

**ISTANBUL BILGI UNIVERSITY**  
**INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS**  
**PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL THOUGHT MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM**

**PSYCHOANALYSIS AS A TRUTH GAME IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE  
NEOLIBERAL SUBJECT**

**ZEYNEP DUYGU YEŐILDAĐ**  
**119679016**

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ferda Keskin**

**ISTANBUL**  
**2022**

**Psychoanalysis as a Truth Game in the Constitution of the Neoliberal Subject**

**Neoliberal Öznenin Kurulumunda Bir Hakikat Oyunu Olarak Psikanaliz**

Zeynep Duygu Yeşildağ

119679016

**Thesis Advisor:** Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ferda Keskin

(Signature).....

Istanbul Bilgi University

**Jury Member:** Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Talay  
Turner

(Signature).....

Istanbul Bilgi University

**Jury Member:** Prof. Dr. Ceyhan Kandemir

(Signature).....

Istanbul University

**Date of Approval of the Thesis:** 21.07.2022

**Total Number of Pages:** 95

**Keywords (Turkish)**

- 1) Neoliberalism
- 2) Özne
- 3) Psikanaliz
- 4) Hakikat Oyunu
- 5) Kendilik

**Keywords (English)**

- 1) Neoliberalism
- 2) Subject
- 3) Psychoanalysis
- 4) Truth Game
- 5) Self

## **FOREWORD**

First of all, I would like to thank my esteemed supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ferda Keskin, who was my thesis advisor and inspired me with his lectures on this study,

To all my instructors and jury members, whose ideas helped me gain new perspectives, and whose courses I had the honor of attending during my undergraduate and graduate studies,

To my family who supported me in every sense throughout my academic life,

To my soul mate B.D., who is my spiritual thesis advisor, who has always believed in me and whose support and presence I have always felt, and who has made my life meaningful,

Endless thanks.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT .....	vi
ÖZET .....	viii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
FIRST CHAPTER: MICHEL FOUCAULT’S PHILOSOPHY .....	10
1.1. THE ANALYSIS OF POWER AND POWER RELATIONS .....	10
1.2. THE CONCEPTION OF SUBJECT AND TRUTH.....	18
1.3. THE CONCEPTION OF RATIONAL AND IRRATIONAL .....	24
SECOND CHAPTER: SIGMUND FREUD’S THEORY AND PERSONALITY FORMATION.....	31
2.1. THE FORMATION OF PSYCHOANALYTIC THEORY .....	31
2.2. THE STRUCTURE OF PERSONALITY .....	35
2.3. THE DEVELOPMENT OF PERSONALITY.....	42
THIRD CHAPTER: THE STRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEOLIBERAL SOCIETY .....	45
3.1. THE BIRTH OF NEOLIBERALISM.....	45
3.2. THE APPROACH OF NEOLIBERAL GOVERNMENTALITY .....	49
3.3. THE CONSTITUTION OF NEOLIBERAL SUBJECT .....	55
FOURTH CHAPTER: ANALYSIS OF THE QUEST FOR SELF.....	67
4.1. SIGMUND FREUD’S APPROACH TO SELF-UNDERSTANDING ....	67
4.2. MICHEL FOUCAULT’S APPROACH TO SELF-UNDERSTANDING .....	71
CONCLUSION.....	76

**REFERENCES .....85**

## **ABSTRACT**

In this study, "the quest for the self" as a notion of the ongoing search for absolute truth in human history will be analyzed from the perspective of Michel Foucault and Sigmund Freud. In the first chapter, Michel Foucault's ideas on power will be discussed comprehensively and the factors that constitute the subject will be explained together with the subject and truth section by emphasizing the importance of knowledge-power relations. At the end of the first part, the notions of rationality and irrationality will be discussed together with their historicity, and it will be pointed out that these concepts are discursively produced. After claiming that those who are outside of reason are marginalized by dominant systems, the second part will discuss Sigmund Freud and the theory of psychoanalysis. The function of 'psy' disciplines in forming personality and the limitations that psychoanalysis brings to the individual in this direction will be explained.

In the third part, the neoliberal system will be introduced to the discussion and the notions regarding the positioning of the subject of the society functioning under the influence of neoliberal governmentality will be explained. Michel Foucault's model of biopolitics, which deals with the processing of bodies in systems of governmentality, and finally the facets of the formation of the subject in line with the historical realities of neoliberal governmentality will be described. The factors of the objectivities claimed by Sigmund Freud with his theory corresponding to subjective objectivities within the scope of Michel Foucault's thoughts will be explained, and the effect of the neoliberal system on the self will be discussed.

In the fourth chapter, the aspects of the individual's questioning and quest for the self for centuries will be discussed from the perspective of Sigmund Freud and Michel Foucault. Finally, the theory of psychoanalysis in the practices of self-understanding will be discussed as the truth game that legitimizes the neoliberal order. The scope of the study will be limited to the neoliberal subject formed within the framework of neoliberal rationality from the perspective of Christian Laval and Pierre Dardot in line with Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytic theory and the insights that led it to be referred to as a cultural theory and Michel Foucault's thoughts on

the manifestation of truth games in the context of power relations. The aim of the study is to position the theory of psychoanalysis, which is discussed in the corpus of Michel Foucault but not in detail, within the neoliberal order.

**Keywords:** Neoliberalism, Psychoanalysis, Self, Subject, Truth Game

## ÖZET

Bu tez çalışmasında insanlık tarihinde süregelen mutlak hakikat arayışının bir nosyonu olarak “kendilik arayışı” Michel Foucault ve Sigmund Freud perspektifinden incelenecektir. İlk bölümde Michel Foucault’nun iktidara dair düşünceleri kapsamlı bir şekilde ele alınacak, bilgi-iktidar ilişkilerinin önemine değinmek suretiyle özne ve hakikat bölümüyle birlikte özneyi oluşturan etkenler açıklanacaktır. İlk bölümün sonunda, akıl ve akıldışı nosyonları tarihsellikleri ile birlikte tartışılmak suretiyle, bahse konu kavramların içi doldurulan söylemler olduğuna işaret edilecektir. Aklın dışında kalanların egemen sistemler tarafından ötekileştirildiğine değinilmesinin ardından ikinci bölümde, Sigmund Freud ve psikanaliz teorisi ele alınacaktır. Psi disiplinlerinin kişiliği oluşturma işlevi ve bu doğrultuda psikanalizin, bireye getirdiği sınırlılıklar açıklanacaktır.

Üçüncü bölümde neoliberal sistem konuya dahil olacak ve neoliberal yönetimsellik etkisinde işleyen toplumun öznesinin, neoliberal özne olarak konumlanmasına dair nosyonlar açıklanacaktır. Michel Foucault’nun yönetim sistemlerinde bedenlerin işlenmesini konu alan biyopolitika modeli ve en nihayetinde yönetimsellik modeli ile birlikte tezahür eden neoliberal yönetimselliğin tarihsel gerçeklikleri olan hakikat oyunları doğrultusunda öznenin oluşumuna dair veçheler betimlenecektir. Sigmund Freud’un teorisiyle beraber iddia ettiği nesnelliklerin, Michel Foucault’nun düşünceleri kapsamında öznel nesnelliklere tekabül etmesine dair etkenler açıklanacak, neoliberal sistemin kendiliğe etkisi tartışılacaktır.

Dördüncü bölüm ile birlikte, bireyin yüzyıllardır kendiliğini sorgulamasına ve aramasına dair veçheler Sigmund Freud ve Michel Foucault perspektifinden tartışılacak; en nihayetinde psikanaliz teorisi de kendini anlama pratiklerine dahil edilmek suretiyle, neoliberal düzeni meşrulaştıran hakikat oyunu olarak ele alınacaktır. Çalışmanın kapsamı, Sigmund Freud’un psikanalitik kuramı ve kültürel bir teori olarak anılmasına neden olan kavrayışlar ile Michel Foucault’nun iktidar ilişkileri bağlamında hakikat oyunlarının tezahür edişine dair düşünceleri doğrultusunda Christian Laval ve Pierre Dardot’un perspektifinden neoliberal



akılsallık çerçevesinde oluşan neoliberal özne ile sınırlı tutulacaktır. Çalışmanın amacı, Michel Foucault külliyatında işaret edilen fakat detaylı bir şekilde yer verilmeyen psikanaliz teorisini, neoliberal düzen içerisinde konumlandırmaktır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Neoliberalizm, Özne, Psikanaliz, Hakikat Oyunu, Kendilik

## INTRODUCTION

The search of the human being for an absolute "truth" and accordingly for a genuine "self" is an ongoing quest with a long history. Throughout the historical process, various objectivities have emerged as various ideologies have become dominant. The objective knowledge of each period has also given birth to the "self" projects unique to each period. The fact that the knowledge claimed to be objective in societies reflects the ideology specific to the relevant period has brought about questions about the notion of truth. In the historical process, norms on how people's selves can be "true" have been dictated with the emergence of new objective knowledges or the domination of new ideologies. The dominant systems of society convey instructions on the characteristics that the individual should have in his/her body as well as his/her soul, through various means in various periods. The norms according to which the individual's mind is categorized as ill or healthy have progressed differently in different historical periods. In other words, the fact that the central authority in the Middle Ages was religion and the personality had norms in this context can be taken into consideration. The fact that the characteristics of the self accepted by the way of thinking that progressed in this direction took a different path with the centralization of science reveals the historicity of objective knowledge. When Scholastic philosophy was at the center of philosophical thought in the Middle Ages, the constitution of the subject on the basis of justifying and systematizing religious belief was considered as truth. Therefore, the acceptable subject of the Middle Ages consisted of selves who internalized the rules of religion and lived their lives accordingly. With the Age of Enlightenment, parallel to the central authority becoming science, the forms of the acceptable subject also changed, and the subject's self began to be reconstituted accordingly.

The fact that knowledge that is accepted as true and objective in a certain historical period is not considered true in another historical period and undergoes change points to the influence of dominant ideologies. This thesis will be based on the philosophy of Michel Foucault due to the main idea that the quest for the self throughout the historical process continues under the impact of power relations.

Hence, the broad aim of this study is to indicate the impact of power relations by pointing out that projects of the self are historically constituted. Indeed, all experience that can be attributed to the individual such as crime, sexuality, and madness, which constitute the characteristics of the self, are produced, according to Michel Foucault. At the same time, none of them are constituted independently of power relations. The experiences constituted through power relations become the norms of society by being carried through the institutions that the current age has constructed to maintain the existing system. This is precisely why Michel Foucault argued that power is everywhere and pointed out that science, which became dominant with the Age of Enlightenment, produces truths and objectivities in line with power relations. In order to address the historicity of power, he explained various models of power and put forward the model of "biopower" as a model that involves both the body and the soul of human beings. By biopower, on which the main idea of this study will be based, the human body has become altered and transformed for the sake of various dominant ideologies.

Emphasizing the power-knowledge relation and the subjectivity of the truths that emerge in this direction, this study will focus on the discipline of psychology that dictates the human body and soul in general. How scientific institutions such as psychology, psychiatry, and psychotherapy, which will be referred to collectively as 'psy' disciplines, form an individual's mind and body will be discussed. At the same time, references to the emergence of the relevant scientific institutions and the nature of 'psy' disciplines constituted through power relations will again be based on Michel Foucault's thoughts. Sigmund Freud's thoughts will be included in the discussion of the theory of psychoanalysis, one of the greatest scientific narratives of the Age of Enlightenment, which constitutes the main question of this study.

The reasons why the theory of psychoanalysis was a great scientific narrative for the psychological world of its time will be explored and the influence of power will be discussed. At the same time, the changes that the theory of psychoanalysis has undergone while maintaining its relevance from the past to the present and the examination of the factors that cause it to be discussed as a cultural theory will be an important part of this study. One of the purposes for bringing

Michel Foucault and Sigmund Freud together in this thesis is that both thinkers' thoughts on the human mind are formed through the 'psy' disciplines. Although the two thinkers have contrasting approaches, they both position psychoanalysis as a quest for the self. With Sigmund Freud's theory of psychoanalysis, the effect of the unconscious and the reflection of the quest for the self in this direction as if it was discovered for the first time ends with Michel Foucault's genealogy of psychoanalysis. At the same time, according to Michel Foucault, Sigmund Freud's theory of psychoanalysis involves the concealment of the quest for the self by assuming a medical identity. This study will point out that the quest for the self in historical processes has always proceeded with different truth games. From Michel Foucault's perspective, the institutions of human psychology have a structure that shapes the mind from the outside. Sigmund Freud, in contrast, argues that the institutions and theories of human psychology are the basis for understanding the inner mechanisms. Unlike Sigmund Freud, who believes that with the increase in knowledge the individual will gain power over himself, Michel Foucault believes that power shapes self-knowledge. Although they have diametrically opposed views on human nature and the phenomenon of society, what both thinkers have in common is that psychoanalysis has an impact on the individual. Another point where the two thinkers are at odds is in their perspectives on power. Sigmund Freud proposes that a civilized society submit to the destruction caused by power relations, and he has no objections to shaping human psychology in this direction. However, Michel Foucault advises that we think like the rest of society and not overlook power relations. It is precisely at this point that there is a need to compare the ideas of Michel Foucault and Sigmund Freud in carrying out the medical and cultural function of psychoanalysis, and this is what this study will cover.

Neoliberalism and the development of biopolitics, a model of power in which people are changed from the inside out to support the existing regime, are responsible for the emergence of "neoliberal subjects". The neoliberal subject is consistently created for power on the basis of "efficiency" and is changed and transformed in case of any disturbance. The way to become an acceptable subject in the age of biopower is to internalize the desire of neoliberalism and make it one's

own. All these processes of quest for the self and subjectification will be discussed within the framework of neoliberal governmentality. In neoliberal governmentality, bodies and souls must be completely included in the system. In other words, various truth games are needed for the constitution of neoliberal subjects. As a matter of fact, the individuals of the neoliberal order are obliged to convert themselves again in the face of psychological deviations. Within the scope of the study, the conversion of the individual in the neoliberal order using 'psy' disciplines will be of great importance while positioning the individual as a neoliberal subject who should contribute to society. Finally, it will be discussed how psychoanalytic theory is formed in accordance with power relations and how it maintains its validity by undergoing a conversion in the neoliberal order. The neoliberal order's need for 'psy' disciplines will be addressed, along with its desire to control the subject's psyche. At the same time, the reasons for the emergence of the need to re-constitute the theory of psychoanalysis, which is based on impulses outside of consciousness, due to historical necessities will be explained. Referring all behavior patterns that jeopardize the continuity of the existing system and prevent the corporatization of the individual to the unconscious will be attributed as the conversion of psychoanalysis. In the neoliberal system, psychoanalysis will be discussed both as a theory of culture that produces selves and as a means of converting behaviors that are not accepted by the existing order. While emphasizing that psychoanalysis is not independent from power relations, Michel Foucault and Sigmund Freud's perspectives on human nature will be compared. It will be argued that psychoanalysis, both as a psychotherapy technique and as a cultural theory, is a technique of self-conversion rather than a self-quest. Accordingly, psychoanalysis will be positioned as a way of totalizing entrepreneurial individuals in society. This thesis has ultimately emerged out of the need for a critical perspective against the transforming theory of psychoanalysis and scientific domination in the world of the 21st century.

In the first part of this study, descriptions of power practices are given by referring to Michel Foucault's works on power. The section on the analysis of power and power relations avoids drawing general frameworks, but describes the concepts

of power. It will be argued that power is not only a place of domination, and it will be explained that that it should not be independent from the production of knowledge. Where there is knowledge there is power and wherever there is power there is knowledge. It will be argued that the notions of knowledge and power, which are defined in a reciprocal relationship, produce various norms. As a consequence of the claim that the history of power does not simply consist of oppression, issues relating to the constitution of pleasure and meaning will be discussed. While analyzing power, descriptions of power relations will be discussed within Foucault's perspective. In this respect, the models of sovereignty, discipline, biopower and governmentality as power models will be explained and their transformations of human life will be taken into consideration. While writing the chapter on the analysis of power and power relations, Foucault's works *Security, Territory, Population* and *History of Sexuality* will be taken as a basis. It will be argued that it is not possible for power to narrow the field of possible actions of, in other words, to dominate the one on whom it is exercised, even if it inclines to do so. It will be stated that power is a system that has freedom as its precondition. The breadth of the range of possible actions will be shown to be a condition for freedom. In this direction, it will be asserted that power cannot exist without freedom, and that groups of actions are produced through their relationships. By arguing that power encompasses is everywhere, the factors that make it touch everyone without exception through generating numerous discourses will be discussed.

With the chapter on subject and truth, the frameworks capable of describing the subject will be explained and its relationship with truth will be analyzed. Discourse, as the sum of the discursive and non-discursive practices, will be discussed in detail in this section. It will be explained that discourse creates the subject and that the subject owes its existence to the discourse. As a result of the explanations that there is nothing but discourse, the methods and techniques of producing discourse will be discussed. With the development of the modern subject, the objectification of the subject and the factors that constitute the subject in parallel with the formation of the truth regime in line with discourses on the axis of power-subject relations will be discussed. It will be emphasized that power, which

manifests itself as a practice of division by operating through dichotomies, produces subjects. The effect of power on subjects' ideologies will be explored in line with the fact that power is always on one side of the dichotomy by producing diverse oppositions. It will be emphasized that one of the notions that make up the dichotomy is supported by the government and that the excluded side is shaped by discourses. Through emphasizing that the subject's production objectifies it, explanations concerning its construction as a result of various dichotomies will be provided. In order to explain the notion of the game of truth that accompanies the constitution of the subject, Foucault's works such as *Subject and Power*, *Society Must Be Defended*, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, *The Birth of Biopolitics* will be frequently referred to. The concept of a game of truth that implies the articulation of human existence with a certain discourse will be described and positioned as *historical a priori*.

Following the explanation of power-knowledge relations, in the chapter on rationality and irrationality, the factors regarding the construction of the related notions will be explained. The historical a priori construction of conceptions that are produced in accordance with discourses and are subject to various definitions in the historical plane will be described. It will be pointed out that madness, mental illness and the abnormal are constituted by discourses. Hence, the madness contained in religious doctrines and the mental disease included in medical treatments as discourses of rationality and irrationality emerge from various historical realities on the axis of power-knowledge. Explanations will be given for their inclusion in medical practices with scientific domination. In the chapter on rationality and irrationality, Foucault's thoughts on the related notions will be brought together within the context of *History of Sexuality* and *The Great Confinement*. Considering the formation of the discourse of madness and its historical change in this direction, it will be argued that the mad become the subjects of confinement practices.

In the second chapter, the theory of psychoanalysis, which will be positioned as a game of truth, will be explained in all its facets, as medical practices become the subject matter of the thesis. The whole set of theories that emerged with the

claim of understanding human behavior and are named as “psychoanalytic theory” by Sigmund Freud will be explained. In the chapter on psychoanalytic theory, Freud's works *Introduction to Psychoanalysis*, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* will be taken as a basis and the main issues related to the theory will be discussed by explaining the determinations that the individual has two basic instincts.

In the chapter on the structure of personality, the topographic model and the structural model will be explained in detail, and in this respect, the ego defense mechanisms that occur in the internal conflict of the individual will be discussed. As the categories of consciousness that comprise the topographic model, preconscious, conscious, and unconscious will be discussed. The functions of consciousness, which include the impulses that the individual is aware of, the functions of unconscious, which include the impulses that the individual is not aware of, and the functions of preconscious, which provide a bridge between these two conceptions, will be examined. After the explanations about the topographic model, the structural model, which includes other factors in the formation of personality, will be discussed. This discussion will focus on the shaping of the personality of the individual in line with the notions of the structural model consisting of the id, ego and superego. It will be emphasized that there are ideas that prevent an individual from living in society by associating with the unconscious and the id. In line with the conflicts of the superego, which represents the social and moral aspect, and the id, which represents the primitive self, the deadlocks of the ego will be explained. The defense mechanisms that Freud claims developed in the face of conflicts that the ego has to struggle with will be discussed. The relevant mechanisms will be explained by emphasizing that the ego employs various defense mechanisms in order to incorporate the person in social life. In the chapter on the development of personality, the periods of psychosexual development described by Freud will be explained and the problems that arise in the world of psychology due to the tasks that are not completed in these periods will be discussed. As psychosexual developmental period, the oral, anal, phallic, latent, and genital periods, as well as the deviations that may arise throughout these times, will be examined. Abnormalities, which Freud describes as fixation, and which individuals



are obliged to struggle with as a result of deviations that may occur in periods, will be discussed.

In the third chapter, neoliberalism will be dealt with, on the basis of Pierre Hardot and Christian Laval's book *The New Way of the World*, in parallel with Foucault's ideas in this regard. In this chapter, firstly, the birth of neoliberalism will be discussed by identifying the points where liberalism reached an impasse, and then the factors that led to the emergence of neoliberalism will be discussed. After the notions of neoliberal order are explained, the chapter on neoliberal governmentality will be discussed in parallel with Foucault's thoughts in this context. Since our age is a neoliberal age, neoliberal society and its form of government, neoliberalism functioning through governmentality, in other words, 'neoliberal governmentality' will be discussed. By explaining that neoliberal governmentality changes and transforms societies, it will be argued that it puts society in a competitive deadlock, and the aspects of the market society will be discussed. Population and government of population will be pointed out as the problematic of neoliberal governmentality, and the practices of transformation applied in this direction will be discussed. In order to internalize the norms produced by the order, individuals will be transformed without being aware of it and institutions will be shaped in this direction. It will be argued that the state of being compelled to act against the individuals of the neoliberal order creates a false notion of freedom. In line with various statistical methods, it will be discussed that individuals become a part of statistics and find value in this space. Since producing subjects that make the sustainability of the market society possible is vital for the continuity of the system, factors regarding the conversion of individuals will be discussed within the chapter on the neoliberal subject. Explanations capable of characterizing the neoliberal subject will be provided, and the self-corporation of the entrepreneurial subject will be discussed. It will be discussed that neoliberal subjects, who are asked to make market virtues their own, spend their lives in competition in order to be respected individuals in society. As suggested by the neoliberal order, the efforts of the subjects who make the interests of the market society their individual interests to produce their human capital will be pointed out.

It will be discussed that the neoliberal subject, who positions his/her value in the society in this way by participating in business life, experiences psychic splits and that anxiety situations arise as a result of these great responsibilities. Therefore, it will be claimed that the neoliberal order pushes the individual to 'psy' disciplines in order to convert and attention will be drawn to the formation of the neoliberal subject in this direction.

In the fourth chapter, the individual's quest for the self will be addressed along with a questioning attitude towards the individual's becoming the subjects of various experiences throughout the course of history. This chapter will be based on Foucault's book *Technologies of the Self*, which contains his seminars on the techniques of forming the self. First of all, the main subject of this thesis, Sigmund Freud and the teachings of psychoanalytic theory to understand the individual's self will be discussed. The factors that led psychoanalytic theory to become not only a therapeutic approach but also a cultural field of study will be discussed. Secondly, the main idea of this thesis, Michel Foucault's thoughts on the techniques of self-knowledge will be discussed, and it will be stated that the individual's self-understanding pre-dates psychoanalysis.

Eventually, the factors that lead to the inclusion of psychoanalytic theory as a subject of this thesis will be formed on the analysis initiated by Michel Foucault. It will be approached within the framework of a critical attitude towards the neoliberal subject that internalizes the truth games in parallel with the adoption of historical realities as objectivities to subjects in line with various technologies of power. By comparing the thoughts of Sigmund Freud and Michel Foucault, contrasts and similarities will be pointed out. From the perspective of Michel Foucault, Sigmund Freud's theory will be examined as will be the function of psychoanalysis in this direction. Finally, the aspects of the neoliberal subject of the market society shaped by competition will be discussed in relation to the theory of psychoanalysis as a grand scientific narrative.

**FIRST CHAPTER:  
MICHEL FOUCAULT'S PHILOSOPHY**

**1.1. THE ANALYSIS OF POWER AND POWER RELATIONS**

The word “*power*” in English corresponds to *pouvoir* in French. When the etymologies of these words are compared, the content of the concept of *power* is revealed. Since the earliest of times, power has always been seen as a product of the dynamic relationships that exist between individuals, groups, and societies. According to this view, power includes the concrete or intangible actions of one society on another society or societies; one individual on another individual or individuals; one group over another group or groups. In addition to determining values, norms, and beliefs, it forms relevant concrete and abstract activities of an individual, group, or society. Thus, power is the manifestation of the majority. In interpersonal interaction, the constitution of fundamental conceptualizations, such as determined norms, values, and beliefs, is influenced by power; it emerges as a result of the dominant ideology. This dominant ideological situation and the conceptualizations that have been formed or determined as a result of the application of power demonstrate the existence of an authority. and the first thing that typically comes to mind in relation to the concept of "power" is the dominant position held by the state.

However, Michel Foucault did not position the idea of "power" in this way. The "Method" chapter in the first volume of the *History of Sexuality* contains his clearest descriptions of the conceptualization of power, which occupies an important place in his thoughts, and especially his explanations of what power is not. Power will be regarded not as a state institution whose duty is to maintain the loyalty of its citizens, but rather as a network of strategic relationships. Foucault avoided using sharp statements or a definition that could be attributed as a theory when expressing his thoughts on the subject of power. He considers power to be a historical mechanism. It is impossible to confine the conceptualization of power as a domain

of strategic social relations to a definition and to draw sharp lines around its boundaries. Since defining power would contradict the nature of the concept, it is only possible to analyze and characterize it. Power can occur anywhere, regardless of changes in location, time, or space. Power is everywhere because it can generate itself, reproduce at any point, and originate from anywhere. Power, which does not have a fixed point of origin and can be understood in terms of the pervasive function it plays, cannot be described as static or fixed. Rather, it is dynamic and continual. Foucault rejects the distinction between the ruler and the ruled, which is used in the classical definition of power. Power does not have dualities within it, it is not just a superstructure with simple functions like prohibition, and it is applied from the bottom up as opposed to the top down model. According to Foucault, power should not be understood as an institution or a structure, but as a set of heterogeneously applied relations that can change and transform within a particular historical period, a particular society, and within the context of particular relations. In Foucault's words:

*“It seems to me that power must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses them; as the support which these force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or a system, or on the contrary, the disjunctions and contradictions which isolate them from one another; and lastly, as the strategies in which they take effect, whose general design or institutional crystallization is embodied in the state apparatus, in the formulation of the law, in the various social hegemonies (Foucault, 1978: 92)”*,

Foucault argues that what constitutes power is the sphere of relations and that there is no central position in this sphere. It is as a result of the institutional crystallization of power relations that the concept of "state" can become possible.

Power, according to Foucault, is not a unilateral mechanism of oppression. But he did not deny that if one set of actions blocks another in the absolute sense,

domination becomes probable. It is widely acknowledged that the potential for power relations to evolve into domination is dangerous, but power itself is a set of relations between sets of actions. Absolute limitation of the action clusters is therefore impossible because it could lead to the annihilation of the omnipresence of power. In other words, power expands its ubiquitous function by allowing an individual to be free or to have a wide range of possible actions. In contrast to the classical definition of freedom, the freedom of the individual is actually the freedom of power, and in this sense, freedom can arise from power relations. Although freedom is not a metaphysical or transcendent concept, it is a concept that is intertwined with power and is related to the world. In general definitions, freedom pits power against the individual, but according to Foucault, freedom is not ontologically and ethically opposed to power. Freedom is only possible in the presence of power relations, just as social relations are only possible in the presence of power relations.

Power is exercised as long as there are independent subjects, and in this context, the existence of individuals or collectively diverse subjects with different behavioral patterns is required. In fact, the concept of freedom is not one that has demonstrated its universality in the course of historical continuity. Instead, freedom is the capacity of the individual to resist in spite of the dominant discourse, which emerges as a result of the possibilities produced in accordance with power relations. Freedom in power relations is an essential concept that entails both encouragement and struggle. Inherent to power relations are concepts such as encouragement, struggle, and conflict, which are possible manifestations of the strategic game of individual freedom. Power and liberty, which are in a complicated relationship, do not exclude each other. The requirement of freedom for the existence of power relations makes domination impossible. If freedom is not a given, everything appears to be about obeying orders, a one-sided pressure system develops, and the concept of domination emerges. Hence, there will be no reciprocal relationships when it comes to absolute obedience, and there also won't be any power relations

that develop. There is a direct correlation between the possibility of power relations and the possibility of mutual relations.

According to Foucault, where there is power, there is resistance; resistance is part of the process of power formation. As with power, resistance is a formation that can manifest as points of resistance and has a heterogeneous nature. Points of resistance can arise wherever there is power because power spreads in time and space. Through strategic coding of resistance points, resistance can be permanent and revolutionary, allowing for regrouping, the formation of different unions, and the reshaping of societies, as well as providing sharp breaks. Although power cannot be governed independently of other relationships, it is linked to countless types of relationships, including economic and intellectual ones. Power is both productive and reproductive; it is not merely a mechanism of repression. The most significant aspect that differentiates Foucault's claims on power from those of other thinkers is that he observes power as having both a negative and a positive dimension. Indeed, according to Foucault, if power did not have any positive aspects, it would quickly evolve into domination.

Power relations and knowledge are concepts that emerge through interaction. On the other hand, on the axis of Foucault's thinking, the concepts of knowledge being equivalent to power and power being equivalent to knowledge are utterly inconceivable. Knowledge is not independent of power, nor is power independent of knowledge, but these two concepts are not interchangeable. They rather interact. Power generates knowledge, and knowledge cannot exist apart from power relations. The fact that knowledge is made possible and spreads in society is inextricably linked to power relations. Power and knowledge are inseparable concepts, and in this context, since there is no production of knowledge independent of power, Foucault argues that the human sciences strengthen power. In this sense, the primary function of knowledge is to legitimize and diffuse power relations. Contrary to common belief, objective knowledge cannot be asserted in Foucault's central thesis, and the term "objective" should be eliminated. In this context, it is necessary to abandon the positivist understanding in order to approach the concept

of "knowledge" as inherent in power relations. Power penetrates and changes people through knowledge, and it spreads to all capillaries of the social body. The conditions of possibility of knowledge differ historically and are produced within this context. According to Foucault, episteme is the totality of discourses that are limited within the scope of the historicity of a specific period and determined in accordance with these boundaries. Consequently, the episteme of each age consists of the dominant mentality of that age, as determined by the returns of that age, applied for a limited time, and requiring archaeological analysis. As distinct epistemes and mentalities characterize each era, there have also been distinct models of power. In fact, the fact that models of power from different historical eras produced different solutions to the same problem and that they were socially acceptable are the clearest indicators of the evolution of epistemology over time, the impossibility of objective knowledge, and the interaction between power and knowledge.

In his related analysis of power, Foucault discusses the model of sovereignty, which is based on prohibitions and obedience, has extremely strict rules, and includes the sovereign-subject relationship. The concept of the "rule of law," in which explicit laws are enacted and sanctions are imposed in the event that they are not followed, is one way to explain the model of sovereignty. It is a negative power model that is also known as the Leviathan model. In this model, obedience to the law is of primary importance, and the "don'ts" are specified. In this approach, power is basically a state that acts in a coercive way. The sovereign has the right to the life and death of the subjects. He decides whether to take life or allow it to continue. The monarch legitimately seizes any property, right, or life of his subjects, and this action is considered acceptable in historical context. In the model of sovereignty, where social order is constructed through oppression, subjects are expected to obey without question. The body of the human, who is a prisoner of the sovereign power, is a tool that has been subjected to various tortures and made into a spectacle to demonstrate the existence and power of the power. The predominance of Christian

thought in the Middle Ages was sufficient to accept the ruler as a manifestation of God on earth and to legitimize all compelling elements in this context.

The historical process has been supplanted by the disciplinary society as a result of the rise in population and the occurrence of various developments following the use of corrective techniques through territorial sovereignty. Disciplinary society, in contrast to the model of sovereignty, to individuals by dictating what should be done, rather than what should not be done, as "norms." The "prohibitions" of the sovereignty model re-emerged as the "norms" of the disciplinary society, but they were transmitted via the power-knowledge interaction and not through coercion. The disciplinary society works by constructing space and has laid the groundwork for its long-term survival by facilitating urbanization, establishing security mechanisms, and constructing capitalist relationships. Individuals perceived as a threat to capitalist relations were initially incarcerated in prisons, and in the historical process, some were transferred to mental hospitals. With the increased power-knowledge interaction, various seemingly neutral institutions emerged in the name of environmental regulation and internalization and dissemination of legal regulations. Truth regimes arose as a consequence of the development of institutions like psychiatry, medicine, and law, and spatial and legal arrangements were created. To force individuals with financial insufficiency to work, and most importantly, to suppress individuals who were likely to revolt was a prominent factor in the Classical Age to rehabilitate individuals who posed a threat to the continuity of the existing order.

The fast spread of disciplinary techniques and the production of scientific knowledge resulted in the creation of docile individuals and the development of numerous non-repressive methods for taming non-docile individuals. The norms produced in places of confinement such as schools, hospitals, barracks, and workshops, served as a contributing factor to the maintenance of power. Historiographically, the disciplinary society is the period of the institutionalization of the use of scientific knowledge on the individual and society for the purpose of ensuring the continuity of power over the holistic aspects of life. Social values were



determined and continued to be determined with the humanities producing life forms on the "what" and "who" of humans within the context of diverse power relations. As a result of the collaboration between scientific knowledge and power, power now has the ability to permeate the deepest levels of society. The manifestation of disciplinary authority and the Age of Enlightenment in the same historical period is evidence of the institutionalization of scientific knowledge. In reality, the zenith of the value placed on knowledge during the Age of Enlightenment and the penetration of scientific knowledge into social power structures occurred simultaneously. With the return of pastoral power to disciplinary power around the seventeenth century and the various manifestations of punishment methods, violence became a disgraceful situation and spectacle executions ended. The main goal of disciplinary power is to identify individuals using various surveillance methods and to make them most useful in the economic system while giving them the impression that the techniques they use are "independent." The use of positive power technologies to constitute the body and soul has brought with it the dichotomy between normal and abnormal, which will lead to divisions on the social space. While power relations produce a dichotomy, they also determine what constitutes "normal" and what constitutes "abnormal" behavior.

Foucault's prison model "Panopticon," which was described by Jeremy Bentham, a utilitarian philosopher, and intended to be more humane, was examined in *The Birth of the Prison*. Except for the bars, there is no element of pressure or punishment against the prisoner in the Panopticon model, which is described as a simple prison model consisting of a watchtower in the middle of circularly arranged prison cells. The primary objective was for all the cells to be visible from the watchtower, but for the prisoners to be unable to see the interior of the watchtower. Due to the fact that the prisoners could not determine whether there was a guard in the watchtower, which they could not see inside, their perception of being observed would always be new, and they would adapt their behavior accordingly. Foucault's Panopticon analysis is currently comparable to a description of the modern power-

form bio-power model that will succeed the disciplinary power model. The individual of bio-power will internalize and normalize surveillance, just as prisoners in the Panopticon model regulate their behavior as if they were being controlled at any moment despite not seeing a guard.

According to Foucault's analysis of the Panopticon, contemporary power behaves identically in all fields. In this context, the Panopticon is not only a prison model, but also the embodiment of institutions such as schools and hospitals. As a matter of fact, the normal-abnormal dichotomy results from the notions of producing the individual: examining at school, grading and accordingly training, raising, changing, and diagnosing in hospitals. Individuals are constituted in accordance with the norms determined by power relations; this process is repeated repeatedly. The bio-power regime, whose defining characteristic is its involvement in all factors inherent to individual lives, seeks to externalize all individuality and expand social functions. As indicated by the word's etymology, "bio" power is the force that interacts with the biological. With the manifestation of biopolitical power, there is no private concept of the individual; sexuality and the pleasure it produces are also incorporated into power relations. Prior to bio-politics, the primary objective of traditional power was to establish territory and institutions for its expansion; today, the population is the primary objective. The transition from a disciplined society to a controlling society has been brought about by biopower, which interacts in various ways to increase population. Biopolitics is responsible for the production and reproduction of life, making possible factors such as health, birth, and death that appear to be impenetrable by power. Biopolitics surpasses it by incorporating disciplinary power techniques and power relations involving total control over the population.

The power models that have altered and evolved as a result of the changes that have taken place during the historical process provide as evidence for historical a priori. In the model of sovereignty, the ruler possessed the ability and desire to take the lives of his/her subjects, but this changed over time. As a result of Enlightenment, violence is now considered a morally reprehensible behavior, and

scientific knowledge is regarded as an increasingly important matter. The period of disciplinary rule, during which the power-knowledge relationships reached their zenith, came to the fore, and the society began to be reformed to exhibit the desired behaviors through confinement, which is a differentiated form of violence in accordance with the laws. Parallel to the advancement of biotechnologies, disciplinary power techniques became insufficient, allowing new areas to be explored. Not with negative power techniques, but with positive power techniques, the method of population control has begun to be based on transformative elements. In the new era, when biopower began to emerge, the potential power of individuals has been activated in accordance with power's interests. Throughout history, there have been forms of power that began with the intention of destroying the human body, progressed by altering and transforming it, and then penetrated the individual's soul and allowed this produced state of being to be internalized.

## **1.2. THE CONCEPTION OF SUBJECT AND TRUTH**

The subject is addressed to the "essence"; in epistemology, law, and ethics, the acting person is used in the sense of "I," whereas in logic and grammar, it serves as the subject of the predicate. *"There are two meanings of the word "subject": subject to someone else by control and dependence; and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge (Foucault, 1982: 781)"*. In political philosophy, the subject refers to the state's citizens; it is viewed as a knowing, active, and volitional being. It is believed that the modern subject thinks and expresses his/her thoughts, constructing himself/herself and his/her environment in accordance with social norms. Contrary to the classical western way of thinking, Foucault examined the formation of the "subject" by modern science, thereby demonstrating an attitude against the modern subject's legitimization. The modern subject is constituted by power within the context of social relations. Individuals' transformation into subjects is their objectification, and this objectification is manifested through fragmentation. The exclusion mechanisms of discriminatory power practices and

the determination of the normal-abnormal dichotomy form the basis of the fragmentation-based subject objectification process. In fact, Foucault was concerned with the constitute of normal and abnormal factors of subject forms that emerged in accordance with discursive and practical processes during the objectification of the subject. Power is always more inclined toward one side of a dichotomy, and in this context, rather than the dialectic of the concepts that comprise the dichotomy; it is crucial that the government begins to constitute the side that it is not inclined towards through discourse. In this sense, Foucault refers to the exercise of power through dichotomy as the "practice of division."

The discourse-constituted subject owes its existence to discourse; the discourse itself is creative. Through discourses, the objects of the perceived world are constituted. There is nothing that exists apart from the realm of discourse; as a result, everything can be characterized as being at least partially subject to interpretation. Exclusion and prohibition are the most common ways to generate discourse. The conditions that make it possible to have this discourse; tertiary relations are formed when primary and secondary relations are brought together. As primary relationships, relationships between institutions that are not based on hierarchical relationships can be demonstrated. As secondary relationships, language interactions can be thought of as the articulation and meaning of a concept with another concept, or as things whose rules are set by factors like rhetoric, logic, and grammar. Tertiary relations, also known as discursive relations, are the result of the interaction between primary and secondary relations. Where the relationship between the institutional, the non-discursive, and the elements to be understood through secondary relations, such as rhetoric, takes place; this is where discourse originates. It is the totality of relations formed by the combination of discursive and non-discursive elements. Thus, subjective experience is altered and constituted according to the discourses. Discourses constitute power relations-generated factors. In fact, the most dangerous form of domination is compelling individuals to constitute their own existence in accordance with certain notions in their own minds and preventing them from pursuing any other course of action. The subject's

experiences are formed by the interaction of knowledge and power factors, as well as the questioning approach individuals take in order to recognize themselves as subjects; this can be interpreted as resistance to the power system. According to Foucault, the subject is not a substance and can manifest in various ways depending on the context. Because the functioning of power is directly proportional to the individual's freedom, the subject is not constituted as an object of completely pacified power. Despite the fact that the individual believes his subjective experience is constituted, he maintains a critical attitude, indicating that it has not completely atrophied under the yoke of power. The primary issue is not the rules by which discourse emerges, but rather the reasons why certain discourses emerge as dominant among numerous discursive expressions. Contextuality is the primary focus of Foucault's analysis of discursive relations.

Archaeological, genealogical, and ethical analyses should be used as a Foucaultian action when it is necessary to investigate the reasons for the dominance of certain discourses produced in innumerable multiplicity. To be able to answer archaeological, genealogical, and ethical questions requires an analysis of a specific society at a specific time in its history. With archaeological analysis, conditions that make discourse possible emerge. Archaeological analysis is a comprehensive examination of the emergence of the disciplines that produce the discourse and related disciplines. When Foucault's works are examined in their entirety, however, it becomes evident that the archaeological method is insufficient for discourse analysis. Genealogical and ethical analyses must also be included in order to reach a conclusion. Foucault continued Friedrich Nietzsche's use of genealogical analysis, which incorporates historical analysis based on the present time. In addition to genealogical analysis, the institutions of the society and the power relations within the institutions are examined in a historical context. In contrast, genealogical analysis, or genealogy, is based on an analysis of historical events from the present to the past. Genealogy, which rejects fixed essences and assumes that there can be different identities, rejects the immutable truths of history, but demonstrates that what is analyzed includes the transformations it has undergone since the emergence

of its meaning and the conflicts resulting from these transformations. Although it is evident that the search for origins that may occur in this direction is metaphysical, the purpose of genealogy is to decipher and decompose identity, not to locate a specific identity origin. In accordance with ethical analysis, the factors revealed by individuals' relationships with themselves are examined. It refers to the subject profile in which the individual positions himself/herself, the restrictions and prohibitions s/he imposes on himself/herself, or the standards of legal conduct. The subject is approached through the power of historical and genealogical analysis when conducting archaeological analysis, and through the eyes of the subject when conducting ethical analysis. Examining all of the historical, political, and personal conditions that make the discourse possible will result in a more accurate conclusion regarding its causes.

The form of power generates truth laws by classifying the individual and constituting his/her identity. Foucault is concerned with the historical constitution of various types of subject through games of truth. The game of truth means the articulation of human existence with a particular discourse, to put it another way; the historical a priori of a possible experience, or the transformation of behavior into experience. *“What Foucault means by the game of right and wrong, or the game of truth in general (jeux de vérité), is the historical establishment of human existence as experience, i.e., as something that can and should be thought about; in other words, a set of rules used to produce certain truths about what is problematized (Foucault, 2021: 13).”* As a matter of fact, the fact that the truths produced in this sense do not have clear definitions, that their sharp boundaries are not determined brings about changeable truths. According to historical conditions, truths are subject to change, and it is impossible to claim of an objective truth. Due to the impossibility of discussing the existence of an objective truth, defined experiences are also subject to change, but are not objective. Foucault argues that subjective experience forms are formed and transformed through problematization, which he defines as a collection of discursive and non-discursive practices. The problematizations are realized through three main factors: power, knowledge, and

ethics. In this sense, every experience unites the field of power containing certain norms, the field of knowledge formed by the produced truths, and the field of relationship that the individual establishes with himself/herself (ethics). In this sense, the individual is producing a historical ontology of himself/herself; this requires answering questions that can position the individual as a subject of power, subject of knowledge, or ethical subject. In other words, the analyses of the truths of normative systems that regulate the practices of historically constituted experiences within power relations reveal forms of the constitution of the individual as a "subject of power." The emergence of the field of knowledge that prepares the ground for the subject's experience, as well as the analysis of discursive practices and the formation of truth games in this field; answers to the question of how the individual is constituted as a "subject of knowledge." In the examination of the constitution of the ethical subject; in the individual's relationship with himself/herself, it is necessary to analyze himself/herself as the subject of any historical experience, the practices of acceptance, internalization, or rejection, and the truth games accompanying these practices.

Even though the three main types of subject are interconnected, Foucault argues that the claimed experiences should be regarded as complex systems that include the field of knowledge and truths, norms and rules dependent on norms, and the individual's relationship with himself. According to Foucault, the most significant outcome of an individual's historical ontology about himself is to demonstrate that the limits on which truths are established and stated are transcended, and thus the imposed identity is subject to change. With the definition by Foucault of the *limit-attitude* first exhibited by Kant, the identities determined in line with the truths in history and the difficult interaction of the struggle with the borders of these identities are expressed. Kant's limit-attitude action is a negative question that seeks the necessary limits that the mind should not exceed; this is the primary distinction between their approach and Foucault's. Foucault, unlike Kant, adopts a constructive rather than a destructive critical stance. *"In short, in contrast to Kant, for Foucault, as for Nietzsche, in exercising our autonomy, the abiding concern must be with*

*problematizing both who we are and the boundaries, or limits, that have been imposed on us as both necessary and non-negotiable* (Healy, 2001: 57).” Subjective experiences, according to Foucault's approach, include queries about the fact that the notions that are considered to be necessary and universal, formed by the individualities brought about by these subjectivities, actually occur through historical a priori. In other words, according to Kant, constructing one's own historical ontology is the search for necessary, not-to-be-exceeded limits; Foucault's approach is a positive, practical critique that seeks to surpass these limits. Hence, the critique of subjectivity is now a critique of how the power-knowledge-ethics axes collectively shape the experiences of which one is the subject, and in this sense, the practices of being recognized as a subject.

According to Foucault, *dispositifs* consist of the relationships between institutional, administrative mechanisms, norms, laws, scientific propositions, discursive and non-discursive notions in order to surround and reconstruct the individual's body. *“The dispositif consists of power relations strategies that are supporting and supported by types of knowledge* (Foucault, 2016: 121).” *Dispositifs* have functions such as maintaining power relations, developing them in a particular direction, striking a balance, and participating in the power game; they are composed of power and are part of the field of knowledge. *Dispositives*, which can be described as discursive and non-discursive practice wholes where power and knowledge axes intersect, establish experiences using these practices and define individuals as the subjects of these experiences. *Dispositives* that impose self-truths on individuals; this is the fundamental mechanism by which the bio-power system operates and in which subjects are produced. Although the individual is produced as the subject of established subjective experience, the form of resistance is to constitute the ontology of his own history using the genealogy method. Moral subjectivation is the decision of an individual to form his/her life in order to constitution her own behavioral areas and re-constitute himself/herself as the subject of her own conduct. Moral subjectivation, according to Foucault, is an art that identifies creativity rather than truth.



### 1.3. THE CONCEPTION OF RATIONAL AND IRRATIONAL

If the mind were to be included in a general definition based on its historical constitution, it could be described as "what should be in every human being" or "what is normal." As the most influential discourse produced within power relations and norms, "rational," which is stipulated as a necessity for positive meaning, has been confined to the borders throughout the course of history. Because "rational" is not a concrete concept, but rather an abstract discourse, its definition has been shaped in accordance with games of truth. Thinking the mind in a definition brings about the opposite as well as the result of thinking about any concept in a definition. In addition to producing the opposite of definition, "irrational" is produced as a notion within the discursive field, which consists of power-knowledge relations. On the occasion of historical truths, the irrational or unreasonable have been labeled in a variety of ways, and various practices of social isolation have been developed for those so labeled. While Foucault's *Mental Illness and Psychology* is a sort of archeology of the mind, in which he primarily describes his thoughts on mental illness through the science of psychology and includes earlier Foucault's thoughts than others, *Madness and Civilization*, *History of Sexuality* also guide the understanding and development of concepts immanent to rational or irrational.

When the historical formation of those who are outside the mind is examined, the West's attribution of madness and then mental illness discourse to those who are outside the mind took place not in ancient history but in recent history. "*It has been said, only too often, that, until the advent of a positivist medicine, the madman was regarded as someone "possessed" (Foucault, 1976: 64).*" The states, behaviors and movements that were considered out of mind until they were called madness were compressed into supernatural, magic-related, religious notions. Individuals with characteristics other than dominant mental practices were viewed as possessed by demons prior to the acceptance of the objectivity of science, when they were deemed "mentally ill." Foucault asserted that the state of possession entered the

field of the history of religious ideas, but medical practices had been discussing this condition for some time. The incorporation of religious concepts into medicine by physicians during the time when the church was in charge did not result from objective knowledge, but rather from the effort and dominance of religious experience. In the nineteenth century, which coincided with the acceptance of positivism, the definition of "mental illness" emerged with the change of medicine from religion. The definitions of rational and irrational, which led to the formation of the field of "psychology," occupied the field of pathology for a considerable amount of time as science advanced. There is always a medical treatment for the irrational, which is known as madness, and hospital beds with specific characteristics are reserved for patients with this disease. In the Middle Ages, manias and melancholic states were thought to be curable and confined to a small portion of the population. The "madness" has become uncontrollably widespread. The Renaissance, on the other hand, corresponds to the time when the theme of "madness" was celebrated and left its mark on the literary world. Organized demonstrations, entertainment, iconography works, philosophical works, scientific texts have evolved towards a more positive meaning as the quirks of minds that do not inhibit their dreams through theaters. During the Renaissance, however, the first large institutions for the treatment of the mad were established, and various treatments were developed. In the middle of the seventeenth century, sudden onset madness began to be included in exclusionary practices. Individuals included in the definition of madness, as well as anyone who gave threat signals to the morality and common sense order of society, have begun to be confined in various large correctional facilities. Institutions in which individuals who pose a threat to the social order and who are different from the general public are incarcerated have replaced medical treatment facilities as the domain of individuals who should no longer be in society. Therefore much so that those incarcerated in relevant institutions are required to contribute to the advancement of the institution's material system by producing and performing various jobs. It is evidence of the effort to tame those who are socially isolated. Nonetheless, as the oppressive regime of correctional institutions elicited responses from societies during the course of

history, the practice of being confined evolved into "mental hospitals." Scientific treatments for mental illness began to be incorporated into medicine and began to be categorized as "disease." While medieval and Renaissance periods glorify madness and position it as a divine power and superior mind; Classical Age is the period of bringing mad people to the same form as criminals. During the positivist era, insanity was deemed a "disease."

While Foucault claims the classification of those suffering from madness in society as "other," this concept requires us to think like the "other." The fact that there has been little change in the discourses producing the rational and irrational conceptualizations that have persisted throughout history, and that the norms of "normal people" are similar, has always led to the search for an "other" in individuals' perceptions. Individuals who differ from others or those who suffer from mental illness are examples of difference. Paradoxically, while madness represents the mind, it opens the door for it to be endowed with meaning. While reason reigns supreme, madness strives to evade this rule and pursues its quest for uniqueness. According to Foucault, "madness" occurs when there is a non-metaphysical disconnect between the soul and the body, and when their functions become incompatible. *"In other words, beginning with passion, madness is still only an intense movement in the rational unity of soul and body; this is the level of unreason; but this intense movement quickly escapes the reason of the mechanism and becomes, in its violences, its stupors, its senseless propagations, an irrational movement; and it is then that, escaping truth and its constraints, the Unreal appears* (Foucault, 1988a: 93)." The onset of madness that results from man's disconnection from reality occurs when this relationship is severed. In this sense, madness has a negative connotation; it is subdivided into categories such as the type of delusions perceived in the context of a deteriorated relationship with reality, mental errors that eliminate the ability to represent, and forms that diminish and weaken the capabilities of the effort to reach the truth. Although the topic of madness appears to feed its negative roots, the relationship between rationality as the form of the truth of insanity and its ultimate meaning, irrationality, is complex. The

manifestation of madness has shifted from negative to positive as a result of various psychiatric concepts and perspectives on the distinction between the rational and the irrational. In the *Madness And Civilization* and the *Birth of the Clinic*; Foucault guides the emergence of conditions that may be sufficient for the meanings directly accepted in societies where individuals deemed mad or ill reside to be formed as the object of rational knowledge. In fact, certain conditions must coexist for madness to be the subject of rational knowledge, and Foucault investigates the formal conditions between meaning and scientific object. In an effort to control all behaviors of the individual; it means to integrate the individual into criminal, mad-like classifications, to continue examinations on the pathological and to place these behaviors into scientific categories, to make the individual an object of science. Even though science has limitations and coherences, it is evident that throughout history there has been obscurity surrounding it. Foucault argues that throughout history, incompatible forms of insanity have emerged, including four distinct types of consciousness of madness. First, "critical consciousness of madness"; includes the effort of moral condemnation that arises in response to deviant behaviors, without defining its concepts, ignoring its inconsistencies, and as a result of the individual's unfounded confidence in his own mind. The critical madness consciousness, which can facilitate social division, lays the groundwork for the definition of "practical consciousness of madness" as the second. The notion of what Foucault refers to as "the consciousness of practical madness" is the undesirable aspect of the sacred; it represents the exclusion of the mad who do not comply with the norms and violate the boundaries in a society that adheres to the norms. As the third type of consciousness, "declarative madness consciousness" is associated with declaring someone mad after identifying a concrete example and does not involve an act of exclusion. Foucault's fourth and final type of consciousness regarding madness, "analytic madness consciousness," is associated with madness becoming a field of study and an object of knowledge. Even though these types of consciousness regarding madness coexist, they are insufficient for understanding madness. "Although faced with the deployment of the main strategies of the complex consciousness of madness, i.e. the strategies of judgement, rejection,

*recognition and analysis, madness still eludes capture by any of the forms of reason, whether social, moral, legal, practical or scientific (Boyne, 1990: 28)."*

In Western culture, societies constituted through various dichotomies throughout history have ultimately been reduced to the normal-abnormal dichotomy. In actuality, reducing the opposition to two concepts facilitates the imposition of the normal, thereby facilitating the constitution of the historically abnormal and directing society directly. When the normative factors are constituted, classifying everything else as abnormal, including any deviation in pathology, facilitates the operation of the dominant ideology and legitimizes the practices of confinement. In this direction, the historical process has labeled "criminal" individuals, i.e., those who violate society-specific laws, as pathological, in the same conduct as "madness" individuals. *"And if, now, we try to assign a value, in and of itself, outside its relations with the dream and with error, to classical unreason, we must understand it not as reason diseased, or as reason lost or alienated, but quite simply as reason dazzled (Foucault, 1988a: 107)."*

Foucault argued that modern confinement practices such as mental hospitals, hospitals, and prisons did not exist until the 17th century and individuals who are madness, criminal, or ill, and who are not useful for the continuation of the current system, are initially incarcerated without distinction in the same space. Indeed, Foucault identifies the economic and political factors as the concepts underlying the confinement process. For instance, the practice of being confined up can be viewed as a safe precaution for the government against resistances that may result from financial inadequacy in the face of a societal economic crisis. During the 17th century, when European societies were exposed to major uprisings, real confinement practices were implemented. When the survival of capitalism is in jeopardy and problems such as unemployment arise, the old negative methods of suppressing resistance in history are replaced with a more effective method; has isolated the threatened segment of the population by confining them in prisons. At the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the nineteenth century, confinement practices underwent a significant shift. The mentally ill are contained in asylums,

criminals in prisons, and juveniles in detention facilities; confinement practices based on categorical division were implemented. *“As for a common language, there is no such thing; or rather, there is no such thing any longer; the constitution of madness as a mental illness, at the end of the eighteenth century, affords the evidence of a broken dialogue, posits the separation as already effected, and thrusts into oblivion all those stammered, imperfect words without fixed syntax in which the exchange between madness and reason was made (Foucault, 1988a: 11).”* When the abnormals of society were divided into different categories and began to be institutionalized, according to Foucault, this situation was initially economical, but as the number of institutions increased, it became inefficient. In fact, the cost of rehabilitating and treating those who are unemployed or unwilling to work in order to return them to the workforce has increased to a detrimental degree. Foucault questioned the continued insistence on the continuity of institutions despite all of this damage.

In his reflections on the objectification of the subject, Foucault illustrates the mode of objectification, which he refers to as "dividing practices"; he uses the classifications of guilty and innocent, mad and intelligent, and ill and healthy. The fact that the relevant practices become experiences by being problematized and individuals accept themselves as the subjects of experiences means that they internalize the modern capitalist discipline. The discursive practices generated by these problematizations consist of truth games generated by historically populated scientific research fields such as crime, mental illness, and pathology. On the other hand, non-discursive practices are spaces where relevant research fields produce historical facts; institutions such as prisons, mental hospitals, schools, and barracks. The re-constitution of mental illness as an experience of madness has made possible the scientific domination of the mind over the irrational. Through human sciences, human truths, and institutions as the environment that prepares the ground for the production of these truths, madness is transformed into mental illness and new experiences are produced. *“It would consist in saying that the problem is to bring to light the conditions that had to be met for it to be possible to hold a discourse on*

*madness -but the same would hold for delinquency and for sex- that can be true or false according to the rules of medicine, say, or of confession, psychology, or psychoanalysis. (Foucault, 2008: 36)."* The souls of the individuals who are the subjects of the experiences produced are the actual site of profound resolution. Mental hospital, prison, which functions under the name "healing", or "school" institutionalized in societies with the function "educating"; are institutions of disciplining and assimilating spirits outside of norms into norms.

## **SECOND CHAPTER:**

### **SIGMUND FREUD'S THEORY AND PERSONALITY FORMATION**

#### **2.1. THE FORMATION OF PSYCHOANALYTIC THEORY**

Sigmund Freud founded psychoanalytic theory, which is one of the 'psy' disciplines, by radically influencing the scientific world of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In spite of the fact that he is a neurologist, Freud is best known for his innovative method of treatment, which is referred to by the same name and is credited with giving the field of psychology the concept of psychoanalysis. When psychoanalysis, which manifests as a therapy approach, is viewed as a psychotherapy technique, it aims to identify the nervous disorders that individuals claim to suffer from and to provide treatment in this direction. In point of fact, the theory of psychoanalysis is not only a psychotherapy technique, but also a great narrative composed of theories and methods based on Freud's work. The "unconscious," which serves as the foundation of psychoanalytic theory and is Freud's most well-known conceptualization, is based on the idea that individuals' behaviors can be attributed to a variety of factors, some of which lie beyond or outside of conscious awareness. Freud asserted that these factors could be found somewhere beyond or outside of consciousness. Individuals become aware of the causes of these behaviors, which manifest in the unconscious (unconscious), only in the presence of psychoanalysis theory. The related theory examines individual behavior on the basis of innate capabilities, the influence of childhood experiences, and unconscious desires. Freud stated, in accordance with his studies focusing on the conceptualization of the unconscious, that people's physical and mental activities are motivated a priori by universal instincts from birth. He argued that the instinct, which responds to the body's fundamental needs, corresponds to a psychological state by being perceived as tension. *“Instinct is the psychological manifestation of a physiological need, the desire to fulfill a physiological need (İnanç & Yerlikaya, 2017: 15).”* By satisfying the physiological requirements in this manner, the individual, who is responsible



for displaying a variety of behaviors by relieving the tension that arises in accordance with instinct, continues along this path. In actuality, the lack of nutrients, which is positioned as a fundamental physiological need like the hunger instinct, manifests on the mental plane as "food craving." Freud concluded that the individual has a nature that drives them to seek out pleasure and run away from pain. In this direction, the individual, who has been through numerous stages, desires that his/her needs be met quickly, just as s/he did as a child, during the immature stage; otherwise, s/he experiences negative emotions. In accordance with the pleasure principle, an individual can only approach pleasure by reducing tensions. During the period of maturation, the individual gains an understanding of the real world by being tolerant of disruptions or delays that may occur in meeting his/her needs. The reality principle becomes apparent as one's awareness of the real outside world grows, and pleasure in this direction gradually gives way to the reality principle. The main point is that the pleasure is realized in accordance with the reality principle rather than the instant realization. *"The task of avoiding pain becomes an objective almost comparable to the gain of pleasure; the ego learns that its direct gratification is unavoidably withheld, the gain of pleasurable excitement postponed, that always a certain amount of pain must be borne and certain sources of pleasure entirely relinquished (Freud, 1920: 309)."*

Freud proposed that there are essentially two instincts, which he termed "life instinct" and "death instinct," as a result of his changing views on instincts over time. In keeping with the conceptualization, he calls "eros" by pointing to a situation beyond reproduction with the life instinct, he asserted that if all of an individual's bodily pleasures are managed correctly, they can achieve a sense of pleasure by reducing the tensions that arise as a result of those bodily pleasures. Providing the means for the individual to coexist with society; Freud viewed the entire body as erotogenic, addressing sexuality, safety, and health issues within the context of life instinct. However, the three primary erotogenic areas that psychoanalysis theory focuses on are the mouth, the anus, and the genital organs. The death instinct, the other basic instinct of the individual, is referred to as "thanatos" when destructive

factors are included. The death instinct is a tendency to return to a state of non-existence; it is formed around negative emotions such as fear, anger, and hatred. The death instinct includes the aggressive impulses of individuals to harm themselves or society. In spite of the fact that Eros and Thanatos represent polar opposites of one another, they are complementary to one another and are innate components of every individual. In order to protect the organism, the life instincts direct the death instincts' energies outward. In point of fact, Freud posited that life consisted of the struggle and eventual resolution between these two fundamental instincts. The life instinct is triggered when an individual's nutritional needs are met, and the death instinct is triggered when behaviors (like biting and chewing) to meet those needs involve destructive elements. The life instinct is triggered when an individual's nutritional needs are met.

Freud created the concept of "libido" by reconciling the life instinct with psychic energy, based on his assertion that each individual has a certain amount of psychic energy. *"Psychic energy not only enables the individual to function in a healthy and productive way, but also enables him/her to cope with unconscious desires, anxiety and memories (Ergin & Köseoğlu, 2017: 193)."* According to psychoanalytic theory, libido, the manifestation of the life instinct, generates mental behaviors alongside psychic energy. The act of directing the libido toward an object is known as "cathexis," whereas obstacles that prevent the instinct from being satisfied are known as "anticathexis." Cathexis and anticathexis are two processes that are postulated to be able to explain behavior, according to the theory of psychoanalysis. For instance, when a person focuses their attention on a physiological requirement, they direct their libido to their thoughts that are developing in this particular path. It is the price of living in a civilized society, according to Freud, that the libido, which operates by replacing it with the object that is closest to its real, is not completely satisfied with this function. In point of fact, Freud suggests that human elements (such as art, music, and painting) are the direct result of primal impulses.

The psychoanalytic theory asserts that behaviors are predetermined despite the fact that none of the behaviors are the result of a coincidence. In this direction, all physical and mental behaviors historically follow each other; this emerges as a kind of historical a priori formed in accordance with the previous behavior and is referred to as psychic determinism within the framework of psychoanalytic theory. Therefore, despite the fact that the concept of "free will" cannot exist within the bounds of psychoanalytic theory; the inability of individuals to connect with their previous experiences is the root cause of the misconception that people act in accordance with their free will. The psychoanalytic theory indicates that the unconscious is the primary location of actions (paraphrax) that are the result of "accidents" such as behavior, dreams, and slips of the tongue that take place by chance. The reasons for the paraphrax conceptualization, which is used to express the actions that emerged as a result of mistake, are quite complex, and examining these reasons opens the way to reach the unconscious. This is because the paraphrax conceptualization is used to express the actions that emerged as a result of mistake. According to Freud, even though it is easier to identify the cause of some paraphrases, it should not be disregarded that there may be an alternative thought deep within. For example, the fact that s/he could not be there at that time appears to be an unconscious indication that s/he did not want to be there, by forgetting this information about a person who should be in any environment at any time. As a matter of fact, the hidden reason behind the paraphrase is not simply that the person does not want to be in that environment. It can also occur as an unconscious motivation against the pressures that cause the necessity of being in that environment. In accordance with Freud's ideas, the fact that a person frequently jokes about the same subject and acts by making fun of that subject indicates that s/he places a high value on that subject. In this context, the individual's use of idioms or extreme behavior provides insight into their personalities. In Freud's *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, the unconscious is shown to have an influence on daily life. The book outlines a structure in which the unconscious can be seen to manifest itself through a variety of paraphrases, symptoms, and dreams. Although Freud frequently focused on slips of the tongue and paraphrases, they are regarded

as the clearest manifestations of the unconscious. As a result of the emergence of suppressed emotions from the unconscious, individuals may make grammatical errors during their speech or misspell words when writing.

## **2.2. THE STRUCTURE OF PERSONALITY**

In accordance with his research on the development of the psychological structure of individuals, Freud proposed that an individual's personality is the result of the interaction between two models, which he referred to as the topographic model and the structural model. Psychoanalytic theory is distinguished from other psycho disciplines by its precise categorization of the human spirit through these models. Freud initially developed the topographical model, but later on, when he realized that this model on its own was insufficient to explain the personality, he proposed the structural model as a supporting model. The topographic model is used to construct an individual's mental structure, and it is comprised of three primary components: the preconscious, the conscious, and the unconscious. In line with the topographic model, Freud used the image of an iceberg to explain how a person's mind works. He called the part of the iceberg that is under water the "unconscious." In the same way that there are questions regarding the portion of the iceberg that is submerged in water, he pointed to the unconscious as the field that best exemplified the mind's unanswered questions. In point of fact, the unconscious consists of things like desires, impulses, feelings, and thoughts that individuals are unaware of, sometimes do not accept, and escape; it also includes occurrences that are not desirable to be brought into consciousness. Freud said that the unconscious is the deepest part of the mind, where repressed emotions and dangerous, instinctual urges live. The unconscious takes up a larger portion of one's psychic structure than does the conscious mind, which can only be proven to exist through circumstantial evidence. The existence of an unconscious, concrete or measurable concept, which is suggested as the place to look for the primary cause of individuals' behavior, is only accessible through paraphrases and dreams. On the other hand, the

"preconscious" in the topographic model serves as a connection between the unconscious and the conscious; it is comprised of memories or information that had been previously accumulated in the mind. Information at the level of the preconscious mind; this can occur naturally at times, and at other times it can be a result of the techniques used in the psi disciplines. In accordance with therapeutic techniques, unconscious material is brought into consciousness by way of the preconscious. "Consciousness", which is the visible portion of the iceberg metaphor and an element of the topographic model, encompasses the individual's conscious emotions, thoughts, and behaviors. Thoughts can reach consciousness in two ways, which is the only part of the spiritual structure that can be known by an individual. First, an individual shapes his/her thought by perceiving the information coming from the outside world with his sense organs; as the second way, thoughts emerge when information from the unconscious that is not threatening in the psychic structure reaches the preconscious.

The structural personality theory follows the topographic model, which is insufficient for personality explanation, and supports and complements it. The id, the ego, and the superego are the three components that make up this structural model, which explains the foundations of unconscious mental processes. The "id" component of the structural model, also referred to as the lower self, encompasses the individual's primitive impulses. In the topographic model, the id, which is manifested through interaction with the unconscious, contains the instinctive aspects by containing the source of psychic energy. The id, which converts biological needs to psychological tensions, reveals the desire for satisfaction. It contains impulses such as eating, drinking, aggression, and sexuality. The id avoids impulses whose results are disturbed by unconscious interaction. The id encompasses all of the urges that must be sated and operates and is managed in accordance with the pleasure principle. The id obtains pleasure by attempting to alleviate the discomfort caused by tensions resulting from the release of the instinctive cathexis. If a person insists on satisfying one of his/her impulses, despite the fact that it is evidently driven by the id, the individual instinctively turns to the

backup object in order to alleviate tension. In actuality, the id, which manifests itself devoid of the reality principle, disregards all social constraints in its pursuit of personal satisfaction. At the point where the reality principle is grasped and internalized, the effect of the id ceases to exist; however, this does not imply complete detachment, as id impulses can still arise in certain areas. In contrast, the impulses of the id are repressed along with other aspects of one's personality. The processes of the id that are characterized by an impulsive and irrational approach thanks to their interaction with the unconscious are referred to as "primary processes." The concept of the "ego," which the structural model refers to as the "self," can only exist as a result of the interaction that an individual has with his/her surrounding environment. With the development of the reality principle, it is responsible for preparing the id to realize its primitive desires and for regulating its relationships with the real world. The ego, which emerges by acting as a bridge between the pleasure principle and the reality principle, delays the release of tension until the object that will alleviate it finds its counterpart in the external world. "Secondary processes" refers to the processes of the ego, which include delaying pleasure by making the individual compatible with the environment by thinking realistically. Learning to differentiate between images and reality by internalizing the reality principle is known as the "reality testing process." In secondary processes, reality testing occurs, and these reasoning actions include the ego's formulation of plans to satisfy id impulses and evaluations of these plans. If the ego is unable to fulfill its duties as a structure responsible for maintaining balance and ensuring the safety and integrity of the organism, various deviations occur. For instance, if the id controls the ego, the individual who exhibits unacceptable behavior in society is revealed. In this direction, an attempt by the ego to completely ignore the id results in feelings of tension and intense discomfort due to the individual's inability to satisfy his or her impulses. As the third level of the structural model, the "superego" comprises the interaction of the individual with social and moral standards. As a matter of fact, value judgments and social norms are not innately assigned to individuals. The individual is exposed to a variety of norms either by learning to live in society or by being raised by individuals who have more

life experience. Because the individual's superego has not yet developed, s/he does not have any thoughts about "right" and "wrong" during his/her first life processes. This indicates that his/her learning about discrimination is incomplete. The superego, according to Freud, is formed in accordance with the value judgments formed by the guidance of the individual's caregivers. In this context, not only the mother and father in the concept of family are included, but also the person who raises the individual; the teacher is also included in the concept of school. In fact, the value judgments of the people who are responsible for a person's upbringing are not innate a priori knowledge; rather, they occurred in accordance with the unwritten rules and socialization processes of the society in which they lived, and what they conveyed is composed of these. As the individual is exposed to various value judgments, they attempt to regulate their behavior in this direction; otherwise, they may feel bad under the influence of their superego as a result of the behavior. The superego often takes the form of an authoritarian parent and is responsible for modeling ethical and conscientious behavior. When the superego develops excessively, the individual accepts social norms with a strict attitude, as is appropriate. However, when s/he does not exhibit appropriate behaviors, s/he is confronted with intense anxiety and once again gives in to feelings of shame and guilt. As a result, the conflict that arises between an individual's ego and superego is caused by all impulses that are forbidden. The superego also consists of two subsystems, namely "conscience" and "ego ideal." Conscience describes a person's misbehavior that resulted in parental punishment. The ego ideal, on the other hand, consists of the correct behaviors rewarded by parents. The individual gains self-respect in accordance with the ego ideal, but it is impossible to achieve this state perfectly. As the individual realizes the desires that arise in the context of the ego ideal, the standards increase, and a never-ending cycle of new desires ensues. The superego subverts the will of the id and guides the ego toward ideals of perfection that are consistent with the superego's own standards. However, for a healthy personality, a dynamic balance must be achieved; the ego must stop the basic needs of the id until it is rationally met, and the superego must evaluate the moral acceptability of the emerging needs.

The topic of "anxiety" is currently being discussed, which is consistent with the action shifts that took place when the topographical model and the structural model were introduced. Freud initially considered the concept of "anxiety" as psychic energy that has been accumulated and not discharged within the psychic structure; in other words, he proposed that it results from a repressed libido. However, as a function of the ego, their ideas and anxiety shifted over time. *"The primary function of anxiety is to prevent the conscious perception of unacceptable instinctive impulses and to ensure that these impulses are satisfied at the appropriate time and in the appropriate manner (Freud, 1977) (cited in İnanç & Yerlikaya, 2017: 25)."* The ego, which is subject to a variety of pressures from the id and superego, reacts to threats from the outside world with anxiety while performing its duty. According to Freud, anxiety has been studied under the headings "realistic anxiety," "neurotic anxiety," and "moral anxiety," depending on its source. Realistic anxiety represents a real threat in the external environment and reveals the individual's fear. Realistic anxiety, which allows precautions to be taken against a potential threat, is a "natural" form of anxiety that includes avoiding dangerous elements and the resulting reactions. Neurotic anxiety, on the other hand, consists of the fear that the ego will lose control over the demands of the id; in other words, it consists of the fear of losing one's mind and causes abnormal behavior in the individual. Early-life neurotic anxiety is characterized by a variety of extreme reactions and abnormal emotions that may impede the individual's ability to adapt to society. As the final type of anxiety, "moral anxiety" is the result of conflicts between the ego and the superego; it emerges when value judgments are excessively internalized. The moral judgment, which reveals the emotions that disturb the superego, includes punishments that result from behavior or thought that is in opposition to dominant ideologies.

According to psychoanalytic theory, each individual employs unconscious defense mechanisms to protect the self from internal and external threats. According to Freud, the individual should utilize one or more of the defense mechanisms in order to maintain a balanced life. It is essential that the defense



mechanisms function by maintaining their equilibrium, and excessive use may result in deviance from reality. In accordance with the conflicts between the id and superego, the ego's defense mechanisms, which develop as a method of coping with anxiety, aim to prevent the impulses d's from occurring uncontrollably in the consciousness. Unconscious realizations and the resorting to distorting reality in order to make the anxious feeling less intense are characteristics shared by all defense mechanisms. As the fundamental defense mechanism, "repression" emerges with the intention of making the individual forget even what he has forgotten, and it pushes anxious thoughts away from the conscious mind by pushing them into the unconscious. In fact, the fact that the individual creates forgotten memories by failing to recall events s/he is dissatisfied with is evidence of the use of the suppression mechanism. As a defense mechanism used in conjunction with the suppression mechanism, "projection" refers to the reflection of thoughts that are not accepted at the conscious level onto other people by being pushed into the unconscious. By attributing impulses, feelings, thoughts, and behaviors that the individual does not accept to other individuals or objects; perceiving his/her own thoughts as if they belonged to someone else and making them perceived is an indication that the individual is employing the projection mechanism. Projection is also a mechanism that an individual employs in order to cover up his/her deficiencies or failures in society that s/he has brought upon himself/herself. The individual who does not accept responsibility for the negative outcomes of a failed endeavor attributes the failure to external factors and modifies the situation accordingly. The individual who does not accept responsibility for the negative outcomes of a failed endeavor attributes the failure to external factors and modifies the situation accordingly. The impulses that the individual does not accept are first pushed into the unconscious, and then the individual will act in the opposite direction of these impulses, which will result in the individual excessively manipulating his/her own behavior. It is used simultaneously with the "repression" mechanism, along with the unconscious suppression of unwanted impulses and bringing the opposite impulses into consciousness. The displacement, from ego defense mechanisms, involves redirecting an individual's impulses towards an

object or person towards another object or person. In accordance with the displacement mechanism, the anxious state of the individual's impulses against his/her real goal is directed toward the goal that will cause less anxiety than the main goal. The displacement mechanism is exemplified by children's aggressive behavior toward their toys as a result of their parents' negative reactions to their children's mistakes. "Rationalization," which is another type of defense mechanism, can be defined as fitting behaviors that an individual does not accept logically into alternative notions. The rationalization mechanism, which happens to be a mechanism that members of the society frequently use, is the reflection of reality by distorting it. Another defense mechanism that emerges in the direction of intense anxiety is "regression"; it involves the desire to return to the place where the individual feels safe last, especially to childish behaviors, in cases of intense anxiety. Among the defense mechanisms is "sublimation," which is viewed as a healthy concept because it does not involve the suppression of the impulse; it indicates that primitive impulses are transformed in accordance with social norms and become useful. It emerges as an aspect of an individual's capacity to satisfy his/her impulses without isolating himself/herself from society and is regarded as the source of artistic and scientific creativity. In fact, if science is used as an example, it is possible for a person with intense aggressive impulses to become a successful surgeon through the use of the sublimation mechanism. In the "denial" mechanism, wherein external threats manifest as the source of anxiety, the individual disregards the facts. By utilizing the denial mechanism, one opens themselves up to the possibility of experiencing situations in which they are unable to accept the death of a relative or deny the existence of unfavorable circumstances. The "fantasy" mechanism used in conjunction with denial involves the actualization of impulses the individual desires to realize through dreams. Individuals achieve satisfaction by fantasizing about things that do not exist in reality but are desired by them. Among the defense mechanisms, the "identification" mechanism, which includes the desire to behave like others, regardless of whether they are positive or negative, can sometimes lead to the imitation of good behaviors and sometimes bad behaviors. The "undoing" mechanism, which may vary within the framework of

cultural conceptualization but also includes partnerships; it includes acts such as magical behaviors or confession in accordance with religious factors in order to rid oneself of the guilt that was caused by the id.

### **2.3. THE DEVELOPMENT OF PERSONALITY**

Psychoanalytic theory suggests that childhood experiences play a significant role in the formation of an individual's personality. Freud termed it the "psychosexual development theory" and described personality development as a five-stage process. Freud asserts that, in accordance with the psychosexual development theory, which he explains using a genetic approach, certain stages are universally experienced by all individuals prior to the age of five. In accordance with the psychosexual development theory, the natural energy source, libido, has a different focus at each developmental stage, and deviations occur when tensions in these focuses are not sufficiently reduced or are oversaturated. Freud termed "fixation" the deviation that occurs when the satisfaction that occurs in Freud's developmental stages is insufficient or excessive. If developmental conflicts are not resolved and moved on to the next stage, the individual's adulthood is negatively impacted. In fact, even though parental attitudes are cited as the primary cause of fixations, behaviors such as excessive attention to the individual or pathogenic inhibition can contribute to the development of a negative personality. In Freud's theory of psychosexual development, the erotogenic zone is not limited to the genitalia but encompasses the entire body, and libido is not satisfied solely through sexual activity.

The "oral period" is the first stage of development in the psychosexual development theory, and it encompasses an individual's development from 0 to 18 months of age. In the oral period, the individual takes pleasure in sucking, biting, chewing, and feeding behaviors by focusing the libido on the mouth and its surroundings. Fixation is brought on by insufficient libido or oversaturation.

Reflecting on adulthood, deviations such as malnutrition or overnutrition that may occur during the oral period influence the formation of attitudes such as trust and addiction. By dividing the oral period into two, Freud identified the phase he termed "oral passive"; he stated that it is the period from birth to the eruption of the individual's teeth during which pleasure is derived from the sucking-swallowing reflexes. The second stage of the oral period is called the "oral aggressive" process in which pleasure occurs in line with the bite-chewing reflexes as the individual's teeth begin to grow. If fixation occurs during the oral passive phase, the individual's personality is formed by being naive, optimistic, excessively dependent, and in need of validation. Characteristics of the individual that are pessimistic, vulgar, and exploitative are the subject of fixation during the oral aggressive phase.

The second stage of psychosexual development theory, spanning ages 1.5 to 3, is known as the "anal stage." During the time when the libido is focused on the anus and its surroundings, anus control is acquired. If there is no fixation during the anal period, the individual develops self-control. Although s/he has completed toilet training, the individual who has begun to gain control of his anus experiences pleasure when s/he realizes s/he can act voluntarily or involuntarily. In fact, the pleasure experienced as a result of control over the anus is viewed as the initial phase of the elimination of sexual impulses. During the anal period, when the id's pursuit of pleasure is shaped in accordance with social constraints, a parent-imposed "anal conservative" personality can manifest as traits such as stubbornness, over-attention to detail, and stinginess. The individual who reacts against parental pressure by using the toilet at inappropriate times may have an "anal-expulsive" personality characterized by extravagant, disorganized, and irregular features.

The ages of 3 to 6 encompass the "phallic stage" of psychosexual development, which is the third stage. This period, in which the libido focuses on the genital organs, corresponds to the stage in Freud's theory where the most criticized Oedipus complex occurs. During the phallic period, a person becomes interested in sexuality by exploring the genitalia. The "Oedipus complex" consists of an individual's identification with a parent of the same sex, desire for the opposite sex, and hostility

towards a rival of the same sex. Psychoanalysis theory asserts that the Oedipus complex occurs unconsciously; it is a developmental process that allows individuals to recognize the opposite sex. In accordance with the anxiety caused by the associated complex, individuals suppress their sexual desires by internalizing the traits of their same-sex parents. When suitable conditions are created for the individual, and when s/he meets the appropriate opposite sex, s/he directs his/her suppressed sexual desires towards him/her, thereby resolving the confusion. As a result of the fixation that can occur during the phallic period, adulthood is accompanied by behaviors that emphasize gender characteristics.

The "latent period," which is the fourth stage of the psychosexual development theory, encompasses the ages of 6 to 12 and, unlike other periods, does not emphasize libido. Sexuality is defined as latent during this period when the individual reaches school age and the development of social relationships is crucial. As a result of the intense suppression of sexual impulses during the phallic period, the related impulses are forgotten; individuals avoid establishing relationships with their opposite sex and primarily form social bonds with their contemporaries. Due to the absence of libido concentration, there is no fixation during the latent period.

The "genital period," the fifth and final stage of psychosexual development, refers to ages 12 and older. Beginning with adolescence, this period begins when the libido focuses on the genital organs; includes the regulation of sexual desires in accordance with social norms. The individual, who is said to have achieved hormonal compatibility with sexual life, initiates intimate relationships with the opposite sex. During this time, the person does not experience any sort of fixation, and as a result, they have a problem-free marriage, a problem-free social life, and a healthy personality that is able to regulate their impulses accordingly. Individuals who are able to successfully overcome the confusions experienced in previous periods are deemed to have achieved psychological maturity during this period.

## **THIRD CHAPTER:**

### **THE STRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEOLIBERAL SOCIETY**

#### **3.1. THE BIRTH OF NEOLIBERALISM**

Liberalism, which was founded with the goal of enabling free competition between economic powers and individual independence, has emerged in history as a world of tensions. In line with the integration of population science and economics, the ideology of "let them do it" as a manifestation of political economy led to the birth of liberalism. Since liberalism is founded on the sanctity of individual rights, the intervention of a central power in life undermines its nature. As a matter of fact, the liberal critique, which emerged against the constantly expanding and interventionist structure of the state mind, adopts that the administration should only include regulations on specific processes. Liberalism has been a pioneer in the self-limitation of government, positioning its presence in non-political spheres. According to Foucault, liberalism is considered as the "art of government" not only because it restricts the role of the state in society, but also because it assumes that it is necessary for the government of non-political spheres. However, again based on Foucault's ideas, liberalism should be considered first and foremost as a technology of power, a notion that aims for more influence with less use of force.

From the mid-nineteenth century onwards, when liberalism proved inadequate to provide solutions to the problems of the growing population around industrialization, fracture lines began to emerge. *"In reality, what is commonly called the 'crisis of liberalism' was, in Foucault's terms, a crisis of liberal governmentality – that is, a crisis that essentially posed the practical problem of political intervention in economic and social affairs and its doctrinal justification (Dardot & Laval, 2013: 28)."* The organizational transformations of capitalism, the threat to private property posed by governmental intervention and subsequent class conflicts, and the confrontation with new international power relations are discussed as the main factors that put dogmatic liberalism into crisis. Although

liberalism was originally based on the principle of equality, in industrialized capitalist countries it became alien to its own essence and began to experience contradictions. As a matter of fact, the problems that liberalism faced and that led it to a dead-end stemmed from its inability to establish a coherent framework on the issues of individual freedoms, social welfare and benefit. In this sense, liberalism also experienced an internal crisis within itself. Classical liberalism, which failed to encompass the new facets of capitalism that developed with the free market doctrine, was unable to respond to the developing era and economy. The gap caused by the inability of liberalism to create a coherent framework paved the way for the ruling power to manifest itself as sovereign in line with the decisions that the ruling power claimed to be in the interests of society. As a matter of fact, even the possibility that everything that the state mind claims to be in the "interests of society" is in the state mind's own interest and brings about a series of actions contrary to the nature of liberalism. However, the giant corporations that emerged with the development of capitalism, their legal forms and new forms of competition have taken their place among the phenomena that classical liberalism could not incorporate.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, Herbert Spencer reacted violently against empirical utilitarianism with the aim of resolving the contradictions that liberalism had run into and reconstructing it. He argued that utilitarianism should be founded on an evolutionary and biological basis. Herbert Spencer's evolutionary theory is entirely based on the book *The New Way of the World*, which includes the perspectives of Christian Laval and Pierre Hardot in order to reference the birth of neoliberalism. He argued that societies are living organisms and that they naturally establish their own equilibrium, believing that interdependence increases as they become more complex. He matched the struggle for existence and adaptability in nature with competition in society and claimed that the best would emerge in line with competition and cooperation. Spencer, who opposed all kinds of state laws based on the law of evolution, thought that state interventions were an obstacle to liberalism. Social, medical and educational issues, which he categorized as

"coercive laws", should not fall within the sphere of government. Because if these issues are included in the sphere of government, the extent of intervention becomes unlimited and directly becomes a state of "welfare" by harming cooperation. He argued that the state of "welfare" and "help" with any external intervention is not socially correct. He considered that adaptation to variables is a necessity and as a natural consequence the complexity of the environment increases intelligence and adaptation. He defends liberalism, believing that state intervention disrupts evolutionary development. Thus, in Spencer's thinking, the most talented individuals adapted to capitalism are able to survive competition, and should survive. In other words, there should be societies in which evolutionary liberalism is practiced. In line with Spencer's biological evolutionism, the division of labor based on the regulation of the principle of division of labor by a central authority became a division of labor model based on natural selection. In this sense, in line with Spencer's ideas, which treat the principle of division of labor as an evolutionary utilitarianism, liberalism started to move towards an understanding based on the struggle for survival. *"Unlike in orthodox economics, classical or neo-classical, competition is regarded not as a condition of the smooth operation of exchange in the market, but as the pitiless law of life and the mechanism of progress via elimination of the weakest (Dardot & Laval, 2013: 41)."* In this context, the fear of survival caused by the state of competitiveness, which Spencer positions as a struggle for life, has left the social well-being far behind and has motivated individuals to be the subject and object of competition while ensuring the spread of economic governmentality to all areas. Dardot and Laval argue that Spencer's biological evolutionism carries the influence of neoliberalism in its different branches.

Neoliberalism should be preceded by the chronologically prior "new liberalism", which operates by adhering to the ideals of classical liberalism. As a type of liberalism represented by John Maynard Keynes, "new liberalism" has gone down in history as a modified version of classical liberalism in terms of the relations and duties of the state in the economic sphere. New liberalism assumes that the state



should have a role in economic and social issues by legitimizing state intervention. Indeed, liberalism, which emerged with the ideology of "let them do it" and the claim that the market economy is "free", has resulted in increased intervention with restrictions and regulations on the freely created markets with the new liberalism. It is obvious that liberal thought, which claims to be non-interventionist, actually opens up spaces for intervention. Despite the dead ends of the free market, state interventions have been legitimized as being for the "welfare of society". Therefore, every free market brings with it state intervention for the welfare of the society, and interventions emerge to protect the existence of the free market.

Neoliberal thought, whose intellectual foundations were laid at the Walter Lippmann colloquium in 1938 and whose chronological influence began in the last century, explicitly recognizes the necessity of state intervention. Although the new liberalism and neoliberalism were both born out of the crisis of liberalism, there are differences as well as similarities between them. Indeed, the similarity of their names stems from the fact that they serve common goals. Both emerged to overcome the problems arising from the changes in capitalism, social conflicts, and international problems; they provided justifications for government intervention and rejected liberal naturalism. However, the most important point that distinguishes neoliberalism is the "competition" that Spencer's biological evolutionism emphasizes. *"It is no longer a question of postulating a spontaneous agreement between individual interests, but of creating the optimal conditions for the interplay of their rivalry to satisfy the collective interest (Dardot & Laval, 2013: 54)."* Thus, in the case of neoliberalism, governance needs to be surrounded by legal rules to purify the competitive market. Neoliberalism, which is based on a competition-based market understanding and the belief that state intervention should be mandatory, recognizes that the market, which Spencer positioned as a product of nature, is human. As another manifestation of the state mind, neoliberalism is a form of politics that generally operates economic policies through liberalization and produces norms in line with its interests. With neoliberal thought, the issues of superiority between states have been replaced by territorial and rational

forces, and power has started to change on this axis. Neoliberalism, which is the re-emergence of the basic foundations of liberalism with different possibilities, is the mind and sustainer of contemporary capitalism. Neoliberalism is not limited to economic policies but has infiltrated every aspect of social life. In this context, neoliberalism can be considered as a set of discourses, practices and mechanisms that determine the form of governance based on the principle of universal competition. However, when neoliberal thought is conveyed, its "interventionist" aspect is not explicitly emphasized, on the contrary, it is built on the aspect of freedom. It has created an order of exploitation by behaving as if it responds to the special problems or demands of societies in a special way, but by doing the opposite. Moreover, while establishing this order of exploitation, the consent of societies was obtained with the motivation of freedom, and neoliberal practices were put into practice in this direction. As a matter of fact, neoliberal thought has put free competition and marketism into practice in the most brutal way by changing the form of interventionism under the narrative of individual freedom.

### **3.2. THE APPROACH OF NEOLIBERAL GOVERNMENTALITY**

In order to explain the notion of "governmentality" that constitutes neoliberal governmentality, it is first necessary to consider the models of power again, as explained in the analysis of power in line with Michel Foucault's ideas. The norms created by the models of sovereignty and discipline are manifested differently in the governmentality model positioned as a security state. There is no such thing as substitution between the models of power, and similar laws in line with historical factors operate in line with new historical a prioris. The model of sovereignty has chosen "prohibitions" as the most important notion that determines social life, and in this context, while everything that is prohibited is defined, what is not prohibited remains in the realm of the undefined. The disciplinary model, as Foucault states, appears as a more developed model; it is a centralist mechanism of rules that operates by isolating space. The governmentality model appears as a model that

does not limit freedoms, but governs and regulates them in contrast to the sovereignty and disciplinary models that restrict freedoms by prohibiting or commanding them. The governmentality model, which needs to make power appear completely free from domination, emerges as a manifestation of advanced control under the name of security following corporal punishments as the historical change of corporal torture.

In his 1977-1979 Collège de France lectures in his books *Security, Territory, Population* and *The Birth of Biopolitics*, Foucault, in his genealogical analysis of governmentality as a form of power, states that in this model the dominant form of knowledge is political economy, its main target is population, and its main technical tool is security apparatuses. As a matter of fact, the prohibition of laws and the commandment of discipline, together with the governmentality that has now taken the shape of the new historical process, has made new technologies of power subject to discussion in a way to regulate reality. The governmentality model, which became necessary when the population started to become a de facto problem, obliges "to do" by avoiding coercion or restriction, contrary to previous models. This is a state of being obliged to do that individuals' attitudes towards themselves and other individuals emerge automatically. In the analysis of governmentality, the notion of "government" was defined by Foucault as "the conduct of conduct" and in this respect, it opened a discussion on ethics. As a matter of fact, the subjects limited by laws or individuals shaped by disciplinary methods have been replaced by a population whose attitudes are formed in line with new fields of knowledge claiming objectivity and discursive and non-discursive practices. As a new facet of domination in the classical sense, the model of governmentality, in which oppression is realized without making itself felt, is in a particular need of freedom. As the area of freedom, which is the most important notion of the possible conditions of governmentality, expands, the area of intervention also increases. As a model of governmentality that governs not in spite of or against freedom, but through freedom, governmentality leaves individuals "free" in order to realize spontaneous compliance with norms. In the governmentality model, "things" rather

than people are considered as the field of implementation by the administration. However, these "things" are considered within the totality of people's relations with land, space and economic exchange. In this context, it can be clearly stated that the sphere of implementation of governmentality exceeds people and extends to all areas.

*“And maybe, in a completely general, rough, and therefore inexact way, we could reconstruct the major forms, the major economies of power in the following way: first, the state of justice, born in a feudal type of territoriality and broadly corresponding to a society of customary and written law, with a whole interplay of commitments and litigations; second, the administrative state that corresponds to a society of regulations and disciplines; and finally, a state of government that is no longer essentially defined by its territoriality, by the surface occupied, but by a mass: the mass of the population, with its volume, its density, and, for sure, the territory it covers, but which is, in a way, only one of its components (Foucault, 2007: 145).”*

The aim of governmentality is to make reality measurable through statistics and to identify and overcome problems that may arise in this direction so that incentives can be provided for desired realities. As a matter of fact, in order for the population to become controllable by the state, statistics are needed to make realities measurable in a systematic way. When it comes to security systems, what comes to mind now are notions such as danger, risk, crisis and incident that can be analyzed through statistics. Cases that pose a threat to the government are handled one by one through security systems, measures are created to prevent the spread of a certain situation as a risk factor, and accordingly, it establishes the mechanism to govern crises. It can be stated that governmental power is manifested on two planes: the macro plane and the micro plane. By macro-plane, we mean political technologies that deal with the population as a whole, such as urban planning that enables mobility, safe circulation of labor and capital, measures against agricultural problems, and management of health. The micro level is the use of individualizing techniques to make individuals voluntarily participate in the system of

governmentality; the manipulation and conducting of conduct or, in Foucault's terminology, "subjectification". The process of subjectification, which is discussed in detail in the section on subject and truth and which includes the internalization of certain normativity by the individual without any pressure or coercion, involves the practices of becoming the subject of experiences. Indeed, it is obvious that the governmentality model, with its constitutive effect on subjects, is directly related to the biopower model mentioned earlier in the analysis of power. The fact that the population has become a de facto problem propels the government into the era of biopower and includes people's bodies in the political system. In this context, in line with the interests of power, individuals have been exposed to various manipulated objective information in order to ultimately maintain the continuity of the existing system. Knowledge that is claimed to be objective, in other words, the notions that emerged as the power-information systems fed each other, began to rule the population with various historical facts. Norms, values or experiences that do not encompass all these historical realities have become notions of marginality. With the model of governmentality invented in the eighteenth-century, the central point of the actions of normal and abnormal is now determined as being favorable or unfavorable. The model's population becomes the object of government with unfavorable phenomena automatically canceling themselves out. The notion of government refers to techniques for governing people's conduct and not necessarily to the people who govern them. The term "governmentality" was coined to denote the activities of individuals, whether they belong to government or not, to direct the attitudes of other individuals; in other words, to govern. Various institutions that are subject to the notion of governmentality can be exemplified as schools, armies, workshops, etc., and can be considered as places where techniques of conducting conducts are created and maintained. As a matter of fact, governmentality aims to reach the individual at the deepest level, and since its ultimate goal is to provide self-government; it aims to produce a relationship between the individual and himself/herself.

The factor of governmentality as the model of power adopted by neoliberal thought, or what will now be referred to as the notion of "neoliberal governmentality", is both a producer of truth and a producer of subjects. As a matter of fact, neoliberal governmentality manifests itself by both individualizing and totalizing. In this sense, the main goal of neoliberal governmentality is to determine the possible field of action of individuals. Neoliberal governmentality is not an ideology but a rationality and a norm of existence that encompasses the relations that individuals establish with themselves. However, the fact that this rationality is called a norm of existence does not mean that it is the necessary destiny of human history, but like all other notions, it is historically constituted. In this study, it is important to consider neoliberal governmentality as a new type of reason that produces and governs individuals, produces truths and brings its norms, rather than an economic policy.

The society of neoliberal governmentality has now become an "enterprise culture"; individuals use their bodies for the continuity of the existing system with their own consent. In other words, the individuals of the enterprise culture constitute a society that has become its own operator and accepts its attitudes towards others in line with the norms of competition as objective truth. At this point, it is necessary to address the notion of population as the main problematic of neoliberal governmentality through biopolitics. The only purpose of the interventionist and transformative attitude on population is not only on the legal level, but also at the point where the age of biopower has come into being to provide various transformations through biological bodies. In other words, and from Foucault's perspective, neoliberal governmentality keeps society and the individual under a constant and profound constructionist intervention in line with the principles of the market. Far from a "let them do it" ideology, neoliberal governmentality involves governing strategies to influence the behavior of different categories of the population by anticipating their behavior. Neoliberal governmentality should be considered as a set of discourses, practices and apparatuses that make production possible through government techniques that extend to all social spheres related to

individuals. Neoliberal rationality, which revises all social relations according to the market model by ordering individuals to engage in economic struggle with each other, offers a universe of generalized competition. Neoliberal rationality, which aims to establish, govern, and direct the thoughts, desires, attitudes and wishes of each individual of society by creating a certain framework, is within the complex interrelationship of subjectification and objectification. Together with the objectivities it creates in line with historical a priori, it generalizes notions such as investment, enterprise, risk and generalizes them to all areas of life, thus creating societies that it incorporates into the system of competition. While there is no "outside" in neoliberal governmentality, "freedom" is promised in a life where different types of subjectivities become impossible. Neoliberal governmentality, which includes the implementation of new forms of exploitation such as the control of labor and regulations on the mobility of capital, also constructs a new type of social subject by spreading this rationality to the social sphere. In neoliberal rationality, labor for enterprises is no longer an external mechanism, but an internal profit element included in their capital. Neoliberal governmentality, which demands complete commitment from individuals, constitutes "human capital". Individuals constituting human capital should develop themselves in line with the profits of the market. The primary objective of all self-education techniques should be to develop and maintain the market. As a result of all of this self-education, the labor produced in work life presently belongs to the enterprise rather than the individual. Indeed, the post-fordist human capital, with all its subjectivity and motivation, must devote itself to the company and work as if it were working for itself by eliminating all distances between itself and the company that provides employment. The individual formed by the neoliberal order must internalize the interests of the company to which s/he belongs as his or her own interests and shape his or her life accordingly with his or her own consent.

### **3.3. THE CONSTITUTION OF NEOLIBERAL SUBJECT**

Neoliberalism, together with the new governmentality and its associated dispositifs, reveals the possible conditions for the transformation of subjectivity. Neoliberal governmentality brings with new norms, values and knowledges by not only regulating society but also constructing the social framework. It imposes a competitive mission on subjectivity by producing actions that enable the continuation of the market economy as a process. As a matter of fact, in this sense, "competition" both makes it possible for the market to function and becomes a notion that connects subjectivity to society. Freedom, which enables the stable functioning of competition, opens up space only in this context. With the neoliberal order, knowledge becomes policy of economics, and the practice of freedom becomes the freedom of competition and thus emerges functionally within the market economy. While the homo-economicus positioned in classical liberalism was the individual who exchanges and the productive subject, with neoliberalism, he has become the "entrepreneurial subject" who aims to maintain the continuity of the market society with all his motivation.

With neoliberal governmentality, the environment in which individuals can live is created by connecting them to social and economic reality as small enterprises. In this context, the neoliberal order, which intervenes through the relations realized within the social structures to which the individual is connected, has taken away the individual's autonomy. As a matter of fact, the personal norms of the individual are now determined on the plane of competition and individuals shaped accordingly become "neoliberal subjects". At this point, when the individual internalizes the neoliberal norms and starts to constitute himself in this way, he contributes to the governmental function of neoliberal governmentality. In order for individuals to continue as actors of the neoliberal order, their sense of belonging and trust must first be established. By taking property relations as an example, this can be considered as the basis on which individuals adapt to society and hold on to it. In industrialized societies, the sense of belonging that the acquisition of any property creates in the individual is one of the driving forces for the continuation of the



neoliberal order. One of the most important conditions for the functioning of the market is the internalization of market conditions and rules by the individual. When the individual internalizes the rules of the institution in which s/he works in order to survive in society and fully commits himself/herself in this direction, in other words, when s/he fully possesses "market virtues", s/he can exist in the market society. At the same time, the individual's voluntary possession and maintenance of all market virtues is important for the continuity of the market economy. The individual who sustains market society by conforming to a certain kind of subjectivity directly reveals the vital triangle of "society-market-individual" of the neoliberal order.

One of the possible conditions for the neoliberal order to position the working individual as an economic subject is that it treats salary as an income, as the return of the investment of a capital. The capital that can provide this income, i.e. the human capital, is the sum of all physical and psychological characteristics of the individual. While human capital includes both innate and acquired characteristics, individuals can develop their capital as they increase their investments in themselves, and it is precisely at this point that the transformation of the individual into an enterprise takes place. Indeed, in *The Birth of Biopolitics*, Foucault points out that even innate characteristics can be changed, and in this context, genetic science objectifies individuals for specific purposes. The norms of the neoliberal subject and the economic norms produced in this context do not only remain on the economic plane, but also vitally permeate the social plane. Individuals turned into enterprises by the neoliberal order direct their private lives and all their personal relationships in this context. In the neoliberal order, society is directed in accordance with its own interests as if it has no other choice. As a matter of fact, the neoliberal subject, who lives his/her life depending on various market communities by leaving aside his/her solitude, is shaped by the smooth transfer of the order of competition to him/her.

The order operates by removing all gaps with firms so that the individual does not alienate himself/herself and by turning the firm's goals into the goals of the

individual. *“The new techniques of ‘personal enterprise’ doubtless reach a peak of alienation in claiming to abolish any sense of alienation: following one’s desire and obeying the Other who speaks softly within the self are one and the same thing (Dardot & Laval, 2013: 289).”* In this sense, the opiate of the individuals who, despite their alienation from themselves, internalize the logic and rationality of the market and make it possible for it to spread to every field, is a moderate reflection of the mechanical aspects. Therefore, individuals serve the market society in every aspect of their lives and automatically perform their actions accordingly. As a matter of fact, in line with the purpose of neoliberal governmentality, individuals internalize the fact that they are enterprises, and thus form their self-identity in this way.

Foucault states that for a society to become governable in line with the homo-economicus, it is necessary to create a "civil society" as a new truth. *“An omnipresent government, a government which nothing escapes, a government which conforms to the rules of right, and a government which nevertheless respects the specificity of the economy, will be a government that manages civil society, the nation, society, the social (Foucault, 2008: 296).”* Against the limitation of legal factors that emerge as an obstacle to the complete control of the economic sphere by political power, governmentalization is necessary. As a matter of fact, the notion of civil society, which is a solution to the impasse of the opposition between economic and legal factors, is part of the technology of governmentality and is not a naturally occurring phenomenon. Foucault treats civil society as a historically constituted phenomenon, like the notions of madness or sexuality, and calls all of these "transitional realities". Transitory figures such as civil society, which emerge from actions outside the control of power relations, are historically constituted realities. In this context, the notion of civil society can be considered as the field of truth for making the social sphere governable and the functions of the sustainability of governmentality together with homo-economicus. The most basic example of the neoliberal subject as homo-economicus is the notions of crime and punishment. With the new rationality, the concept of crime, far from being a reference to the

moral or universal justice system, appears as an economic decision mechanism. As a matter of fact, while in past histories, crime was a phenomenon that was tried to be minimized in any society, the neoliberal order aims to determine the level of crime that can be economically overcome. In other words, the economic order determines the price for immoral behavior or any behavior that is considered pathological. In this direction, the biggest evidence provided by the neoliberal order is that the elements that make crime a crime are historical constructs and are in direct contradiction with objectivity. In a model where crime, pathology, abnormality or all other notions of marginalization are determined in line with the economic order, it is clearly seen that the understanding of security aims to ensure the security of the system rather than the security of society. As a matter of fact, neoliberal governmentality is not interested in the individual or individuals who are criminals but is busy creating the rules of the games of truth that make the criminal a criminal. In other words, since the neoliberal order's one-by-one intervention in individuals would bring great economic losses, it keeps society under its influence at a low cost by directly determining the rules of the game.

The process of harmonization of the market, which operates in a regulated manner, with society can only be achieved by constituting its own subject. Therefore, neoliberal governmentality treats the market as a process of subjectification. Neoliberal governmentality is manifested as a subjective process and the subject it creates is formed in line with the principle of competition. Individuals, who are in competition with each other while the competition continues, create various plans, goals and undergo certain trainings in order to win this race. As a matter of fact, to be the winner in competition and to ensure that others become the "other" by leaving them behind is through the acquisition of various knowledge. The aim of the neoliberal subject is to establish a competitive advantage with the information created in line with its goals and in this context, it reshapes subjective experience. In this respect, it is necessary to recall the power-knowledge relations explained in the analysis of power. Indeed, with neoliberal governmentality, information is transformed into knowledge through power.

However, the individual of the market society does not have equal access to information, and it is precisely this "inequality" that perpetuates the market society. The imbalance that comes with inequality is permanent, and the reason why this inequality is vital for the market is that subjects take initiatives to access information and the entrepreneurial movements that increase as they access information. Therefore, the subject of the market society, which provides a cycle within itself, is formed in such a way as to sustain it. In this sense, the vital elements of the subjects formed by neoliberal governmentality are competition and inequality. The notion of competition, which is integrated into social life as the endless game of neoliberal governmentality, causes individuals to become immanent to themselves and causes them to lose all connection with the existence of things outside of it. The subject of neoliberal governmentality has become "entrepreneurial" as required by the game of competition and has started to train itself in this axis for all areas of life. The subject, who lives in and is shaped by the market, is now the reason why governmentality can manifest itself in a different way by mastering market knowledge, receiving various trainings that serve this purpose and continuing them continuously, and governing itself. The disciplinary, prohibitive methods that emerged in previous historical conditions to exercise power over the subject have been replaced by self-government. The neoliberal subject incorporates itself into the market society without the need for any external element and ensures the continuation of governmentality. As a matter of fact, due to the norms of the society in which he lives, the neoliberal subject has to reproduce himself; it should not be unemployed by being a "respectable" person so as not to be a burden on anyone. Another notion of the neoliberal subject is the concern of "being trustworthy" and accordingly, the working individual automatically becomes trustworthy once s/he attains a respectable position. The responsibility of the neoliberal subject is to support itself and its genetic family through material gain, and even to enlarge this cycle by starting a family. Otherwise, individuals who are unemployed and do not meet the conditions necessary to find a job and insist on not conforming to the ideology of the majority are marginalized by being labeled as unreliable and irresponsible. In the neoliberal order that problematizes

unemployment as a moral problem, it is its productivity that determines the value of the subject. As a matter of fact, the emergence of "self-realization" actions and the fact that individuals feel better when they take actions in this direction are precisely the indicators of becoming a neoliberal subject. Acts of self-realization, which include various forms of being the best, increase the value of the neoliberal subject as they increase its efficiency. Subjects who fall outside this notion and do not develop themselves, or in other words, do not invest in their own company, are labeled with all the marginalizing adjectives of society. Therefore, while the individual has a responsibility to "be the best" in society, society has no responsibility towards the individual. *"His own expert, his own employer, his own inventor, his own entrepreneur: neoliberal rationality encourages the ego to act to strengthen itself so as to survive competition. All its activities must be compared with a form of production, an investment, and a cost calculation (Dardot & Laval, 2013: 292)."* The neoliberal subject must calculate statistical risk by calculating the deviations that may occur in the external factors of all his actions and, accordingly, become a responsible adult.

All aspects of the behavior and decisions of the neoliberal subject must be accountable to society, and in this respect the individual is subjected to psychic splits and fragmentation. When the psychological processes of the neoliberal subject, which is constantly constructed as having to sustain itself, are considered, the responsibilities imposed on the individual born with anxiety create greater anxiety in the future. The inability to fulfill the missions imposed on the individual, who is born with various responsibilities on the neoliberal plane from the moment of birth, brings with it the feeling of "worthlessness". The fact that individuals who have problems in adapting to norms in order to be accepted in society are considered worthless emerges as an inevitable end in the neoliberal order. Feelings of helplessness and shame accompany the individual who tries to cope with these feelings and who is obliged to regulate his/her conduct within the family even as a child. The conduct of the individual who shapes his/her life by mastering the factors of the neoliberal subject, which do not nurture this situation, bring with them the

feeling of not being accepted in society, the feeling of worthlessness and helplessness in the face of this worthlessness, and the feeling of shame towards his/her environment. It has become essential for individuals, who are equipped with the responsibility of self-development and self-government, to continuously educate themselves in order to be a part of the society. The subject of the order strives to reach the position of "being valuable" by becoming the best that it can be and without needing anyone else in order to survive. *"We are seldom at ease, and free enough from the solicitation of our natural or adopted desires; but a constant succession of uneasinesses out of that stock which natural wants, or acquired habits, have heaped up, take the will in their turns; and no sooner is one action dispatched, which by such a determination of the will we are set upon, but another uneasiness is ready to set us on work (Locke, 1825: 168)."* As Locke notes, anxiety in this sense gives rise to desires to guide behavior. In this context, individuals are obliged to shape their education, work life and social life by considering the problems and risks that may arise. The fact that the neoliberal subject becomes integrated into the system and reaches the "best" position is actually an indicator of the individual's helplessness. The aim of the individual who attempts to position himself/herself as the best is now to be "valuable" in the opinion of others and the satisfaction of desire is realized in this direction. As a matter of fact, the notion of the healthy adult of neoliberal governmentality is a historical construct and does not involve any objectivity.

The neoliberal order, which has been manifested with the emergence of positivist sciences, brings with it various subjectivities. Neoliberal governmentality's evisceration of 'psy' disciplines, equipping them with new discourses, turning them into notions and adopting them to subjects, reveals the psychological framework of truth games. The historicity of the emergence of 'psy' disciplines such as psychology, psychiatry, psychotherapy, and psychoanalysis, which deal with the emotions, thoughts, attitudes, behaviors and related mental states of the individual, is parallel to governmentality. While 'psy' disciplines provide determinations on the mental states of the individual, they create a certain

kind of field of truth in the construction of the subject formed on the axis of power-knowledge. The notions that emerge in order to ensure psychological regularity bring problematizations and practices with them. The realization of normalization and disciplining techniques in line with psychological practices within the framework of a certain political rationality causes them to be handled as an apparatus of neoliberal governmentality. As a matter of fact, by totalizing individuals who are not within the social norms into the social norms, these sciences, which include normalization techniques, sustain the system with "improvement" proposals. The benefit of the existing system on the subject of psychology, who is required to adapt to the economic and social environment, is not questioned. The purpose of the establishment of 'psy' disciplines is to "normalize", to turn what is desired into the continuity of the currently functioning system. As a matter of fact, all constructs that are "normal" are realities established on the axis of power-knowledge-truth, which have historically changed in line with the models of governance. In line with various techniques of confinement, change and transformation (therapy sessions), it is conveyed how the neoliberal subject should behave by limiting the areas of freedom. *"By conceiving the subject as the site of passions, desires and interests, but also of norms and moral judgements, it was possible to understand how psychological forces are motives of conduct and how to act technically on the psychic terrain through tailor-made systems of stimulation, encouragement, reward and punishment (Dardot & Laval, 2013: 316)."*

While individuals are positioned as producers of the market society and subjects of the neoliberal order, they must also assume the responsibility of protecting their mental and emotional health. As a matter of fact, no emotional problem of individuals should be reflected in their work life where the notion of professionalism is in play. Correcting the negative impact of society or past experiences on the individual is under the responsibility of the individual himself/herself and s/he should apply to the 'psy' disciplines that have emerged in this direction. When the neoliberal subject thinks or behaves differently from

others, it is accepted that it shows psychological resistance if it does not adapt to society through various therapy methods. Psychological resistance is a sign of ill-health that needs to be treated through inclusion in other abnormal actions. In this sense, the possible conditions for the individual to think or behave on his/her own, without any control mechanism, are naturally destroyed. However, since the neoliberal order represents an ideology established under the umbrella of "freedom", 'psy' disciplines transform individuals through their own freedom. The order, which operates unnoticed and apparently intervention-free on the basis of "freedom", also infiltrates and penetrates the individual's psyche. Although 'psy' disciplines recognize that people have different lives, they turn them into data within certain classifications and through various statistical methods. Examining people with various personality traits within various groupings and determining separate treatment methods for these grouped people emerges as the way 'psy' disciplines categorize the individual. As a matter of fact, while the fact that psychological terms are applicable to every person is an indicator of categorization, the statistical results obtained from these classifications turn the individual into data contributes to the way neoliberal governmentality functions. Just like homo-economicus, various statistical analyses determine the subjects who are included in governmentality and the subjects who will be excluded from it. By labeling individuals in line with certain notions, 'psy' disciplines, which are obliged to correct and rehabilitate those who have the potential to pose a problem for the continuity of the existing system, make society governable. As a matter of fact, the fact that material existence is the condition for accessing 'psy' disciplines, with exceptions, does not serve the purpose of creating a real "healthy society". In an order where the relevant disciplines, which claim to serve individuals for the purpose of treatment, healing and repair, have economic interests, it is obvious that the only goal is not social welfare. The relevant disciplines aim to teach subjects various behaviors and ways of thinking that will cause them to establish a certain kind of relationship with themselves and with other subjects. Accordingly, the first thing the individual must learn is to take responsibility for himself or herself. The individual who accepts his/her responsibility chooses not to question the dominant



system for the unhappiness or setbacks s/he experiences, but to question himself/herself, and this is a free choice. Thus, neoliberal subjects created within the neoliberal order see themselves as guilty by holding themselves responsible for their unhappiness. In order to reverse their negative feelings, they have to resort to 'psy' disciplines, which ultimately, like all other historical a priori, contribute to the market society. The 'psy' disciplines that are resorted to in order to recover from various disappointments or negativities make the subjects docile. As a matter of fact, the main goal of the therapeutic processes and the scientific recommendations that emerge in this direction is to integrate the individual into society in a docile way. For example, the neoliberal order suggests that the state of mourning or feeling bad about a loss should be overcome by applying to psychology units. Indeed, the grieving or ill-feeling individual's productivity is reduced in relation to the market society, the company s/he works for and the economic order, and "healing" must take place in order to restore this productivity. Individuals are advised to resort to 'psy' disciplines to establish a relationship with the self, even if they do not experience a situation that is contrary to the normality offered by the neoliberal order. At this very point, the individual's relationship with the self opens up a field of governmentality and a set of discourses on self-understanding emerges. The neoliberal order, which integrates the individual's need for 'psy' disciplines in order to understand, to be understandable and to be able to explain, leaves no space outside of this. The individual who has resorted to 'psy' disciplines in order to understand himself/herself and to understand other subjects, in line with a free choice, must think that s/he has never had any other option, and this is precisely the way neoliberal governmentality works. 'Psy' disciplines, which claim to know more than individuals know about themselves, emerge as authorities and teach subjects to think in certain ways. The neoliberal subject participates in this very notion by using the discourses of 'psy' disciplines to define itself. Experts such as psychologists and psychiatrists, practitioners of 'psy' disciplines, receive the information they convey to individuals from governing technologies (educational institutions) and accordingly have a say over life. Positioned as an external authority in life, 'psy' disciplines are sustained through accessing the knowledge of what is

happening outside and inside. Experts of 'psy' disciplines claim that they possess the knowledge of all the problems and solutions to human behavior. If it is assumed to be completely unadulterated, human nature, social sustainability factors and all governance practices are impossible to know because they will contain thousands of differences. The state of knowing in this regard can only be valid for the subject formed in line with certain notions. Accordingly, the fact that the entrepreneurial subject of neoliberal governmentality is composed of given knowledge, and that all its aspects are knowable, makes 'psy' disciplines functional as well as therapeutic.

The discourses of 'psy' disciplines, which emerge as having the authority over the subject and thus the right to have a say, are used by the individual to explain all mental states. For example, when an individual expresses that s/he suffers from "depression" as a result of experiencing more than one negative emotion while expressing his/her feelings and thoughts, this is an indication that 'psy' disciplines are included in the field of discourse. In this situation, which works just as neoliberal governmentality is imposing acceptance without being perceived, the individual turns himself/herself into the subject of 'psy' disciplines without even realizing it. With 'psy' disciplines, a wide field of truth emerges by creating certain types of knowledge through certain types of subjectivities, and there is no space left outside this plane. The trust created in society by these notions that constitute a field of truth legitimizes the authority of experts specializing in 'psy' disciplines over individuals. In this sense, just like the infiltration of neoliberal governmentality both in business life and private life, 'psy' disciplines become natural enough to be positioned in areas that can be called "private". As a legitimate form of infiltration into the individual's family life or personal relationships, 'psy' disciplines contribute to the intervenable areas of neoliberal governmentality. The privacy of the "patient" in therapy/treatment processes may come to mind here, but what is in question is not a system that operates at this level, but the treatment practice of the person who performs the treatment as a neoliberal subject. As a matter of fact, it has already been stated that neoliberal governmentality leads to a compulsory freedom by leaving no other space under the name of freedom. It is an inevitable

result that specialists trained with the programs provided by the institutions that have emerged in line with this order perform treatments in the context of neoliberal aspects if they do not question them. Especially since 'psy' disciplines are based on the techniques of "normalizing human beings" and this normalization itself is a game of truth established through power models, it is quite clear that it is impossible for them to stay outside the neoliberal order. The political aims of neoliberal governmentality and the scientific aims of 'psy' disciplines coincide with each other; mental and physical "well-being" is centered on the basis of "efficiency". The fact that this well-being is based on making individuals productive and not causing problems in society, regardless of what the individual wants, is the sustainer of the continuity of the system. 'Psy' disciplines impose on subjects the mission of being the subject of calculations by diagnosing them through subjectivities, organizing reports and turning them into statistical data. Individuals, who become calculable subjects, are categorized as those who threaten the general welfare of society or those who do not; they are imprisoned in various confinement practices or various treatment methods. The abnormalities of the individuals who will be included in confinement practices are defined in line with the economic calculations of the government. As a matter of fact, it should not be ignored that the notions that constitute the discourse of abnormality have been renewed in line with each historicity and each power model. In this sense, "madness" manifests as a historically constructed experience that appears objectively true based on science but contains subjective knowledge. The 'psy' disciplines, which position people as "knowable" beings by including them in various classifications, have replaced the old oppressive methods of ordering or forbidding with personal motivation.

## **FOURTH CHAPTER:**

### **ANALYSIS OF THE QUEST FOR SELF**

#### **4.1. SIGMUND FREUD'S APPROACH TO SELF-UNDERSTANDING**

The psychoanalytic theory proposed by Sigmund Freud is not only a form of treatment within the therapeutic method of psychology, but also a set of social phenomena that must be culturally analyzed. With *The Future of an Illusion*, psychoanalysis began to be considered as having a role in the formation of society and civilization. Freud, who positioned the theory of psychoanalysis on the formation of civilization in the last periods of his life, argued that individuals are equipped with various cultural codes throughout their lives. The fact that the external controls that occur in line with the factors forming the personality become internal controls over time constitutes society and thus civilization. The theory of psychoanalysis emphasized that the individual is at war with himself by suppressing his impulses and restricting his desires as the condition that makes it possible for him to live in society. Freud saw the concepts of "culture" and "civilization" as equivalent notions and stated that they are formed in line with repression. While forming his psychodynamic theory, Freud was influenced by Greek mythology and Darwinian evolutionary theory; he based the Oedipus complex on the fact that humanity was ruled in herds by a male tyrant in primitive times. By utilizing Ancient Greek mythology, he based the instincts of life and death, which he called the basic instincts, on Eros and Thanatos.

Freud, who believes that the members of society need to work and contribute to the economy in order to survive, serves the aims of the capitalist system in this sense. With his work *Unrest in Culture*, he pointed to the economy as the main motivation of the individual, and at the same time, he emphasized that the control of sexual energy is achieved through work. Freud, who dealt with issues such as technology, art, science and religion as the basic dynamics of civilization, shaped his psychoanalytic theory in line with these notions while integrating it into the

subject of civilization. He believed that aggression impulses could be sublimated in line with the dynamics of civilization and especially claimed that there is a close connection between art and human beings. Knowing that art has always been present in human life in different aspects since primitive societies, knowledge of art is not only based on reason but also on intuition. While the individual acquires a high level of fulfillment by assuming the identity of an artist while performing art, s/he also contributes to the cultural development of the society to which s/he belongs. In fact, there is no more persuasive method than art in showing devotion to social norms, which are the formative factors of culture.

"Religion", one of the notions of civilization as a reference point for humanity's desperate searches, was considered by Freud as a form of consolation. He positioned it as one of the notions that make it possible for society to live together; he argued that religion and civilization function in line with similar demands. According to Freud, religion, one of the notions that constitute the cultural superego, is important for the continuation of civilization. Just like other notions of cultural superego, such as politics, law, and social institutions, factors that operate in line with similar demands pursue the interests of civilization. However, who Freud addressed religion in the same way as Karl Marx considers the notion of religion as the opium of the peoples. He positioned religion as an "illusion", thinking that it was quite unscientific and attracted the masses only because it told them mysterious things. Freud, who always advocated science, argued that a relationship between religion and civilization needed to be re-established.

According to Freud, civilization sustains itself through the subjugation of human instincts. However, according to him, civilization, although it contains aspects that cause unhappiness for the individual, is necessary for the maintenance of a social life. Freud, who believes that individuals acting on their id impulses will harm social unity, accepts the regulations of civilization through various pressures as legitimate. Freud pointed out that the prohibitions of civilization are necessary as a condition of civilized life, since he did not have an imagination of a society consisting of individuals who spontaneously participate in working life and

voluntarily give up their impulses. As a matter of fact, Freud, who believed that without the prohibitions of civilization, the individual would continue his life entirely based on id impulses, pointed out that an environment of chaos could occur and attributed great importance to the superego in this sense. Freud argues that acting entirely on id impulses would bring about the end of civilization and bring about the state of nature. Freud, who accepted the state of nature as chaos, considered civilization as a response to the desperation of human beings in the face of nature. As a matter of fact, in the state of nature, the individual does not need to impose any restrictions on his/her instincts; however, nature has various methods of restriction. Factors such as natural events, diseases, turmoil, death, which can completely disrupt human life, mock the individual's effort to dominate nature. According to Freud, as a result of the dangers posed by nature to human life, "civilization" emerged as a mechanism to protect society and must be maintained no matter what the circumstances require.

The fields of civilizations' struggle against individuals are prohibitions based on social morality. As a matter of fact, individuals may rebel against various prohibitions and become unhappy with social life due to these prohibitions. According to Freud, the restriction of sexual life, which is seen as the most important cultural prohibition, is a necessity in order to live as a society. The possibility of living in society without being subjected to sexual restriction with id impulses will create various aggression impulses and chaos. Accordingly, all notions related to the subject, including the individual's choice of sexual object, are determined in a controlled manner by social norms. This determination is seen by Freud as one of the conditions that make it possible to live in a society. The entire social life of the individual is shaped in line with cultural prohibitions, but repressed thoughts can emerge as aggressive impulses. Therefore, civilization must prevent all these negative impulses; it must strive to suppress them. It is precisely at this point that aspects of civilization such as art, science and religion come back into question. The aggressive impulses of the individual must be pushed to other targets by civilization through various repressions and obligations; it must make them

functional in matters such as art, science and religion. As a matter of fact, Freud, who positioned human nature in a negative way, especially through the impulses of aggression and sexuality, thought that it was not possible to completely eliminate the tensions between the individual and culture. He believed that life occurs in a struggle in line with the conflict of instincts and that this situation will continue to recur and that the bad instincts of human nature should be suppressed by the authority. The suppression or manipulation of instincts does not completely eliminate the tension in the individual and accordingly, neuroses occur in some individuals. Although Freud was in favor of the suppression of the individual by society, he considered the neuroses that may arise in individuals as the price to be paid for living in a civilized society. Freud, who considered unhappiness as a permanent notion in human life, argued that the necessities of life also contributed to this unhappiness. He points out that the superior power of nature, the weakness of individuals' bodies, and the inadequacy of factors that will regulate relations in society (such as family, state) bring about unhappiness and that this issue cannot be overcome by the efforts of the individual. By presenting various ideas to justify the oppression by civilization, Freud argues that happiness would not be possible anyway and that hostility towards culture is unnecessary. He argues that the main effort of the individual, in the struggle between Eros and Thanatos, should be to direct Thanatos towards useful cultural areas in order to make Eros prevail.

The theory of psychoanalysis, which emerged in order to explain the mental states of individuals, as a psychotherapy technique, does not operate in isolation from society. Accordingly, it is an obvious conclusion that the main reason for the behaviors or thoughts of the individuals exposed to treatment, which are coded as "problems", emerges in line with social factors. As a matter of fact, as a social being, the individual lives in a spiritual turmoil by using various defense mechanisms in line with superego and id conflicts. The main reason for this psychological turmoil is the effort to belong to a society, to be included in a civilization. It is precisely at this point that the theory of psychoanalysis, which seeks the unconscious reasons underlying behaviors, reveals the notions of civilization. The price of living in a

civilized society is not only the struggle against neuroses, but also the sacrifice of the individual and this is seen as a necessity from Freud's perspective. Freud, who imagined an environment of chaos by referring to civilization from the most extreme point when it comes to id impulses, ignored the most extreme point of the superego's desires. As a matter of fact, while proposing life under the domination of the superego, he ignored the possibility of a mechanical life, in other words, the possibility of depersonalization in parallel with the loss of human impulses as a result of excessive id suppression, which is the extreme point of this situation. While psychoanalysis is a guiding technique for the individual in establishing a relationship with himself/herself or in spite of his/her efforts to understand himself/herself, being led to other paths or regulating behaviors on this path is another manifestation of domination.

#### **4.2. MICHEL FOUCAULT'S APPROACH TO SELF-UNDERSTANDING**

Michel Foucault, one of the thinkers who conducted research on the collective psychological transformation of the way of life as a result of the material environment that occurs within the individual mind, social factors and the use of language in this direction, examined the relationship between human psychology and social order. From psychiatric clinics to prisons, Foucault examined various confinement practices, social norms and sexuality, and also worked on techniques of self-reflection. Freeing himself from the psychoanalytic perspective, which was the dominant Western way of thinking of his time, he analyzed historical psychology in terms of collective mentalities. While Foucault's early works dealt with the shaping of the mind by an external authority and the definition of non-public behavior according to actions of abnormality, his later works deal with the consequences of the inclusion of individuals defined as abnormal in various practices of confinement.



The Age of Enlightenment, or what is more commonly described in Foucault's corpus as the Classical Age, claimed to treat intellectual freedom as its primary priority. However, according to Foucault, this period differs not only in its disciplining of human behavior but is the result of the reappearance of previous models of power with new techniques. With the subjection of the body and the mind to public scrutiny, the public was defined by defining the boundaries of the normal, and those outside the boundaries were classified as abnormal and became the subjects of confinement practices. Foucault argued that the modern concept of reason was shaped as a result of policing activities that led to a mentality of directing appropriate behavior. *"Foucault's thesis about the policing process is the key to his understanding of the psyche as an abstraction conjured up by public authority to satisfy the need of modern society for a more disciplined conception of the self (Foucault, 1988b: 126)."* Behaviors that only led to being positioned as the outsider in the Middle Ages became intolerable and excluded behaviors with the modern notion of reason. As a matter of fact, within the scope of Foucault's thoughts on rational and the irrational, it has been argued that the notions of "sanity" or "madness" consist of a historical definition. Foucault, who frequently argues the shaping of individual behavior through dichotomies, explained that various notions emerged in order to impose the norms of the wider society. For example, the discourses that produce the notion of sanity are shaped by the notion of madness. Concepts that are opposites of each other, while confirming each other by being described within the limitations subject to institutional definitions, become the truth of individuals. The fact that individuals who are locked up in psychiatric clinics as insane get rid of this weakness by seeking treatment is a different aspect of validating institutional definitions. Policing activities that emerge in this direction involve the construction of discourses and actions towards human nature. The fact that individuals make themselves identifiable through their words and behaviors is an indication that they cannot reach a hidden reality through self-analysis. As a matter of fact, the result of the method of self-analysis will be no more than the totality of public description procedures. Therefore, according to Foucault, although there is no given human nature, generations are shaped in line with the

linguistic and institutional factors inherited from previous generations. However, all notions inherited from the previous generation that become the discourse of the new generation can manifest differently. Just as the notion of insanity was first parsed historically in line with religious doctrines, then metamorphosed through legal arguments, and finally transformed in medical/psychological terms, the limitations placed on human behavior have remained the same even as explanations have changed. Foucault considered continuity not in ideals but in the strategies through which ideals are formed. By examining the relations between the techniques used to realize human activities rather than their meanings, Foucault attempts an inquiry from the present to the past using the method of genealogical analysis. *“The main point is not to accept this knowledge at face value but to analyze these so-called sciences as very specific “truth games” related to specific techniques that human beings use to understand themselves (Foucault, 1988b: 18).”* As the conditions that make the emergence of practical reason possible, technologies of production, sign system technologies, technologies of power and techniques of self-fashioning, often working together, enable individuals to be changed and transformed. All factors that will emerge in the journey of the individual's self consist of discourses formed in the field of various truth games and are shaped by the dominant ideology of the period.

In his early works, Foucault signaled the beginning of the infiltration of the unregulated areas of the society, which was tried to be kept under control; with his thoughts on sexuality, he pointed out that there was no area left outside the dominance of policing activities. Just like the notions of madness and criminality, when the subject of sexuality began to be widely discussed in society by being subjected to public scrutiny, limitations emerged. Foucault argues that sexuality is not liberated as it begins to be talked about, but its limitations are determined and accordingly it is institutionalized by being confined to boundaries. Indeed, according to Foucault, sexuality itself is a constructed notion. Foucault, who considers the most important revolution in the modern age as the spread of discourses on sexuality, argues that legitimate and illegitimate sexual behavior

codes were determined in line with policing activities. Policing activities, which take place on the notion of sexuality much more than notions of insanity or criminality, bring along techniques of self-control. Hence, the transition from the existing authority's techniques of policing the individual to the individual's techniques of self-policing becomes an issue. In line with the directives for the individual to better understand himself/herself, analyzing his/her sexual behaviors in order to make sense of them paves the way for the individual to control himself/herself. Restraining the desires of the body or the individual's approach to the spiritual leader by abstaining from worldly pleasures reveals a process leading towards the confessional practices of 17th century religious doctrines. Self-analysis techniques that go back even before religious doctrines date back to the Stoics. Actions such as religious retreats, meditation, rituals, dream interpretations, which are believed to provide information about the future, were frequently used by the Stoics for different purposes and aimed to help the individual cope with the realities of the outside world. As a matter of fact, even before the Stoics, techniques of self-knowledge had been practiced; in the years before Christ, Pythagoreans had suggested to their apprentices to sink into silence by teaching them the virtues of life and to master them in this direction, and as Plato's dialogue *Alkibiades I* states, Socrates pointed to self-knowledge as a way to prepare one of his students for adult responsibilities in society. Foucault's genealogical analysis shows that the techniques of self-analysis have developed from the Platonic and Pythagorean periods, but their lineage goes back even further. Emphasizing that self-analysis techniques do not have a single starting point, Foucault argues that they have emerged with various aspects since the birth of humanity and continue to be renewed. Foucault, who believes that the individual should trace back several generations by using the genealogical method in his journey of self-understanding, touches upon the similarities and differences between the ways in which generations use ideas. The importance Foucault attaches to the ideas of the current age emerges in this context. He points out that the notions that determine an individual's behavior are not derived from familial factors, but from the various accidental norms of the age. In this context, the shaping of human psychology in

line with various norms is not a newly emerging phenomenon, but a mechanism of transformation that has continued as long as human history has existed. *“The discursive formation whose existence was mapped by the psychiatric discipline was not coextensive with it, far from it: it went well beyond the boundaries of psychiatry (Foucault: 2002, 179).”*

Stating that the mechanisms of power are always vigilant in producing norms and values, Foucault pointed out that human nature has a structure that is constantly being constructed in line with the journey of searching for meaning. Foucault, by stating that objectivity is not possible in the definition of the self, treated it as a subjective reality that is constantly renewed in discourse in line with historical repression mechanisms. Ultimately, even if the individual's techniques of the self have gone through various differences, it is a set of tools to increase the capacity to establish power over behavior. Foucault considers human psychology not as an archive but as a mirror and considers the search for the self as the re-presentation to the individual of the images that the individual creates by defining himself. Foucault emphasizes that the methods for understanding the self are more important than the search for the self, and points out that the continuity of the shaping techniques is in the reconstruction and reconstruction of human nature. Since there is no given human nature, human behavior is the product of subjective realities that are being transformed in line with the historical period in which they exist.

## CONCLUSION

This study includes explanations on the use of psychoanalytic theory as a truth game in the construction of the neoliberal subject, starting from the production of the social individual as various subjects in line with existing notions. Although the notion of "truth" seems to correspond to the objective, it is considered as a set of procedures in which statements are produced, organized and disseminated, since it cannot be thought independently of political factors when it comes to practice. From the perspective of Foucault's thoughts, it has been argued that power creates truths, determinations and accordingly forms of individuality. The "truth regime", as the notion of the circular relationship of power with truth, represents the totality of identities that emerge with the aim of sustaining the continuity of the contemporary capitalist system. From this perspective, social norms are formed through the historical objectivities of the truth regime, and accordingly, the aspects of the construction of individuals as subjects become the focus of discussion. In line with the power model that Foucault describes as biopower and corresponds to the establishment of the psychological subject, the set of relations between heterogeneous elements such as institutions, discourses, laws, scientificities as discursive and non-discursive practices form dispositifs. Foucault revealed that there cannot be a single objective rationality, and that rationality is historical. Hence, it is possible to constitute objects and subjects along various historicities. By determining the process of the constitution of the subject in line with historical factors, "truth" is manifested as a "historical a priori". Various types of subjects are formed when all notions, which become the norms of society as truth, become "objective" in line with various power mechanisms and take the form of historical a priori. While doing the archaeology of knowledge, which he described as archival science, Foucault aimed to show different fields of discourse and examined the forms acquired by discourses and the historical a prioris of the discourses that emerged in this direction. He proposed the method of genealogical analysis to understand the factors of individuals' construction and acceptance of themselves as

subjects and interpreted the relations between knowledge and power in this context. For example, "madness", a notion established in line with knowledge-power relations, was defined as "deviance" in its historical antecedent, while it was defined as "patient" as a subject of psychiatry in the order in which the norms of science began to dominate. It is precisely at this point that there is no single objective truth that is valid in all historical processes, but realities are established notions. Practices involving the effort to socialize the other, who has become the subject of 'psy' disciplines and medical notions, are similar to the changes in the human body that bio-power makes subject to the changes in the human body.

Systems of power teach that the conditions which make it possible to live in society require adaptation. Individuals who are changed and transformed in order to maintain the continuity of the system cannot find a way out other than internalizing or obeying various mechanisms of subjectivation. Most views point to the impossibility of the individual living alone and the necessity of living collectively with shelter and security opportunities. The individual, who meets his/her needs for nutrition, shelter and security through society, has to obey various rules in return. Throughout history, the individual, who was obliged to obey the rules by force, sometimes in line with repressive policies, comes under an invisible control at every point where he feels liberated. As various norms are internalized by individuals, the presence felt by the mechanism of repression disappears. When it comes to the neoliberal governmentality order, the individual is automatically included in the system and internalizes the norms without the need for repression or violence. The notions of normal or abnormal are no longer imposed on individuals by the system through coercion, but through the fear of being marginalized. At this point, since the individual, who is the subject of psychology, is a being approaching pleasure as defined by Freud, s/he contributes to the continuity of the existing system with his/her own consent in order to avoid being involved in various practices of confinement. Otherwise, the individual, who experiences intense anxiety about being isolated from society, resorts to the therapeutic power of psychological disciplines. It is precisely at this point that the

neoliberal system comes into play, aiming to transform the individual's lifestyles in the age of biopower. Individuals who are classified as abnormal have been included in the system through various treatment methods within scientific methods. As the domination of the church in the Middle Ages was replaced by the science of the Age of Enlightenment, new technologies of power spread to every field. The claim that various areas of freedom have been opened up is nothing more than expanding the areas where power can penetrate. At the point where the relations between knowledge and power became evident, the grand narratives of science were shaped without feeling the pressure of power, but under its invisible domination. The fact that the factors of science have the function of governing the human body more and more every day has made it the tool of the age of biopower. The fact that various scientific practices have gained new objectivity in line with various new discoveries throughout history is proof of the impossibility of objective science.

The theory of psychoanalysis, one of the greatest recurring narratives of science from the 19th century to the present day, is the sum of Freud's approaches to resolving the uncertainties inherent in human beings and attributing meaning to their own obscurity. The theory of psychoanalysis, which is one of the narratives of science that is determined to maintain the continuity of the existing system, was born precisely as a response to the impasse of the power system of its time against life, which was becoming more complex with science. It made it impossible for the individual to feel that s/he was ruled by power, and that his or her behavior was governed by an unknown force (the unconscious). Accordingly, the primitive self and the unconscious became responsible for all the impulses of the individual that were not accepted by the existing system; therapeutic processes were aimed at eliminating these impulses. By pointing to the unconscious and even to dreams, psychoanalysis gathered the uncertainties at a single point and advised the individual to focus and adapt to social life rather than focusing on his/her own life. Indeed, at this point, the unconscious, which suddenly emerges with the narratives of science, paves the way for making sense of and destroying the illegal impulses that the mechanisms of power encounter in order to maintain their existence.

Foucault does not give a wide coverage to the theory of psychoanalysis, but his corpus can be read as a reference to psychoanalysis. As a matter of fact, although he does not analyze Freud's theory of psychoanalysis in detail, it is obvious that all his thoughts are capable of containing answers in this direction. Foucault and Freud's methods of approaching the mind are in stark contrast: Freud tended to examine the inner workings of human psychology. However, Foucault treated this method as a model that has been shaping the mind from the outside for centuries. Foucault, who revealed that psychoanalysis did not start with Freud within the framework of a genealogical analysis, pointed out that in this sense, the lineage of self-analysis techniques dates back to pre-millennium. Suggesting that the method of psychoanalysis derives from the ancient techniques of self-knowledge, Foucault points out that with Freud's theory, this situation was camouflaged in a medical language. Psychoanalysis, which is taken as a historical a priori precisely at this point, consists of a notion of techniques of self-understanding that existed under various names in the past and under various conditions. Like other notions of truth games that have emerged under different names and even in different disciplines under different conditions in history, but which serve the same purpose, psychoanalysis is a manifestation of the coming together of the technique of self-understanding, which has its origins in the past, with modern science. While Freud attributed the individual's behavior to the past, repressed impulses and parental care, Foucault pointed out that there is no given human nature on which behavior is based. By treating human nature as a notion that is entirely constructed and produced with discourses, Foucault pointed out that the understanding of the self is a set of truths that can be reconstructed. Freud acknowledged that the failure to satisfy the various primitive impulses that constitute personality by coming together with social norms creates unrest in the individual, but he reflected this unrest as the price of living in society by internalizing it. At this point, Freud's view of the individual's restlessness as the survival of society serves the interests of the governmentality model. As a matter of fact, Freud's theory of psychoanalysis has become more accepted and continues to be accepted with renewed acceptance in later historical periods due to its contribution to the continuity of the contemporary



capitalist system. The id, which is the culprit of the malfunctioning of the ego or the neoliberal subject, is tried to be rendered obedient through various defense mechanisms. Freud theorized what kind of defense systems the ego could develop in the face of primitive impulses, and provided leadership for what the neoliberal subject could do if it deviated from social norms. Ultimately, the disobedience of the id creates the need for 'psy' disciplines and leads to various therapies and hospitals. In this sense, the individual who resorts to psychiatric clinics or treatment methods emerges as the driving force for the individuals working in this field to continue their working lives and sustains the market society. Freud, who likened the theory of psychoanalysis to a memory technique and suggested on scientific grounds that past experiences can be revealed with the help of analysts as long as there is no organic damage to the brain, contributed to the establishment of 'psy' disciplines within the neoliberal order. Hence, experts of 'psy' disciplines or scientists who can sustain the market society play an important role in making sense of the scattered images extracted from the unconscious of the individual. It is precisely at this point that an expert in any 'psy' discipline, being himself a constituted subject, cannot be analyzed independently of various social contexts. In this context, from Foucault's perspective, institutions such as schools, where scientific experts learn the objectivity of science, cannot be considered independent of the mechanisms of power. As a matter of fact, just as there is no objective knowledge and knowledge consists of truth games established in line with power relations, the objective analyses that the method of psychoanalysis claims to reveal are also included in the same notion. According to Foucault's corpus, all objectively transmitted knowledge to society is regarded as subjectivities that are constituted and reproduced in accordance with the returns of historicities.

Freud claimed that the integrity of the personality is restored by the successful performance of psychoanalysis by the analyst towards the person analyzed, in other words, by the correct establishment of the links between past and present experiences. However, what is striking at this point is that the integrity of the personality is corrupted from the beginning. Pointing out that the ego will

become aware of its entire life story and all mysteries will be revealed through the analysis carried out with psychoanalysis, Freud argued that the power of the self will be re-established with the information generated in this direction. Indeed, while Freud argues that knowledge establishes power over the self, the entire Foucaultian corpus is about power shaping self-knowledge. The other point where the two thinkers have completely opposite opinions is about sexuality. The primordial self (id), to which all repressed desires point, consists of the construction and regulation of sexuality, along with other notions of structural models. As a matter of fact, individuals were taught the construction of sexuality and the behaviors that should occur in this direction through 'psy' disciplines, which were effective on areas that the power systems of the period could not explicitly influence.

*“While my project in writing the history of sexuality is to reverse the perspective, this is not to say that psychoanalysis is wrong, or that in our societies there is no such thing as the subject's ignorance of its own desire; My aim was to say, on the one hand, that we should try to examine this excessive socio-cultural production of knowledge about sexuality in its origins and its specific forms, and, on the other hand, to see how and to what extent psychoanalysis, which presents itself as the rational basis for the knowledge of desire - psychoanalysis itself, of course - has become part of this grand scheme of super-production of critical knowledge about sexuality (Foucault, 2016: 217).”*

It was also stated by Foucault that not all discourses and constructions on sexuality emerge spontaneously a priori; it was pointed out that the psychic structure does not have any systematization. As a matter of fact, while Freud argues that talking about sexuality is a liberating act, Foucault points out that the boundaries of sexuality are drawn and in this direction, on the contrary, it is restricted. Sexuality, which manifests on the axis of knowledge-power, derives its repressed structure, which must emerge under various conditions, from the necessity of the sovereign system. In this direction, the narrative of psychoanalytic theory that the individual begins to control id impulses in parallel with learning the principle of reality makes the principle of reality an area that is open to being besieged by systems of power.

What is imposed in neoliberal governmentality is not the principle of reality but the principle of power, and accordingly, subjects whose souls are obedient are formed. The fact that psychoanalysis points to the impossibility of intervention against the psyche but the possibility of adaptation through various actions prepares the individual for inaction against power. It is one of the ultimate aims of psychoanalytic theory that the truths established within the systems of power are internalized by individuals and that they build their lives accordingly. As a matter of fact, the abnormalities sent to the unconscious that psychoanalytic theory will put forward and the normality that should remain at the level of consciousness become definable only in this way. Therefore, what is to be cured is determined in line with the interests of the dominant system by positioning it as pathological and handed over to 'psy' disciplines to treat it. With neoliberal governmentality, the theory of psychoanalysis, which manifests as a mechanism of ideological repression, emerges as a new notion of inclusion of individuals who are outside the market society. The theory of psychoanalysis, which is historically a priori reproduced and reproduced in line with conformity to the existing order, emerges with different facets; while it previously served only to suppress impulses through therapeutic forms of treatment, with neoliberal governmentality it enables the control of impulses.

The theory of psychoanalysis defined various developmental stages based on childhood experiences and parental care, and assigned various tasks to individuals accordingly. Freud has already introduced the individual to a sense of responsibility with the narrative that there are tasks that individuals must perform from time to time and that if these tasks are not fulfilled, they will bring about neuroses. Just as in line with the laws of power, the individual is obliged to fulfill various duties in line with the laws of psychoanalysis, otherwise s/he is subjected to practices of confinement for the purpose of treatment. With psychic determinism, which states that behaviors emerge based on the previous behavior, Freud denied the existence of free will and saw the psychic structure as the sovereign power. As a matter of fact, Freud, who did not completely reject the existence of power

systems in this sense, shaped his theory by believing that it is essential to maintain the system as a necessity of living in a civilized society. With the neoliberal order, it has become impossible to think of any mental or physical activity as independent of the existing order. Indeed, neoliberal governmentality requires the individual to be free in order to ensure the continuity of the system. Ultimately, the individual takes the discourses occurring on the axis of knowledge-power as part of his/her free thought by adopting them as his/her own truths. Although free will consists of being the will of power, choices and thoughts emerge as the individual's own free choices in the real sense. The reason for this is that the neoliberal order does not leave any other choice, but creates the options itself. Accordingly, with the choices that the individual thinks s/he has made, s/he feels free and is satisfied with various pleasures, but these pleasures are realized as another aspect of the games of truth. As an indicator of the cooperation between neoliberal governmentality and the pleasure principle, the neoliberal subject has adopted various forms of self-development with the aim of being productive to society by getting pleasure from performance and working life. *“Herein lies the truth of ‘human capital’: the value that is ever more valorized is no longer simply the means to enjoyment, it becomes the object of enjoyment (Dardot & Laval, 2019: 93).”* The neoliberal subject, in whose history the pleasure principle has been established, has internalized the desire for more of the impulses that serve the superego rather than the impulses of the id. Although the superego's desires do not end, the fact that they have parallel desires with the neoliberal order is a different aspect of the steps towards the continuity of the market society. The neoliberal subject, who has started to position itself as a company in order to be useful to society, normalizes this impulse with the superego notion of psychoanalytic theory.

Neoliberal governmentality leads to the fragmentation of the psyche by using mechanisms of division and division through the subjectivity of individuals. By constantly defining various identities for neoliberal subjects in line with psychic division, the system problematizes subjectivity. Individuals, who continue their lives without being aware of the division, develop an unconscious mechanism by

defending themselves against various psychological tensions through personality division. However, at this point, the fragmentation of the psyche is manifested as an internalized reflection of the fragmentation of the external world. As a matter of fact, in this direction, involuntary blindness develops against realities that are not wanted to be seen. In reference to Freud's inability to cope with reality, neoliberal subjects are in psychic regression, unable to face a reality outside the external world that is articulated in their inner world. It is precisely because of this situation that they devote themselves entirely to becoming entrepreneurial subjects; they internalize their entire working life and focus on self-improvement techniques. The neoliberal subject, whose greatest field of pleasure is to perform and accordingly to corporatize itself, has ironically and dramatically become unaccountable for its self-concern by becoming overly responsible for itself. As a matter of fact, the neoliberal subject, with the perception that it cannot change the outside world, as it has been taught in all histories, must return to itself; it must rebuild itself from within with the contribution of psychoanalytic theory. While the neoliberal order attributes the individual responsibility for himself, it advises him to resort to 'psy' disciplines to transform himself. The responsibility of the neoliberal subject, who is said not to contribute to society in any way, or who feels various psychological problems while contributing to society, is to submit himself to 'psy' disciplines to cure himself. In the neoliberal order of governmentality, the individual's objectionable attitude towards the establishment of the individual as any type of subject becomes possible only through the attempt to establish an environment of solidarity by rejecting the environment of competition. Instead of externalizing the others, the common environment of solidarity, performed as a struggle for the self together with the others, can only make the practice of freedom in the real sense of the word.

## REFERENCES

- Boyne, Roy (1990). *“Foucault and Derrida: The Other Side of Reason”*, London: Unwin Hyman.
- Dardot, Pierre & Laval, Christian (2019). *“Never-Ending Nightmare – The Neoliberal Assault on Democracy”*, (Translated by Gregory Elliott), London – New York: Verso Books.
- Dardot, Pierre & Laval, Christian (2013). *“The New Way of the World: On Neoliberal Society”*, (Translated by Gregory Elliott), London – New York: Verso Books.
- Ergin, Hatice & Köseoğlu S. Armağan (2017). *“Gelişim Psikolojisi”*, Ankara: Nobel Akademi.
- Foucault, Michel (2016). *“Entelektüelin Siyasi İşlevi”*, (Çeviri: Işık Ergüden, Osman Akınhay, Ferda Keskin), Istanbul: Ayrıntı Yayıncılık.
- Foucault, Michel (1988a). *“Madness And Civilization: A History Of Insanity In The Age Of Reason”*, (Translated by Richard Howard), New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, Michel (1976). *“Mental Illness and Psychology”*, (Translated by Alan Sheridan), New York: Harper and Row.
- Foucault, Michel (2021). *“Özne ve İktidar”*, (Çeviri: Işık Ergüden, Osman Akınhay), Istanbul: Ayrıntı Yayıncılık.
- Foucault, Michel (2007). *“Security, Territory, Population”*, *“Lectures at the Collège de France 1977- 1978”*, (Translated by Graham Burchell), New York: Palgrave Macmillian.
- Foucault, Michel (1982). *“Subject and Power”*, *“Critical Inquiry”*, Volume 8, Number 4, Summer. The University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, Michel (1988b). *“Technologies of the Self – A Seminar with Michel Foucault”*, London: Tavistock Publication.

Foucault, Michel (2002). *“The Archaeology of Knowledge”*, (Translated from the French by A. M. Sheridan Smith), New York: Routledge.

Foucault, Michel (2008). *“The Birth of Biopolitics”*, (Translated by Graham Burchell), New York: Palgrave Macmillian.

Foucault, Michel (1978). *“The History of Sexuality – Volume 1: An Introduction”*, (Translated from the French by Robert Hurley), New York: Pantheon Books.

Freud, Sigmund (1920). *“A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis”* (Translated by G. Stanley Hall), New York: Horace Liveright Publisher.

Healy, Paul (2001). *“A ‘limit attitude’: Foucault, Autonomy, Critique”*, History of Human Sciences Vol.14, No.1, pp. 49-68, London: Sage Publications.

İnanç, Banu Yazgan & Yerlikaya, Eşef Ercüment (2017). *“Kişilik Kuramları”*, Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Locke, John (1825). *“An Essay Concerning Human Understanding”*, London: Thomas Davison, Whitefriars.