Dreams and their Interpretation, with Special Application to FREUDISM. By Sir ROBERT ARMSTRONG-JONES, M.D., F.R.C.P., F.R.C.S., Lecturer in Psychological Medicine to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, and Consulting Physician in Mental Diseases to Military Forces in London, late Resident Physician and Superintendent of the London County Asylum, Claybury. (By arrangement with the Editor of the *Practitioner*).

IT may seem out of place, whilst we are face to face with so grim a reality as a war for our very existence, and a war which has so deeply affected the life of every individual in this country as well as within the Empire, that we should be discussing the realms of dream-land; but we may claim that the "Bowmen," in the early days of the war, laid particular emphasis upon dreams—for to these of our brave warriors appeared the "Angel of the Mons," and the "unconscious mind" has been drawn, in literature at any rate, into the tragedies of the war.

In regard to mental diseases there has been witnessed, among our soldiers during this war, a marked dissociation of the elements of the mind, and the influence of the emotions upon conduct has been more than confirmed. The attention has been engrossed, and the mind has acted automatically and unconsciously without the direction of the will. Sir William Hamilton stated that consciousness cannot exist independently of some peculiar modification of mind, but some modification of mind (meaning the unconscious) is possible without actual consciousness. This field of the unconscious mind is not, as is claimed for it, the recent discovery of Freudian psychologists. Consciously and "unconsciously" the feeling of all medical men has been how best to win the war, and the Director-General of the Royal Army Medical Corps has been supported in his work with unspeakable patriotism by the whole medical profession; there has been a general undefined feeling that life should be preserved, grief assuaged, and suffering relieved, and an analysis of this "unconscious" feeling has been a favourite study among those who endeavour "to heal the mind." As an instrument in this analysis the study of dreams has been regarded as of utility to unravel its mysteries. It is claimed that the interpretation of dreams may help to *bring out of*

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.63.261.200 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the "unconscious mind" what is perplexing and hidden, and may thus help to restore the balance in the unstable and the neurasthenic who have suffered so extensively from mental shock of various kinds. The laboratory of the mind is open to all, but it must be especially attractive to students of mental conditions who take more than an academic interest in the subject. We are, therefore, justified in seeking for explanations of facts such as dreams which are within the experience of all.

The subject of dreams has interested mankind since the early days of primitive culture, and long before the dawn of history. Many and varied have been the speculations in regard to them, and the philosophers of antiquity entertained great diversities of opinion as to their cause and meaning. Dreams may be said to have a world of their own, and to have only obscure links of connection with any other facts in human experience. The savage regarded the dream-world as similar to, only more remote than, the one he dwelt in. When he fell asleep his second self left his body for unfamiliar haunts, where he met the second self of his dead ancestors. Socrates believed in the divine origin of dreams. Lucretius accounted for them on the principle that ideas or thoughts were material things which could be detached from each other, and be made to strike upon the mind. Porphyry ascribed dreams to the influence of a good demon, who warned the dreamer of the evils the bad demon was preparing for him. Baxter, in his work upon the soul, attributed dreams to the agency of good spirits which descended from their proper sphere, and condescended to weave midnight visions for poor mortals. As sleep has something awe-inspiring and inexplicable, so dreams, viewed from the waking state, have no less strange or perplexing a reality.

Dreams have been defined as "conscious processes during sleep," a definition which implies a self-contradiction, for conscious processes deny sleep, and normal sleep is attended with unconsciousness; but this unconsciousness may indeed be slight, yet it is not infrequently profound and even complete. During deep sleep the senses are unaffected by external, and even by internal impressions, yet it has been asserted that the mind is never at rest during sleep, and that there is always some dreaming. Dreams have also been defined as thoughts, or a series of thoughts, experienced in sleep—*i.e.*, a train of ideas

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.63.261.200 Published online by Cambridge University Press

presenting themselves to the mind during sleep. To-day, according to the followers of Freud, the definition of a dream is "the symbol of an unfulfilled wish," the meaning of the symbol having to be interpreted by an assumed psycho-analytic "code"; and the art of the psycho-analyst lies in the interpretation of these symbols. Because of its symbolic function a dream is looked upon to-day as having its root firmly fixed in the experience of the waking life, whilst its superstructure lies in the unreality of phantasms. It may help to understand the terms "symbol" and "symbolism" if we state that they are only applicable when the dream is interpreted, *i. e.* the dream then becomes the symbol of the meaning elicited. The terms themselves apply to the dream as recorded or the manifest dream, which is always centralised round certain subjects connected with the waking experience, and not, as erroneously believed by some, always and invariably connected with sexual matters. This is an injury to the dreamer, and an unnecessary contravention of the proprieties, and it is against experience to regard all dreams as desires. In other words, the dream, according to Freudian interpretation, always means the gratification of suppressed sexual desires.

The history of dreams is a long and ancient record, and authorities in the past have offered many explanations as to the process and import of dreaming. The Old Testament describes many dreams, also their interpretation. We have the beautiful dream of Jacob's ladder, and that of Joseph, which he related to his brothers, also the dream of Pharaoh and of Pharaoh's servant, of Solomon's choice of wisdom, through which he obtained in addition riches and honour. The dream of Nebuchadnezzar, which, as frequently happens, he himself had forgotten, was with Daniel's help revealed and subsequently interpreted, often the quickest way then to royal favour, and in acknowledgment of which the "King made Daniel a great man." The influence of dreaming upon the conscience is shown by the dream of Job, when he affirmed that "God speaketh once, yea twice; yet man perceiveth it not. In a dream, in a vision of the night when deep sleep falleth upon man; then He openeth the ears of men and sealeth their instruction, that He may withdraw man from his purpose." In the New Testament there is Joseph's dream, both before and after the birth of the Saviour; the dream of the three wise men,

and the dream of Pilate's wife, which were all quoted as messages from the spiritual world. Shakespeare puts into the mouth of Mercutio the cause of dreams: "Which are the idle children of a brain, begot of nothing but a fantasy." Byron, Milton, Robert Louis Stevenson, who stated that the motives for his best romances were inspired by dreams; Coleridge, Moore, and John Bunyan have all dwelt upon this attractive subject, and Bunyan stated that the whole of the *Pilgrim's Progress* was revealed to him in dreams. Certain races, like the North-American Indians, are stated to look upon a dream as a sacred event, being the most ordinary way in which the gods make known their will to man. In the *Journal* of a voyage to North America, Charlevoix relates how an Indian dreamed he had his hand cut off, which occurred the next day. The poor still have their dream-books, and they often pay for the "meaning" of their dreams.

It may help to clear our conception of the working of a dream if we briefly state how the mind works normally in the waking state. All of us are brought up to observe certain conventionalities, and to regard with solicitude certain social laws and amenities, in consequence of which feelings of undue assuredness, aggression, and self-assertiveness are kept under or repressed; and out of regard for social customs certain tendencies or passions are also kept under control, a feeling of self-restraint and inhibition being thus exercised. All of us who are properly brought up look upon ourselves with a certain compulsion in regard to observing the courtesies, ceremonies, and conventions of life, and our conduct is formulated accordingly. These compulsions eventually become automatic restraints, and they tend to keep up the structure and wholesomeness of human society. They constitute the feelings of social obligation and of personal regard for others, and are based upon certain instincts which have emotional representations, such as fear, anger, joy, sorrow, love, hate, and disgust.

When, let us say, an object is presented to one of the senses—for instance, to the sense of sight—all the unconscious feelings of restraint which have been instilled into us in youth, and which in grown-up people act automatically, are applied to the object we have in view, and our conduct or reaction towards it varies accordingly; for our unconscious life is always acting in numberless and unsuspected ways upon our conscious mental

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.63.261.200 Published online by Cambridge University Press

life. Supposing, for example, that we were watching a lady at some social function who was wearing a green carnation: certain rays of light from this object impinge upon the retina; these are conveyed to the brain, and there stimulate a mental picture, *i.e.*, the outward form, figure, surrounding circumstances, time and place of the person are appreciated as an external object, which, when absent, may be reproduced as an image, a picture, or idea upon the cerebral cortex, so that, in the absence of the object, an impression of the lady can be revived in memory upon the mind, the person being "remembered" with all her attendant associations. The mind recalls the occasion either with pleasure, or perhaps with pain, and in idea the whole previous scene can be re-enacted, even to the recognition of personal charms, gestures, verbal movements, conversation, habits and ways; these are accompanied by their emotional reactions. All can be revived as representative images, so that the mind is not only able to cognise the object associated with a definite feeling, and with all the voluntary movements, but the image, or memory picture, may also be revived with all the accompaniments belonging to the original presentation. These three factors, *viz.*, cognition, feeling, and will, are the invariable accompaniments of every mental process, whether an object is presented from without, or its picture is experienced from within. The same analogy applies to presentations and representations referring to the organic sensations. In dreams these elements of the mind tend to become dissociated; the will remains in abeyance, whilst the cognitive elements may be represented alone, or grouped with others which are similar or dissimilar; the feelings may also be represented to the mind, and may either be painful or pleasurable. It is the will which refuses to act, and it is questionable whether a dream, once initiated, can ever be modified by the will, although some persons state that they are able to modify a dream, and that they have frequently done so.

The recollection of these dissociated elements of a dream when recalled by the memory is often so weird, so striking and so suggestive, that an attempt to interpret their meaning is inevitable, and the phenomena of dreams have thus become objects of conjecture, of curiosity, as well as of vivid interest. In consequence, many persons have endeavoured to read into them some hidden meaning, whilst others regard them with heedless indifference, considering them to be only a confused

and jumbled record of sleep-memories unworthy of serious reflection. Possibly the truth in regard to dreams lies between these two extremes of undue scepticism and a too *facile* credence. It is difficult not to suspect a meaning in some dreams, as in the dream of Mrs. H—, whose husband went to New York on business. She dreamed one night that he was sleeping on the tenth floor of a hotel which took fire, and that he escaped with difficulty. The next morning, feeling very uneasy, she cabled asking how he was, when he replied: "Quite well and safe, but had a narrow escape last night when the hotel was burnt down."

The following, sent to me by Dr. Leonard Guthrie, relates the experience of a credible witness, E. W. M—, a distinguished scientist and F.R.S. In his own words he writes:

"When I lived in Canada the following case occurred: An Englishman and an American clubbed together to try to reach the Klondike goldfield by the overland trail, *i.e.*, by going due north from the prairies instead of following the usual course of crossing by the Canadian-Pacific Railway to Vancouver, then taking steamer up the coast to Seattle, and crossing back over the mountains *viâ* White Horse Pass. After the pair had passed on their journey what the American judged to be the outposts of civilisation, he shot the Englishman while he lay asleep, tried to destroy his body by burning it, rifled his baggage, taking everything of value, and returned. When he was questioned as to what had become of his companion, he replied that he (the American) had become discouraged, and had given up the expedition, but that the Englishman had pushed on. But there was an encampment of Indians close to the spot where the crime had been committed.

"The old chief saw two men come north and encamp; in the night he heard a shot, and saw one man go south. He went to the camp, saw the body, and informed the nearest post of N.W. mounted police. They trailed the murderer, and arrested him before he could escape across the U.S. border. He was brought to Regina. Meanwhile the brother of the murdered man in England had a dream, in which he saw his absent brother lying dead and bloody on the ground. He came down next morning very depressed, told his dream, and announced his intention of going straight out to Canada to see if anything had happened to his brother. He arrived out as the trial of the murderer was

progressing. He identified several articles in the possession of the murderer as the property of his late brother. The murderer was hanged at Regina."

Another dream of a prophetic nature, and relating to the assassination of Perceval, is recorded in the *Book of Days*, i, p. 617. I am further indebted to Dr. Guthrie for calling my attention to it. It was the dream of Mr. John Williams, of Scorrier House, near Redruth, in Cornwall. He died in 1841, and was described in the *Gentleman's Magazine* as a man of the highest integrity. On the night after the assassination, when the facts could not have been known to him by any ordinary means, he dreamt that he was in the Lobby of the House of Commons, although he had never been there in his life. He saw a small man enter dressed in a blue coat and a white waistcoat. Immediately after him entered another man in a brown coat with yellow buttons. The latter drew out a pistol and shot the former, who instantly fell, blood pouring from a wound a little below the left breast. In his dream Mr. Williams heard the report of the pistol, saw the blood flow out and stain the waistcoat, and he noticed the colour of the victim's face change. He further saw the murderer seized and observed his countenance. When asking in the dream who had been shot, he was told—"The Chancellor." Perceval was Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer at the time. Mr. Williams then awoke and mentioned the matter to his wife, who made light of it. At her suggestion he went to sleep again, but dreamt the same dream a second time, and then a third. After this, between 1 and 2 a.m., he got up and dressed. In the forenoon of the next day he went to Falmouth, and related his dream again to Mr. Tucker, of Tremanton Castle, and his wife. Mr. Tucker replied that the description was like the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Perceval—although Mr. Williams had never seen Perceval nor had anything to do with him. Just then the news of the assassination reached Truro, which was seven miles away. Six weeks after the event Mr. Williams went to London and to the House of Commons. He recognised the Lobby, the exact spot where Perceval fell, and the dress of both men in the dream corresponded precisely with those actually worn at the time. The extraordinary thing about this dream was that a minute account of it was published in the *Times*, another was given to Dr. Abercrombie, whilst Mr. Williams' grandson communicated

an account drawn up from his grandfather's words. All these agreed in every detail with the first narrative of the dream recorded by Mr. Williams.

Whether we regard dreams as in any way prophetic or not, as stated by Andrew Lang, it is remarkable, when we consider the enormous number of dreams, that there are not more than occasional coincidences. The successes only are noted, whilst the failures as to prophecy have been forgotten. It was probably through the effort to elicit some meaning from dream phenomena that the idea of a soul first arose, and that this soul could exist apart from the body and survive its dissolution. The phenomena of dreams, or "visions" as they were called, suggested, as stated, excursions of the soul into some distant regions, which it explored, and reported what it had experienced to the waking soul, so that if the dream were of the dead, the soul was believed to have travelled to the regions of the dead, and, if of the living, that the soul had wandered into the society of other living souls, and had some message of importance to convey to the dreamer, if only it could be properly and adequately interpreted or explained. Thus they were "symbols" of some message to be imparted by a supernatural being, *i.e.*, if the dream could be properly solved. This "symbolical" view has been revived to-day, although the symbols are erroneously interpreted to be those of sexual disturbances. The interpreter of dream messages, or the "seer" as he was called in ancient times, was, naturally, a sacred person, who came to be regarded with considerable importance, if not with prophetic awe and as of divine origin. Thus arose the magician, or the "wise man," whose survival was formerly represented by uncultured and irresponsible fortune-tellers, but who are to-day represented by competent and able psychologists, who, by methodically arranging and sorting the spontaneously uttered thoughts of a person who submits to examination, or by comparing the verbal association of a series of responses, ascertain the workings of the unconscious mind which lies beneath the manifest dream. According to the teachings of certain psychologists, all thoughts and actions are assumed to be coloured by, if, indeed, they do not directly arise out of, the unconscious mind.

The careful study of the mental life, normal and morbid, has been the work of modern science, which has elucidated and solved many of the dream combinations—together with other

products of the imagination—by the acceptance of that intimate union which exists between mind and body. Upon the close relationship between mind and body, it has been found that the chaotic play of images in dreams is able to throw much light upon normal mental processes, and upon the laws which are observable in the working of the mind during the waking state; hence the appropriateness of studying dreams in this new light, and the justification of a claim for those who study dreams to-day, truly to be called "interpreters," for they investigate upon the solid and substantial ground of science, the intimate and fundamental activities of the human mind in health and disease, without the need of resorting to supernatural agencies which had to be invoked in former days.

The interpretation of dreams by the psycho-analytic method is based upon the theory that in the hidden mentalities or "unconsciousnesses" of our minds are found the explanation, perhaps the secret, at any rate the quite sufficient interpretation, of many abnormal mental occurrences and divergent mental states, such as dreams, lapses of memory, absent-mindedness, obsessions, delusions, and all kinds of intrusions and dominations of semi-repressed thoughts.

It is hardly necessary to state that dreaming is not confined or limited to human beings. We are familiar with the appearance of dogs which jump and bark in their sleep, more especially after active excursions, or following upon hunting expeditions; those who keep canaries have doubtless heard their unexpected pipings whilst asleep on their perches.

In order to understand the nature of dreams it may be desirable to consider the physiology of sleep, and although the exact cause of sleep is not definitely known, the concomitants of sleep are familiar. We know, for instance, that in sleep all the normal activities of the organism are appreciably lowered, and it is not certain that sleep itself is not a state of debility, for there is a lowering of the pulse-rate and of the blood-pressure, there is also a slowing down of respiration. There is, probably in addition, a state of venous engorgement, permitting the products of fatigue to pass by osmosis into the blood-stream or into the lymph-channels during this engorgement, which is favoured by the supine position of the body when at rest, thus giving a better supply of blood to the head, and so predisposing the brain to dreaming. Yet we do not know the inner state of

the organ of mind, *i.e.*, the intimate structure of the cells in the brain cortex during sleep, nor their relation and dependence upon the ductless glands, in particular the pituitary, as has been pointed out during hibernation. In regard to the nerve-cells, therefore, conjecture must take the place of certainty. The brain cortex, normally, is composed of innumerable cells and fibres, the latter forming the connecting links and threads between the cells, their function being to convey sense-impressions from without the body, and then to convey these transformed impressions outwards for the control and proper working of the various organs in the body.

In an average brain the cells or neurons are computed to number 9,000 millions, so a thought, or an idea, or a purpose initiated in one cell, or a group of cells, is immediately linked up with thoughts from scores or hundreds of others by means of these fine connecting fibres. It is believed (Lépine) that the fine fibres—which are called dendrites, from their tree-like appearance—undergo a retraction during sleep, leading to a partial separation of their terminations, thus leaving a space, so to speak, which cuts off nerve-currents and thus induces sleep. This being a theory only, it has naturally evoked another and an opposite explanation of sleep, *viz.*, that sleep accompanies a greater and more extensive prolongation outwards of the fine nerve-processes of the cells (Lugaro), which then touch each other more closely and intimately, thus diffusing rather than concentrating nerve-energy, the effect of such a diffusion being to lower nerve-potential, and so to bring about a general loss of nerve-energy and thus to favour sleep. The whole nervous system presumably participates in this lowering activity of the circulatory and other systems during sleep, yet it is not ascertained whether this lowering is sufficient to interrupt the continuity of the unconscious as well as of the conscious life.

Dreaming, as is well known, can be induced by such agents as opium, alcohol, and tobacco, and this would favour the view that dreaming was a morbid process. It is certainly a process which more often occurs just before or just after the actual state of sleep, and for that reason these dreams are called "hypnagogic." It is general experience that there are more clear as well as more fantastic images just before going to sleep, or just before being thoroughly awakened, than occur during profound sleep. It is doubtless also within the experience of

everyone that the vivid scenes of the day are more clearly impressed upon the mind during the intermediate state between sleeping and waking than during sleep. Indeed, there is much in the basis of observed facts to justify the opinion that dreams occur just before the sleeper awakens, and as he is in the act of entering into consciousness, that they are a part and parcel of the awakening, and merely furnish the material from which the dream is subsequently elaborated, the elaboration only occurring after consciousness has been established. Children often dream before going to sleep of events which occurred the previous day. The *Daisy Chain*, by Charlotte Yonge, when read to a little girl, caused dreams of carriage accidents, and "Peter Pan" caused dreams of flying to the Never Never Land in the case of a clever, impressionable child. Freud asserts that sexual traumata begin early, even in intra-uterine life, and that fear begins during the process of the passing of the child through the pelvis of the mother, and the memory of this "birth fear" is of "unconditioned omnipotence" in after life!

The materials of which dreams are made are chiefly memories of past experiences, although they are often modified by the influence of temperament and environment. Most dreams are buried in the unconscious mind, which is partly the reason that they can be so rarely remembered fully after waking; this is certainly the case with children. It is believed that the age of greatest dreaming, as well as that of the most vivid dreams, is between twenty and twenty-five years. Women sleep more lightly, and dream more than men do; it is certain, at any rate, that more women than men relate their dreams, and women who are accustomed to dream sleep longer. The majority of dreams occur after 6 a.m., although many occur before four o'clock. The time during which a dream is enacted is wonderfully short; a few seconds of time in a dream would be equivalent to days in the waking state, and many dreams may be recorded in support of this statement. The precipitation of images in a dream is so great, and the attention so lacking in precision, that there is nothing to regulate them in time. An analysis of dreams points out that the great majority, 60 *per cent.* of them, relate to sight—thus the ancients were correct in describing them as "visions"—whilst only 5 *per cent.* relate to the sense of hearing; 3 *per cent.* have reference to taste, and only 1·5 *per cent.* to smell. In dreams the two senses, taste

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.63.261.200 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and smell, which are the oldest, most primitive, fixed, and organised of the senses, frequently attach themselves to sight and hearing, which, nevertheless, are easier disturbed because more highly evolutionised, the objects to which taste and smell relate being thus visualised or heard.

The faculties of the mind, to borrow an abstraction, "go to sleep," as it were, in certain orders. We know that we feel fatigue so far as our "judgment" is concerned sooner than we do in regard to our sensory life, we hear sounds during a light sleep and are sensitive to rays of light or to the sense of touch, but because the power of forming a judgment is affected early in sleep there are imperfect associations and images; phantasies and dreams arise, which are the common experience of all. Some power of association and some power of judgment are left in light sleep, but the lessened power of these two "faculties" in dreams reveals the unrestrained, incongruous, and disorderly pictures left on the mind.

It has often been pointed out that insanity and dreams are allied so closely that insanity has been described as a "waking dream," and a dream as a "sleeping insanity." The insane, like dreamers, are under the domination and control of illusions and hallucinations, but they adhere to their dreams or delusions, and no appeal to the senses, to reason, or to the judgment can reconstruct their mind; whilst dreamers, so long as they remain in the dream state, continue to experience their insanity, a reference to a fixed objective standard being impossible during sleep, so that the mind, for the time being, remains unsound. Here, however, the similitude ends, for, upon an appeal to the senses and to reason, the dreamer awakes, whereas the insane person continues in his unreason. It has been stated that dreams may be followed by insanity, and my experience confirms this, although it is doubtful if a dream can ever be the actual cause of insanity, both being probably the product of an already existing mental weakness. A lady under my care, C. W—, dreamt she had, during the night, cut her husband's throat and thrown his body out of the window. She grieved, worried, and became so distressed at her imagined murderous conduct towards her innocent partner that her mind became deranged, and she lapsed temporarily into acute insanity. A man, C. V—, used to dream that he had destroyed St. Bartholomew's Church, and was so alarmed at the notion he could

be guilty of such sacrilege that he feared going to sleep, and he also became insane. Another man, H. K—, after the last air raid, dreamt that his room was being "bombed"; in his dream he saw the explosion, smelt the asphyxiating gas, heard the crackling of the fire, and from that moment his mind seemed to give way. But it is quite open to argument whether in each case the dream was not the first symptom of the mental breakdown caused by fear. It may not always be easy to separate hallucinations from dreams, but it is a fact that insane persons dream more often than do the sane, and the continued presence of hallucinations in them, together with the natural wish to explain hallucinations by some plausible but erroneous factor, causes the insane mind to be one which is readily responsive to slight stimuli. It certainly explains why the insane are light sleepers, and are more frequently disturbed by imagined causes than the sane. The rays of the moon penetrating between the folds of a curtain or along the margins of a window-blind not only disturb sleep by the light they shed, but the rays may also suggest the figures of persons sent to watch them, or to endanger their lives, hence the wakefulness and dreams of the insane; and the general belief is true that these frequently experience exacerbations of their illness during a full moon. It is a fact, known to physicians, that many of our wounded soldiers home from the trenches suffer from dreams of a fearful and horrifying kind, due to the memory of constant explosions, and of the awful effects of exploding shells upon human life. These dreams are accompanied with all the physical symptoms of fear; there is present a lowering of the surface temperature, there is also the blanched face, the anxious expression, and the perspiring skin.

Dreams are closely related to the condition described as somnambulism, which is one of intense abstraction, and nearer to wakefulness than is the dream state. The sleep-walker is guided by the motive which actuated his waking moments, and he sometimes executes performances with a degree of perfection which is not even possible to one in perfect possession of his senses. I have known a nurse get up in the middle of the night, collect all the patients' day attire, and arrange the clothing for about forty patients at the foot of each bed, after which she proceeded to collect all plants and flowers from an adjoining bath-room and place them in the ward, as in the day-

time. She then retired to rest, but upon awakening she had forgotten all the details of the sleep-walking incident.

The state described as "abstraction" or "reverie" is also related to the dream state. In this the attention is so fixed and concentrated upon a train of ideas that, although the eyes are open and sounds are heard, yet no impression is made upon them by external objects. In the condition described as "ecstasy" figures and landscapes may be seen as real; the former are most often seen by religious devotees and sojourners in the cloister. Blake, the artist, was able to concentrate his attention upon his dreams so as to remove all distraction. He could paint pictures without sitters, who were so real to his imagination that he could carry on conversations with them whilst painting their portraits. Among persons whom he thus painted were King Edward I and Queen Catherine of Arragon.

Another state of mental abstraction is the pleasant and extravagant kind called "Castle-building in Spain"; a condition in which imaginary scenes of an agreeable form are constructed and indulged in for the enjoyment or satisfaction anticipated. "Day-dreaming" is another state which is an entertainment that has probably been practised on occasion by each of my audience. "Trance," "lethargy," and "catalepsy"—when the mind is concentrated upon an absorbing but narrow range of ideas—are also related to dreams, and so is the "hypnotic" and other states of partial consciousness, but they cannot be entered into here.

We have referred to the "unconscious mind"; the phrase is so frequently met with that it is used in various senses. Carpenter used it in reference to certain psychical states which he described as "unconscious cerebration," during which acts were performed without the knowledge of the cognitive self; one forgets, for instance, a line of poetry, but remembers it later when one has ceased, consciously, to think of it. In the course of conversation one may forget a word, and having "waited and seen" the word recurs later without effort, perhaps, when the attention is engaged elsewhere. This tends to show that there are unconscious mental operations going on of whose nature we are ignorant, but the thoughts are there in the unconscious mind all the same, and they seem to be interposed between conscious ideas, and to be dug up, as it were, with them. Possibly every conscious idea arises out of and

dies away into an unconscious mental state, and, according to some, there are three degrees or kinds of thought; firstly, thoughts of which we are conscious, and which, when given attention to, are raised into what is called the "focus" of consciousness; secondly, thoughts which are in the rest of the field of consciousness, which are present, but unnoticed owing to inattention; for instance, in the theatre we are intent upon the evolution of dramatic situations, but are inattentive to the audience or oblivious to the staging. The third depth whence thoughts emerge is the unconscious area which could not attract attention until their position had been raised into the full and clear focus of attention by some association or suggestion.

It is preferable, I think, to limit the term "subconsciousness" to the second of these states in which there is still present a certain limited sensitiveness left to ordinary sense-impression, whilst the "unconscious" state represents the third, *i.e.*, the primitive mind, so to speak, out of which conscious thoughts and intellectual processes rise and grow. The motive force of our acts is believed by some to take its origin in the unconscious mind, whilst the directive and controlling force is in the upper conscious levels which thus regulate the lower.

The technical analysis of dreams assumes that there is a dynamic trend of "desire" in the unconscious mind which is ever seeking for the gratification of personal feelings, passions, and sentiments, as against the controlled thoughts of the conscious mind. Psychologists who urge this trend or tendency in the unconscious mind assert that it is kept back and restrained by some imagined power called the "endo-psychic censor"—a wide-awake critic guarding the dream, and for which there is not the slightest justification—a purely fictitious and artificial ego which is continually struggling to repress the natural impulses and thoughts not acceptable to consciousness, this "censor" exercising a guardianship over sleep, even the deepest sleep. These psychologists describe the unconscious mind as an under-world of painful memories and wishes always seeking to obtrude themselves, and always in health being more or less successfully kept under "like steam in a kettle" by the artificial censor. Surely it is not in accord with experience that we can forget unpleasant and horrible scenes or thoughts. They are not thrust into an unconscious territory. Personal experience knows they are always before one, and it is impossible to "forget"

although we can "forgive" them, nor are these always related to sexual matters. When the passions emerge in the conflict they become the "latent" cause of dreams, obsessions, and longings; if dreams be the result, then the dream as remembered or recorded is the "manifest" dream, and the interpreter immediately attempts to elicit the latent wish of which the manifest dream is the symbol. By this analysis a clue is furnished to the real aim and personality of the dreamer.

Dreams are thus regarded as the resultant of a conflict between the censor and the repressed idea, the dream being the "compromise," and only to be solved by a code, for which an array of symbolism has been invented to serve as a key for its interpretation. If the dream be of the sea, for instance, then, according to the followers of Freud who have initiated this sex meaning, it stands as a symbol for "life," as, in their own words, "life needs the mightiest symbol, because existence depends upon the mighty and profound procreative force." If the dream be of an old house, then it is interpreted to be "the abode of life," and, to use the Freudian expression of the dream analysts, "we find it necessary to predicate a creative, myth-making tendency in the structure of the mind by means of which the currents of life beneath all thought become articulate."

The following from an able series of lectures recently delivered: "Breast-sucking is of sexual import," "constipation is a pleasurable experience," and the desire to retain fæces is sublimated into the desire to retain money, and fæces symbolises money!

The psycho-analyst always finds what he is looking for, and there is not a single object in the universe for which some sexual significance cannot be discovered, even the Zeppelins in the sky have a phallic symbol.

According to Freud, the child when born is a poly-morphic pervert and a universal criminal, and the dominating emotional factor is incestuous love, the Œdipus complex, and that the sublimation and criminal tendency give rise to the surgeon!

This sexual theory is over-emphasised, and the Freudians who urge sex as the basic origin of all dreams, of all obsessions, and of all longings, impulses, and neuroses are "sex-intoxicated," they read into dreams the fantasies of their own auto-suggestions. In life's reality surely there are other primary

and original instincts as well as sex, of which fear, self-preservation, anger, and hunger, and the many relations of the individual to the community are the most common examples. Deluded ideas about food, digestion, warmth, electricity, voices, and enemies are far more common in asylums than sex-delusions. All these run deep in the unconscious mind, and each has suffered far more repression than sex? It is against human experience that all dreams are desires, and it is repulsive that all dreams should be interpreted as relating to sex, and such an explanation has brought these conclusions of what have been called "chimney-sweeping investigations" into deserved disrepute. In the analysis of dreams, the method adopted for exploring the unconscious mind depends upon inferences drawn from what has been described as free or spontaneous association, "word association," and reaction time.

The latter has been much used in America as an auxiliary for the detection of crime by means of an instrument of extremely delicate mechanism, such as Hipp's chronometer, the examination revealing a shortened reaction period to word association if the accused be innocent, whilst the reaction period is longer if the accused be guilty, for he is endeavouring to keep back thoughts suggested to the mind in connection with the words presented.

What is the association of dreams with crime? I have questioned insane criminals about their dreams in connection with specific crimes, and although there is always some reserve about admitting revelations in connection with criminal acts, I find that they dream much as do other people. In this class there is a considerable difficulty in proving their hidden personal secrets, and in overcoming the resistance of the so-called "censor." In these cases the conscious and the unconscious cannot be easily brought together, and a clue as to their desires, impulses, or wishes is extremely difficult to ascertain. Moreover, this class is not an easy one to investigate, many of the criminal classes being mentally defective, although some are only morally so, especially as regards prudential considerations, for they cannot postpone present pleasure for future good. They are easily tempted and easily yield, and they have a diminished emotional as well as intellectual endowment. The "criminal type" is impulsive, and though they may not be insane, they have often a psychopathic inheritance and ten-

dencies. Their psycho-anthropological characters may be summarised as egotistic and anti-social, and they are not easy material for the psychological analyst. The discovery of crime through a dream, when the dreamer has by his own dream given himself away, is unknown to me in real life, and this is supported by the extensive experience of Dr. W. C. Sullivan. Dr. Leonard Guthrie reminds me of the story of the murder of Maria Martin by Corder in 1827, when dreams led to the discovery of the victim's body. As he also points out, there are numerous instances of murders having been discovered and avenged by the appearance of the murdered person's ghost. Shakespeare presents two instances in "Hamlet" and "Macbeth." "The Bells," in which Irving represented the Jew, Polonais, exemplifies a drama in which the murderer is being continually haunted by the dream sound of the sleigh-bells, and in "Tom" Hood's "Dream of Eugene Aram," "the unknown facts of guilty acts are seen in dreams from God." The usher, Eugene Aram, dreamed of the murder he had committed, and which he related long afterwards to the boy—"the horrid thing pursues my soul, it stands before me now"; "that very night two stern-faced men set out from Lynn, and Eugene Aram walked between with gyves upon his wrists." The suggestion here made connects the dream with the murderer's arrest. Hack Tuke relates a remarkable instance of a man dreaming that he had performed an act which rendered him liable to legal consequences, and for which he had been arrested. On awaking he was greatly relieved to find it was only a dream, but in the course of two or three days he committed the act in an insane condition of mind. He was arrested and brought before the court for trial, but was released to the care of his friends. There is no record of psycho-analysis assisting in or leading to the detection of crime, not even crimes relating to sex, for which the Freudians seem to have a peculiar predilection.

It will be admitted that a most puzzling terminology has arisen from the efforts made by this new school of medical psychologists to analyse dreams. If the dreamer fails to recognise the new and strange scenes in which the manifest dream is located, this is owing to its "dramatisation," and if the characters are unrecognisable there is "distortion." Should the chief characters be given a subordinate position there is a "displacement," but not infrequently there occurs a fusion of the characters, which

is "condensation." When the ideas in a dream become detached from their usual association, and are "converted" into some other psychic sphere, then they are being "sublimated" into some obsession or delusion. Hysteria, for instance, is the "conversion" of a "repressed" idea into some motor and sensory discharge, and if only the idea can be disclosed to the sufferer and by him disregarded, the result is claimed as a cure obtained by a "cathartic"—a word which is meant to signify suggestion, auto-hypnosis, or, as more recently hinted by Dr. Wm. Brown, "auto-gnosis." These terms, "depression," "displacement," "condensation," "transference," "intro-" and "pro-jection," "intro-" and "con-version," "sublimation," "determination," "exteriorisation," etc., a jumbled vocabulary of metaphysical abstractions.

I have quoted the above to show the complicated vocabulary invented by some psychologists to explain dreams, which, as Bergson points out, are only states of "relaxed consciousness." In the waking state we are always adapting ourselves to our needs, but in sleep we have ceased to select and choose. The mind in its relaxed state brings together memory associations which were formerly packed away in the "storehouse of the unconscious mind," the reason fills up the gaps, and a confused impression results which is the material of dreams.

As is well known, the brain cortex is restored and refreshed only during sleep, and it is a comfort to know that we dream most of events to which no attention has been paid; were it not so, our sleep would be disturbed and pre-occupied by events that are of importance, and which have been our greatest concern during the day, so that our waking life would be prolonged as a permanent dream into the sleeping life, and the necessary restoration and nutrition of the brain would be impossible.

It is most welcome that the revival of interest in dreams should have awakened the psychologist, the physiologist, and the philosopher; but one realises that progress must be at the expense of some long-held views or traditions. Unfortunately in this instance—if progress can be claimed—it is at the expense of some cherished proprieties, and I venture to think there has been an unnecessary pandering to the lower instincts of innocent men and women on the part of those who describe themselves as psycho-analysts. I believe that in the full

pursuit of this craft, which is on a par with mysticism, occultism, cubism, futurism, etc., there has been a distinct over-stepping of the decencies of sex on the part of some who have worked upon these investigations. The foreign teachers, who have been responsible for employing the "sex-mad methods" and the craze for new excitement, have, so far as this country is concerned, already received the recognition of a posthumous notice of their labours, and it would not be incorrect to state that among psychiatrists—in this country at any rate, thanks mainly to Dr. Mercier—Freudism is dead.

DISCUSSION.

SIR GEORGE SAVAGE said he felt particularly interested in this subject: he had written a book upon *Dreams and their Meaning* and had read many books on the topic. He was himself a perpetual dreamer, and therefore he could speak somewhat authoritatively in several directions.

First, there should come the definition of a dream, and that Sir Armstrong-Jones had not given in his paper. The best definition that he knew of—and it was important to consider this definition—was "mental action taking place during sleep which is more or less recognised on waking." On that the question of whether a dog is dreaming when it jumped or barked in its sleep could not be verified, seeing that we had no means of knowing whether the dog on waking had any recognition that a mental process had been in operation. In regard to what Sir Armstrong-Jones said about mental action always going on, one wanted a definition of mental action. The brain certainly always had blood circulating through it, and so was in a condition to react at any time, hence there was always present the potentiality of mental action.

Another question also which he considered important was the length, or rather the brevity, of dreams. He was in a position to say it was possible to have quite a long and detailed dream in a second. On more than one occasion he had been in a position to actually ascertain how long a dream occupied. On one occasion, of several, he was benighted in the Alps, and there was only one change of position he could obtain, namely, by lodging one foot upon a ledge opposite to where he sat. As soon as he lost consciousness in falling to sleep, his foot came down from its resting-place. Many times the foot was put up, and fell down immediately, gravitation would not permit of it resting there for more than a second or two. During one of these very brief periods he had a detailed dream, the character of which it was unnecessary to relate: the dream seemed to have occupied half an hour. On another occasion, while at his cottage in the country, he said he must go and change into dinner clothes. It was then 25 minutes past the hour, and he decided to sleep until the half-hour. At 27 minutes past the hour he had awakened and started relating a long dream which he had just had. There could be no doubt about it, as the clock was in front of him. He therefore affirmed that dreams could be almost instantaneous.

There also arose the question of the interruption of dreams from outside, by the censor, as one might say. One recognised that the cause of dreams, or the character of their association, might be something physical. He did not doubt that, in a certain number of cases, a sexual or urinary trouble or excitement might cause a person to wake up, hence the immediate precedence of that dream might have such a quality; but that all dreams were associated with sexual functions he did not believe. In passing, he said he wished he had been the father of the epigram which the author attributed to him about insanity being the state of "dreaming awake." It originated with Hughlings Jackson, but he (Sir George) had repeated it so often that he had now been credited with its origination.

The large question of the prophetic aspect of dreams, on which Sir Robert

touched, he must leave on one side. He did not know whether the author referred to that most interesting book on *Dreams and their Meanings* by that universal essayist Sir Horace Hutchinson, who seemed able to write on anything, from dreams to golf.

One felt there was a great deal in the sub-conscious mind, a subject on which one might speak in the absence of Dr. Mercier. In his teaching days he used to employ a simile. One saw a big excavation on the site of what was going to be a house. When the house was completed, the kitchen would be underground, and would be invisible. In our lives, in early years, the kitchens of our mind were filled up. He did not doubt that a person's experience had a great deal to do with his dreams. One of Horace Hutchinson's brilliant suggestions was that dreams were associated with either personal, parental, or ancestral experience; that, in fact, when one was flying in one's dreams it was merely the reminiscence of one's arboreal or simian ancestors.

Dr. ROTHSAY STEWART said he would like to make a few remarks, as the subject of dreams had interested him for many years. Some years ago he was discussing the subject with a friend, and they both tried to arrive at some explanation of dreams. After working at the matter for some time, they produced certain theories. After a little practice he (the speaker) found he could relate every dream he experienced to some event which had previously occurred in his experience, and not more than a day or two before the dream; it may have been in relation to something he had recently read. The theory which he and his friend propounded they found very workable. It assumed a submental stimulus. He never dreamed of anything which had been occupying his waking thoughts for any considerable time, and the reason probably was that those cells were already exhausted by the concentration bestowed on them. But during the day the attention might have been momentarily attracted to some object, or some book, and that might well be projected into the dream. The reason dreams were so incongruous was that the mind was unconscious during sleep, and the inhibitory power present during consciousness was in abeyance. An actual occurrence started the dream, but there was no necessary coherency. He believed his theory would be found workable by others, if they would try to remember events in actual life which had a bearing on the subject of the dream. He quite agreed that the submental stimulus causing a dream acted just before the awakening.

COLONEL SPRINGTHORPE said it had been his misfortune to have to deal with some hundreds of shell-shock cases; and as a result of that experience he felt no doubt that in 99 *per cent.*—if not, indeed, 100 *per cent.*—of the cases the exciting cause was fright. So far as he was able to see, the sexual element had nothing whatever to do with it, though he questioned the patients a good deal. He was one of those who considered that Freud had made, in this matter, an unutterable mistake; his conclusion was practically an insult to humanity. There were many other things connected with these states of dreaming. Still, if people of predominantly sexual type were selected, there was no doubt that in them the sexual element would be the chief one. Having for many years made a careful study of his own dreams, he agreed with those who said they must be almost instantaneous. When he contrasted his dreams of earlier years with those he had now, he found that the present ones were much more regulated and orthodox: the persons dreamt about behaved themselves a good deal better than did those in earlier years, when his habits were not so fixed and his cerebrum was more easily upset. With regard to the cases of shell-shock, he would like to know whether Sir Robert Armstrong-Jones did not consider that what, for the present, must be called the mental element in cases of shell-shock was much more important than what had to be termed the material. His own view was that terror and fright of the men at the time was a far and away greater cause of their condition than was any molecular concussion or the trinitro-toluin or other explosive used.

Dr. STEWART said that in his long life he had had varied experiences; had travelled a good deal in the latitudes of science, and discussed many things which were nearly allied to psychological medicine. To-day he had listened with great interest to the speeches not only of Sir Robert Armstrong-Jones, but also of those who followed him, because he had never travelled in the regions they had cultivated and become acquainted with, though he had been a naval officer, and had been in charge of insane patients, and therefore had had many opportunities of

collecting facts. Not until recently did it occur to him how much knowledge might be gained concerning the mind by questioning those who were worried by their dreams. The facts he had been collecting during the last two or three years led him to confirm the view of those who did not believe dreams invariably had a sexual basis.

Apparently, from what had been said, even an elaborate dream occupied only a very short space of time—a few seconds. He would be very glad, if opportunity occurred in the future, to examine that point more fully. Certainly what he had heard to-day had spurred him to greater interest.

Dr. SOUTAR remarked that much of the interest had gone out of this discussion because, so far, no one had taken up a defence of the Freudian idea. Those at this meeting appeared to be agreed that the Freudian explanation of dreams was one which could be ignored, as there was no substantiality about it. British alienists, at all events, did not proceed to examine everything in the light of preconceived ideas. It would be easy for anyone with any ingenuity to discover a sexual basis for anything, for the expression of any thought. It had been said by one of the participants in the discussion that the sexual idea did not prevail in the dreamer. The great desirability, he submitted, was that it should not prevail in the mind of the investigator. However the matter might be regarded, he thought that in this assembly, which was fairly representative of the Association, it might be considered that the sexual interpretation of dreams was not accepted: to his mind such an interpretation was quite contrary to all experience. He did not know anything about the sub-conscious or the sub-mental mind; all he knew was that in certain conditions we were conscious of what was in our minds. Dreams occurred at the moment when the unconscious was merging into the conscious, a stage at which there was not a full operation of discrimination and judgment, as in the fully awakened condition. Hence the dreams remembered were fragments. The transition from the conscious to the unconscious and *vice versâ* was gradual, and it was easy to see why the remembered picture was incongruous and scrappy.

One point of particular interest raised in Sir Robert Armstrong-Jones' paper was that in which he mentioned dreams appearing to precede conditions of acute mental disorder. That he (the speaker) had frequently seen. On the other hand, it was exceedingly interesting to find that in not a few instances one found that the first indication of improvement in the patient was an alteration in the character of his dreams. He had frequently noticed, in melancholic cases, that when they began to be happy in their dreams, an alteration for the better had set in in their brain state, and that when this occurred the mental trouble would probably be recovered from. Again and again he had pointed out to patients that if they were able to dream happily, they would also be able to think happily afterwards.

He would not further detain the meeting except to once more congratulate British alienists on the fact that they did not think it necessary to believe that sexuality and immorality and a generally pernicious state of mind was at the foundation of human action.

Dr. ALICE JOHNSON considered that one thing which Freud lost sight of was that the mind was a reservoir of the beautiful things of this world; beautiful scenery, good books, anything one could think of. Most people dreamed about things of beauty, and these beautiful dreams could not be attributed to sex.

Dr. HELEN BOYLE said she had greatly enjoyed the paper, but, as Dr. Soutar said, it was a pity there had not been more divergent views expressed. All speakers were so heartily in favour of the views expressed that there was not enough opposition to make it pugnacious.

One of the points she would allude to was that of forgetting painful things. She was not inclined to accept Sir Armstrong-Jones' idea that we could not forget painful things. She considered that the normal tendency of the human mind was to forget and be glad to forget painful events; ordinary people forgot those things with a rapidity which was phenomenal, and that was a wise, natural, and sensible method to pursue. It was seen in the case of children, and all through life, until the tendency to bury painful things became quite normal. That was her chief objection to the new treatment of cases, for by it one did exactly the opposite of Nature's way. It was a vogue. All through the history of medicine it had turned out that, owing to deficient knowledge, we had pursued measures which Nature taught were wrong, so that a fresh start had to be made along the lines Nature

pointed out. The careful analysing which brought into prominence matters which troubled the mind seemed to be reversing the natural tendency to bury those troubles as deeply as possible. The method of psycho-analysis did, in some cases which had resisted other means, seem to enable the trouble to be buried deeper than had been previously possible, and to that extent it had proved beneficial. But in those cases she attributed it to the suggestion rather than what it had been ascribed to.

She considered that the present investigation of mental attitudes and purely mental ideas as the causation of nervous and mental disease was a very important one indeed, and in that respect thanks were due to the psycho-analysts for what they had done. She believed that the profession had been getting very materialistic about it, and a reversion might yet be seen in that—it was usually noticed in medicine that there were oscillations of opinion—but there was a tendency to regard everything as due to toxins, or to some sort of disease-germ, forgetting the fact that, as far as human knowledge went at present, we had no explanation for many cases which, humanly speaking, appeared to be entirely due to mental attitudes. She herself knew what mental attitudes meant. In the middle of a dinner-party she was suddenly told she would be called upon to speak at the end of it. The result of that intimation was that she was unable to consume any more dinner; if she attempted to do so, she felt that she would probably be sick. That was purely a mental condition, her physical condition had not changed in the least. Many nervous and mental troubles and anxieties, and some paralyses, were due, as far as could be seen, to mental causes, and hence should be treated by mental therapeutics.

She regarded the opening paper as most important and valuable.

Dr. Boycott said that, so far, the analogy of opium in the production of dreams had not been mentioned. There could be no question that those who for sleeplessness or after operations on account of acute pain, had opium, had most vivid dreams. When speaking of the cause of dreams being purely mental, that definite cause should be borne in mind. What he mentioned was entirely analagous to a dream, though not an actual dream. Another point was, that conditions of mind which resembled dreams were frequently met with in insane people, especially epileptics. A short time ago, he saw an epileptic subject suddenly run amuck, his behaviour being the most violent possible, so that a considerable number of people were necessary to hold him. He came round in a short time, and presently he (the speaker) asked the man what had been the matter, and the reply was that he thought a railway engine had come into the ward and he was trying to get out of the way of it. That man was an advanced epileptic, and was constantly having fits; it was that condition which probably caused him to have that dream, as it could be called. An analogous condition was that of night-terrors in children, a condition often attributable to a physical cause, such as intestinal worms or other form of bowel irritation. The actual form of these children's dreams was probably determined by something they had seen, and they awakened in the condition described by Sir Robert Armstrong-Jones, perspiring freely, and much terrified.

Miss Beatrice Edgell (University of London) said she had been very interested in Sir Robert Armstrong-Jones' paper. On such a question as this psychologists looked to this Society for a very strong lead, not only in regard to psycho-analysis, but also the Freudian doctrine generally. She was not herself in a position to look at the matter from the medical point of view; but one could not study the mental life and be interested in mental processes without having brought before one the whole theory of sub-consciousness. It had always seemed to her that the way in which one needed to approach that, psychologically, was to ask oneself what facts there were in conscious life which could be confirmed in one's own experience and in that of others, facts which demanded for their explanation any theory of sub-conscious phenomena, which we did not know and could not be conscious of. It was quite legitimate to use it in that way as an explanatory hypothesis; and if the Freudian doctrine had caused people to attend more to this question of the validity of such a hypothesis it would have done good. But she did not think people should run away, as they seemed to, with the idea that Freud was the real originator of the theory of sub-consciousness. But where one seemed to find that theory went to the bad was when the method was perverted, or inverted, as it was in Freud's doctrine of dreams, and in many of the other doctrines too; for the

attempt was made to explain not by referring the conscious to the sub-conscious, but reversing it. People did not take facts as they found them and try to explain them, but took the facts of dream-life and tried to make them fit the prearranged explanation. And from psychological quarters one came across a collection of facts which one could neither refute nor confirm; and discussion was hopeless when it came to the use of such terms as sublimation, transference, repression, and the rest. Nothing seemed to carry any conviction with it, because it was impossible to prove what was wrong in the method.

She would be very interested to hear what was the attitude of the medical men present on the subject.

Dr. R. H. STEEN said he would not like the discussion to close without rising to thank Sir Robert Armstrong-Jones personally for reading this most interesting paper, and for coming forward at a time when he (the speaker) was in a hopeless position in regard to finding a contribution for this meeting's discussion. There was to have been another paper read, but the author of that had been detained in France by his military duties, and in those circumstances Sir Robert very kindly came forward with his paper.

At the risk of incurring the censure of Dr. Soutar, he would like to say that he did not think the meeting had been quite fair to Prof. Freud. All the discussion on Freud's theory of the interpretation of dreams had been by way of emphasis of the Professor's sexual view; but he wished to point out to members that Freud did not regard all dreams as of a sexual nature. Indeed, the first dream Freud gave in full, that of Irma, had nothing to do with sex. He thought it unfair to emphasise so much one point in the psychology of that great man.

He would wish to point to some good features in Freud's *Psychology of Dreams*. The first was the author's enormous industry. Ernest Jones had related that before Freud commenced to write his book he analysed a thousand dreams of his own, and Dr. Jones said that fifty of his followers did the same thing, so that there was an immense mass of material to go upon—namely, fifty or sixty thousand dreams. So, even if the conclusions were wrong, the author tried to get at the truth.

A second thing which Freud had done was to show that dreams were not meaningless. He doubted whether people, until the time Freud wrote his work, could find a meaning in dreams; and certainly Freud had thrown a great deal of light on the whole subject. He had shown that there were two parts in a dream: the manifest content, and the latent content.

With regard to repression, the opener alluded to "the censor," but he was sorry he did not also mention any of the works of the Zürich school. A large book had been written by one of the members of that school, Jung, and it contained no mention of the word "censor." The Zürich school founded their theories on those of Freud, but went beyond them. It was not easy to state clearly what they meant, but an example might be useful. This was taken from *The Dream Problem*, by Maeder, a member of the Zürich school. A young man dreamed that he was in a tunnel, that there was an opening in it, through which he looked. At the other end he saw a valley, and in that valley a man ploughing a field. Freud's interpretation of the dream was characteristic, and rather disgusting. But Maeder's interpretation of it was that the young man felt the need for re-birth, almost the Biblical equivalent of being "born again," and that if he were completely cured he saw a useful life's work in front of him. Those of the Zürich school said that a dream had a prospective value, and that it had not altogether a retrospective or regressive significance, which was the feature which Freud laid most stress on. It seemed to be a very beautiful idea, and he thought more might be heard of it in the future.

With reference to a dream being regarded as the fulfilment of a wish, most children, he believed, dreamed, and their dreams were generally the representations of the fulfilment of wishes. A female patient of his recently, when asked whether she dreamed at night, replied that she dreamed every night. Asked as to the subject of her dreams, she answered, "I dream I am at home again." Surely that would be considered as a dream which was fulfilling a wish.

He had felt that he would like to say those few words in favour of Freud, and so state the other side, though he was not himself a Freudian, for in twenty years' time he believed much of what that Professor had advanced would have been shed

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.63.261.200 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and not heard of again. Still, there were features about his contentions which would well repay reading about and studying, as it was possible they might be useful in the treatment of their patients. And he would not like it to go forth from this meeting that British alienists were not studying the question.

Dr. MONRAD-KROHN hoped, as a non-British alienist, that he might be permitted a few remarks. He wished to express his admiration of Sir Robert Armstrong-Jones' paper, and his objective standpoint towards the theories of the Freudian school. He (the speaker) could not look upon Freudism with so much righteous indignation as some of the speakers in the discussion had done. If it was possible to cure a patient by digging out his sexual complex, one was entitled to employ that means. Freud had underlined stronger than anybody else the fact that there were more determining factors in the mind than we were conscious of. Having said that, however, he hastened to add that he was not aware of ever having seen any proof that the eradication of the sexual complex had done a patient any good. He had read much about Freudism, both the teaching of Freud himself and that of the Zürich school; and, to his mind, it only amounted to a heaping-up of new terms. It was a great pleasure to hear Sir Robert Armstrong-Jones mention a selection of the terms which had been introduced. It was necessary to remember that to invent a new term was not to explain the Freudian symbols. All the speakers had agreed that dreams were dependent on everyone's personal experience, and no two persons had the same experience, if only because the circumstances in which they had lived varied so greatly. How, in the face of that, could Freudism claim a general value for the different experiences? His remarks applied not so much to Freud himself as to his pupils, some of whom, he was told, contemplated the working out of a dictionary. But how could they claim a general value for all these things? The whole Freudian school had given psychologists a stimulus to investigate the sub-conscions mind, and to investigate dreams, but after having been given that stimulus, he feared the subject was left more confused than before.

The PRESIDENT said he felt the hour was now too late for him to attempt to even summarise the discussion, and he would not detain the meeting by expressing his own views on the subject. Sitting there, as an onlooker, he gathered that most of what had been said of Freudism could equally be said of anything, however bad.

Sir ROBERT ARMSTRONG-JONES, in replying on the discussion, said he knew that Sir George Savage had had some vivid dreams, and his descriptions of them were well known to members of the Association. He had also been glad to hear Dr. Lepinska, and he felt much indebted to that lady for having come.

He had also been much interested in Dr. Soutar's remarks about the changed character of dreams in convalescence; he would bear the point in mind.

It was also a pleasure to hear Dr. Springthorpe, of Australia, who had had a most valuable experience of cases of shell-shock, which condition had been divided into four or five types. There was the type which might be caused by the autonomic condition fear, connected, more or less, with the disturbance of the sympathetic. Several explanations had been given in regard to this shell-shock. One was the absolutely destructive molecular change brought about by trinitro-toluin, a pressure of about 7,000 kilo. to the square c.m., yet some of the sufferers from this condition were not hot. A man at Mametz Wood did not see the gun which went off close to him; it imparted a terrific shock to the air in his vicinity. The man managed afterwards to crawl a few feet, and then had to be carried, and he had not walked since. He had no wound, but the cerebro-spinal system was delicately suspended in a bag of fluid, and in it there must be profound molecular concussion. His sympathies went out to the shell-shock cases; he felt that they deserved well of their country. A certain number of men constituted very ready material to fall down, because they were of the neurotic type, and in such cases one found there was a history of insanity, or of epilepsy, or some singularity or oddity or tendency in the family.

There was also a purely functional condition; as Dr. Helen Boyd said, the profession must change their position, and think of mind as a definite entity. When one exerted one's will, one knew it was a something, though it might not be material. Some psychologists would not admit there was anything existing which could not be proved. He understood Dr. Boyle to say that it was not right to

draw an analogy between the conscious and the sub-conscious, or *vice-versâ*, because they were two separate things, and not comparable with each other. Secondly, there was actual molecular shock in the shell-shock cases; and thirdly, hypo-thyroidism. Some of the brains of shell-shock cases had been examined, and the changes found in the nervous system were remarkable.

He commended to members the researches of Cannon in the Harvard University. He put cats into cages, and got dogs to bark at and worry them; then he examined the blood, and found the adrenals increased their secretion; the blood-pressure went up, glycogen was released, and in that way energy was supplied to the muscles ready for waging the imminent combat. One might ask why, with that view, one found a man who had great fear was collapsed. It was necessary to carry the point a little further. When injuries had been received through fear, it became evident that it was not to the advantage of the organism to show combat, the only advantage was to show concealment, and so the organism collapsed, and at that time adrenalism had had its innings. Dr. William Brown had shown that in fright the pressure of the blood and the pulse-rate came down. He had been asked by Major Newton Pitt to see a case in which goitre had developed, and Dr. Helen Boyle's experience supported the view that goitre might occur almost spontaneously, in which case one found hyper-thyroidism. He would like to know whether Dr. Springthorpe would regard fright as the cause of the adrenalism. There was a case of an officer, now in Queen Alexandra Hospital, who was seventeen months in the trenches. Then he was shot in the thigh, and had been in bed seven months, and had undergone nine operations. Though he had been a brave commanding officer, he now wept like a baby, declaring he could not help it. He had never previously felt fear, and the speaker thought the best explanation was that the nerve potential had gone down, the battery was now exhausted. That seemed to be the condition of many of these cases.

Dr. Helen Boyle succeeded in burying painful things. She was, he considered, a super-optimist. He (Sir Robert) had never succeeded in doing so, hence the question of temperament came in. He felt he had a right to speak of Dr. Boyle in the way he did, because he had the privilege of working with her at Claybury Asylum for five years.

In conclusion, Sir Robert expressed the thanks and gratitude which he felt on hearing the President's cordial reference to the honour which had been conferred upon him. He had very warm feelings towards the Association, with which he had been so long connected, and which contained so many of his friends. And the honour was not simply a personal recognition of himself, but of those with whom he had so cordially worked.

Remarks upon the Vegetative Nervous System and the Internal Secretions.[1] By FREDERIC J. FARNELL, M.D., Butler Hospital, Providence, R.I.

IT will not be my desire to enter upon a full discussion of internal secretions; still it will be touched upon sufficiently in an attempt to link some disorders of nervous origin with a condition clearly defined by Eppinger and Hess as vagotonia.

As in all other special fields of medicine nervous and mental traits follow certain tendencies among certain types of people, or even among certain communities, and these tendencies are usually shaped by causes more or less inherent for those people; of this all are aware. That there is plenty of clinical

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.63.261.200 Published online by Cambridge University Press