılıklar geliştirme ve farklı tartışmalara olanak sağlama açısından çok daha verimli olacaktır.

Son olarak bu tezde yürütülen araştırmanın değeri olarak psikanalizin sosyal teori için süregelen önemi ve bu konudaki araştırma eksikliği öne sürülebilir. Bu açıdan tezin temelini oluşturan Freudyen teorik inşa ve sosyolojik tahayyül arasındaki bağlantıların incelenmesi, toplumsalın araştırılması ve psikanalizin bu konuda ne gibi araçlar sunabileceği noktasında farklı iç görüler sunabilir. Bunun yanında psikanalitik keşfin Freud’un özYaşamöyküsü, tarihsel koşullar ve yapısal süreçler bağlamında incelenmesi, tezin katkı sunabileceği boyutlardan bir diğeri olabilir.
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