

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329987678>

An Integrative Theory of Dreaming underlying Social Dreaming.

Chapter · December 2018

DOI: 10.4324/9780429449277-6

CITATIONS

0

READS

97

1 author:



Rose Redding Mersky

20 PUBLICATIONS 63 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Social Dream-Drawing: supporting individuals going through big life transitions [View project](#)

Rose Redding Mersky (2019) An Integrative Theory of Dreaming Underlying Social Dreaming. In: Long, S. & Manley, J., eds., *Social Dreaming: Philosophy, Research, Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Routledge, pp. 69-80.

Since being discovered and developed by Gordon Lawrence, social dreaming events have been held worldwide, as parts of professional development programs, group relations conferences, organisational interventions, stand-alone community events and in other creative and important ways. But, what, in fact, is the theory of dreaming that underlies this praxis? And how is this theory actualised in making social dreaming an essential resource for organizations, groups and individuals.

The purpose of this chapter is to offer an integrative theory of dreaming that grounds social dreaming practice. The theory presented in this chapter encompasses not just how dreams are produced from the unconscious, but the particular way in which they are worked with in practice. This is a theory of production and practice. Together, this guides researchers and practitioners and provides a solid grounding in working with dreams.

This theory of dreaming is derived from a combination of many theoretical sources and the work of many great thinkers, which, taken in combination, resonate with this methodology. I developed this theory as part of my doctoral work in developing and researching “Social Dream-Drawing”, a socioanalytic methodology based on social dreaming.

I have divided this discussion into four different areas:

1. Dreams belonging to the whole; where I discuss the way that in social dreaming dreams can be regarded as belonging to the system of interconnected dreamers.
2. Dreaming as thinking; where I summarize the ideas of Wilfred Bion (1962) and suggest how social dreaming events can make use of the thinking from the dreams.

3. The unconscious; where I compare Freud and Jung's notions of the unconscious and how one's notion of the nature of the unconscious influences how one takes up the role of social dreaming host.
4. Dream formation, production and access; where I examine theories of where dreams come from and the processes by which they are produced along with the specific theories behind free association and amplification.

1. Dreams belonging to the whole

Social dreaming is based on the core concept that, while one person may produce the dream, the material relates, in fact, to the social unconscious field of which the dreamer is a part. The dreams presented in the social dreaming matrix reveal its "associative unconscious ... a network and a process of unconscious thinking that belongs to the system and its context, rather than to the individual person" (Long 2016 p. 93). It is composed of "a matrix of thought that links members of a community at an unconscious level" (Long 2010).

For centuries dreams have been taken seriously by cultures from around the world and have been an important element of cultural and societal interest. In some cultures, for example, someone was chosen as the dreamer for the community and some were even elevated to a special status because of this function. One example comes from the Crow Nation, a North American Indian tribe, in the late 19th and early 20th century. This tribe was faced with imminent destruction by white settlers and soldiers, who were crowding them out of their native lands and killing off their beloved buffaloes. They sent out identified members, usually young men or boys, who were called dream-seekers, to the wilderness. Their task was to "plead for the Great Spirit to grant a dream" (Gosling & Case 2013 p. 711). After a dream came, the young man would share it with the elders, who would interpret it, according to their own "cosmology of dreams" (ibid.) in relation to whatever the collective issue was, in this case, their survival following the loss of their hunting grounds.

C.G. Jung coined the term “collective unconscious”. What was collective to him was the history that all humans share in the same way and that “represent the life and essence of a non-individual psyche” (Jung quoted in Coxhead & Hiller 1976 p. 16). This notion of “identical psychic structures common to all men” (ibid.), which is composed of images that were inherited generation after generation, built a growing stock of unconscious visual references over time, what Edgar (1999 p. 199) describes as “a common and universal storehouse of psychic contents.”

His concept stands in contrast to the socioanalytic notion of the associative unconscious, in two significant ways. First, at the level of the associative unconscious, all members of the collective do not hold the exact same images. In fact, individuals hold only a part of the collective whole in their unconscious, which makes the case for accessing all parts, in order to have a better sense of the whole. Second, the associative unconscious does not hold fixed images, but instead contains a world of infinite mental images. Jung’s collective unconscious may be regarded as one part of the larger, infinite associative unconscious.

Jung differentiates personal dreams, dealing with the daily lives of the dreamers, from what he called dreams from the collective unconscious. This is an idea taken up by Lawrence in social dreaming. For Jung, “Personal dreams are limited to the affairs of everyday life and one’s personal process, offering information and guidance pertaining to what is going on in our current lives. These are the everyday dreams, the ‘bread and butter’ of the dream world” (1930 [2009] p. 10). The collective dreams have a much broader meaning.

Linked to this notion of the collective nature of dreaming, is Lawrence’s concept of the matrix, where this collective meaning begins to be revealed in the free associations, amplifications and further hypothesising by the hosts and members of the matrix. The work in the matrix is the engine that not only allows the unconscious thinking from the dream to emerge, but is the cushion and the holding system for the work to take place. The dream is seen as an expression of the group’s unconscious and is worked with in this way and under this assumption. Perhaps this is comparable to the deliberations of the elders of the Crow nation.

In terms of the practice of social dreaming, this cultural history and the concept of the associative unconscious orients the hosts to developing and sharing hypotheses that relate to the matrix as a whole, rather than to individual dreamers in the matrix. This is similar to the work of large and small group consultants in group relations practice, whose work is to offer hypotheses relating to group-as-a whole dynamics.

The social dreaming matrix is not a group, even though the group may be present. By offering hypotheses linking dream material, hosts seek to illuminate the collective unconscious of the matrix, which may either prompt new dream material or free associations and amplifications connected to these hypotheses. This is described in the host's opening statement, e.g., "Our role, as hosts, is to develop hypotheses that link the dream material, in order to deepen our general learning". Additionally, participants are reminded that in the matrix, we work with the dream and not the individual dreamer.

2. Dreaming as thinking

Before explaining more about the unconscious and dreaming, in this section, I explore the key epistemological assumption that dreaming is a form of thinking. Bion offers the notion that thinking comes from unconscious processes (1962) and that, in fact, dreams are a form of unconscious thinking.

Bion based his theory of dreaming and thinking on Klein's work (1975), in what Meltzer described as "Bion's modification of Klein's modification of Freud's model-of-the-mind" (2009 p. 46). Thus, these three theorists offer "... three models of the mind, the neurophysiological one of Freud, the geographic-theological one of Klein and the epistemological one of Bion, [which] can be seen to link with one another to form a continuous line of development" (ibid. p. 47).

The British psychoanalyst, Donald Meltzer (2009), describes the revolutionary impact of Klein's thinking on Bion, as reflected in Bion's development of a theory connecting dreaming and thinking. What Klein taught us, so to say, is that there is an active internal world and that

dreams have an important meaning in relation to both that internal and external world. This internal world plays out in our daily reality, so that “[i]nstead of transference phenomena being seen as relics of the past [à la Freud] they could now be viewed as externalizations of the immediate present of the internal situation, to be studied as psychic reality” (ibid. p. 39). Klein created a bridge between early experiences and present realities, in that “[i]t is in the internal world of relationships that meaning is generated and deployed to relationships in the outside world” (ibid. p.40).

As opposed to Freud’s concept that dream material consists of a forging of unfulfilled childhood wishes and floating dream thoughts peppered with daily minutia, Bion’s view was that the unconscious elements that form dreams are related to the repressed early trauma and memories resulting from a break in the connection between the infant and its mother, as outlined by Klein. These painful bits of “raw unencoded sense data” undergo a process of “narrative transformation” into “meaningful thought” (Haartmann 2000). He termed the free-floating split-off feelings as Beta elements and those that have been processed through the mother’s containment (and later the analyst’s work) as Alpha elements (Bion 1962). He named the process by which this transformation takes place as Alpha Function. Dreaming is one very important way that these bits of sense data can make their way into the state of consciousness. In order to bear them, dreams, as Haartmann (2000) notes, rely on a disguise to “assuage psychic pain” that accompanies this process. At the same time, these dreams have another extremely important function, in that they pick up where the early experience left off. As Haartmann notes: “Because dreams contain messages and promote internal communication, they adopt and extend the work of maternal reverie and containment” (ibid.).

From this perspective, dreams take on a central role in mediating our understanding of the relationship between the internal world of meaning and our external world of work and relationships. What a dream does is to “represent the meaning of emotional experiences” (Meltzer 2009 p.44). While Klein’s focus was primarily on the emotional development of the child, Bion was concerned with the link between early emotional experience and the capacity to develop the mind. As Meltzer notes (ibid.):

Bion's work places emotion at the very heart of meaning. What he says in effect (and this is almost diametrically opposed to Freud's attitude towards emotion) is that the emotional experience of the intimate relationships has to be thought about and understood if the mind is to grow and develop. In a sense the emotion is the meaning of the experience and everything that is evolved in the mind through alpha-function, such as dreaming, verbalizing dreams, painting pictures, writing music, performing scientific functions – all of these are representations of the meaning.

In comparing Bion to Freud, Meltzer points out that Freud's neurophysiological model of the mind (1983 n.a.) led him to believe that "no intellectual activity or manifestation of judgment or function of judgment goes on in the dreamer" (ibid. p. 65). In effect, dreams are composed of childhood reminiscences salted with the day's "residue" (ibid.) Freud also made it clear that emotions had no meaning in dreams (Meltzer 2009 p. 67).

Although Freud linked dreaming to thinking (1900 [1976] p. 385), he considered dreaming "an unconscious process of thought, which may easily be different from what we perceive during purposive reflection accompanied by consciousness." Jung's view (1964 [1970] p. 53) was that "... a dream cannot produce a definite thought", and Klein did not concern herself with this. She essentially concurred with Freud that there is no particular intellectual activity taking place in dreaming other than what he had outlined.

Bion, on the other hand, posited that dreams contain the thoughts related to the unintegrated elements of the infant. Bion's idea was that in addition to the emotional consequence of the mother's capacity to contain split-off emotional fragments, there is also an intellectual consequence, i.e. the first roots of the baby's capacity to develop thoughts. Thus "something which in the infant was near-sensory and somatic was transformed into something more mental ... which could be used for thought or stored as memory" (Crociani-Windland & Hoggett 2012 p.179). "He is describing a passage toward symbolisation and thought" (ibid. p. 170).

With the containment of the analytic setting theoretically replicating the original dyadic environment of the baby and child, the process of free association to the dreams, both by analyst and patient, was for Bion a way to make these dream thoughts more consciously available. His critical theory of thinking was based on the concept that thoughts were always in search of thinkers, not the other way around. As Lopez-Corvo (2006 p. 132) puts it: “For Bion, thinking is a consequence of thoughts and not the other way around. Thinking represents an obligatory development of the mind that is produced by the pressure of thoughts.”

In relation to dreams, this meant that only through a dream could certain thoughts be made available that could then, in the properly contained analytic setting and using free association, be made available for thinking. These thoughts, therefore, were already in existence in the unconscious, but not available for thought. This naturally underpins Lawrence’s concept of the matrix. Dreams contain unconscious thoughts that are, only now, under this particular set of circumstances, being made available for thinking.

Being available for thought, from Bion’s perspective, meant that they could be “digested” by the patient and gradually integrated into a more robust relationship with reality (which links with Freud’s reality principle, which was very helpful to Bion’s thinking).

As J. and N. Symington (1996 p. 60) note:

Bion’s view was that the conscious and unconscious material was rendered more comprehensible by the dream-work, in the sense that it became processible into elements that could be used for furthering the integrating processes of thought.

3. The Unconscious

Freud was well aware of these historical notions of dreaming. As cited in Walde (1999 p. 121), he is quoted as saying: “I think that in general it is a good plan occasionally to bear in mind the fact that people were in the habit of dreaming before there was such a thing as psychoanalysis”. Also,

as a scientist, he was grounded in the notion of the scientific understanding of all things. His monumental work, *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900), can be seen in the context of these historical and contemporary contexts.

Some cultures believed that when one had a dream, his soul had made contact with the gods and/or that the gods themselves had entered the soul of the dreamer. One example is the Maricopa Indians of Colorado, who “believed that success in life depended on the spirit, and that the spiritual is approached through dreaming” (Coxhead & Hiller 1976 p. 12). They believed that when they were in a state of dreaming, the soul would leave the body and search a spirit, who would “reveal a song or a cure” (ibid.).

This notion of the passive dreamer, whose soul meets the gods or who is visited from without, was revolutionised by Freud, in his formulation of dreaming as emanating from one’s unconscious. For Freud, the dream is an expression of “the mental life of the dreamer” him- or herself (Moses 1999 p. 303). It is Freud’s great achievement that “the Unconscious is not conceived as an exterior power, like the pagan gods or fate (of the Christian God), but is rather located within the human being” (Walde 2009 p. 129).

Equally revolutionary was the implication of Freud’s theories of dreaming and the unconscious, i.e. that man had parts of himself that he did not know and could not easily access. This not-knowing existence challenged the prevailing positivist notions of reality and set the stage for the development of ways to access this unknown part. As Moses (1999 p. 307) puts it, Freud’s thinking:

....completely subverted the identity of the subject and of conscious life by transporting the subject outside himself and toward a space where he no longer knows himself. Freud’s division of the psychic apparatus into a conscious and unconscious system explodes the classical notion of subject and scatters its fragments in multiple psychic instances that may no longer be reassembled, as in classical psychology, into one original synthesis.

The epistemological assumption underlying this theory of dreaming is that an unconscious exists. How the unconscious is thought about is important for social dreaming. Is it something to be feared or to be embraced? Is it a source of disturbance or an important communication? Or is it all of the above?

Freud taught us that dreams are a source of tremendous information to the patient and analyst as to what repressed wish or desire has been, so to say, disabling the patient's mental health. His general view was that dreams are either composed of forbidden thoughts or unconscious desires.

As opposed to Freud's view, Jung's concept of the unconscious was of a world of infinite creativity available to be explored and, in such exploration, to expand and illuminate the quality of our conscious existence. As Coxhead & Hiller (1976 p. 15) note:

While Freud looked on the dream itself as a disturbed form of mental activity through which he could approach his patients' neuroses, C.G. Jung saw the dream as a normal, spontaneous and creative expression of the unconscious.

The idea that the dream is an innovative and creative way to bring problems and anxieties into consciousness gives a different picture of its process. Lopez-Corvo (2006 p. 130) describes it as "...vindicating the unconscious from an ominous, unfriendly, and threatening nature, to a more gracious, positive, and valuable one." This notion was later taken up by Lawrence (2011 p. 333), who notes "the creative, joyful dimension of the unconscious."

Jung saw "neurosis as part of the psychic life that is trying to advance" (Coxhead & Hiller 1976 p. 16) and he valued its presence. As he wrote (as quoted in Coxhead & Hiller 1976 p. 16): "All psychological phenomena have some sense of purpose in them." From his perspective, the dream was a means of self-discovery (ibid.).

Therefore, while we all recognise Freud's enormous leap in further developing the idea of the dynamic unconscious, this view was greatly expanded by Jung to encompass its collective and creative potential.

The notion of dreams, as a form of communication and as a creative expression of the unconscious that is not easily connected to conscious experience, is central to social dreaming. This allows violent and disturbing dream material to be shared in a matrix. Sometimes dreams are shared that include other members of the matrix. This has implications for how the hosts take up their roles. They are not “charged” with attempting to understand or interpret the dream material, but only to help the matrix become aware of links between dreams and deeper meanings. This may or may not involve references to the disturbing material.

Hosts try not to run away from what is disturbing, but hold it in the larger context of all the dream material being shared. One could say that in taking this role with this kind of discipline, whatever anxiety may arise as a result of the disturbing material is contained. However, it is not the explicit role of hosts to provide containment for anxiety. The matrix is not thought of as a group that needs a facilitator to take that role. Containment is about taking up the task.

4. Dream formation, production and access

Freud laid out what he terms “the psychical processes at work in the formation of dreams” (1900 [1976] p. 403), in other words the mechanics of their production, as well as their function for the dreamer. For Freud, dreams are formed through a variety of processes that include condensation, a process by which dream elements undergo a series of transformations and are compressed or condensed into the dream as experienced. Thus, from his perspective, “the psychical material has undergone an extensive process of condensation in the course of the formation of the dream ... the dream which we remember when we wake up would only be a fragmentary remnant of the total dream work” (ibid.p. 383). Thus “... dream-condensation is a notable characteristic of the relation between dream-thoughts and dream-content” (ibid. p. 403).

Freud notes a contrast between the extensive dream thoughts in the unconscious and the relatively fewer manifest dream elements in the dream. From his perspective, the dream represents all the unconscious thoughts related to it, even though it does not and cannot explicitly

contain all of them. Thus, the dream is a compromise formation. While few elements from the dream-thoughts find their way into the dream-content, those that do “represent logical relationships between the individual thoughts” (Meltzer 2009 p. 15).

Freud notes that dream material is very often quite mundane. To explain this, he articulates the concept of displacement (another process alongside condensation), whereby dream thoughts are transformed into mundane manifest dream material. As a matter of fact, the more mundane the dream content, according to Freud, the more bizarre the dream thought that prompted it. As he notes, “dreams are brief, meagre and laconic in comparison with the range and wealth of the dream-thoughts” (1900 [1976] p. 383). Either way, in the manifest dream elements or in the original dream thoughts, the unexpected and the often frightening lurk.

Freud developed free association as a way of accessing the original dream thoughts in the unconscious (“if the work of interpretation is carried further it may reveal still more thoughts concealed behind the dreams” [ibid.]). In the treatment room, the patient is encouraged to say whatever comes to mind in as uncensored a way as possible. Freud’s great insight is that the way people go from one topic to another topic in a seemingly random way actually reveals an associative thought process, “a chain of ideas” (Bollas 1987 [2013] p. 9). Once the dream is made available and free association is undertaken, the dream material is “uncondensed” and the bounty and beauty of the primitive unconscious thoughts are available for exploration and understanding.

Freud’s discovery of free association as a means for accessing unconscious thoughts is central to social dreaming. Hosts, in their opening statements, and sometimes during the course of a matrix, state this clearly, and often define what free association is (i.e. “free association means anything that comes to mind.”).

Enhancing free association and amplification is also linked to how the chairs are placed. We cannot duplicate the standard placement of the couch and the analyst in the analytic consulting room. In social dreaming, the chairs are placed so that the familiar behavior of conversations and discussions are not encouraged and direct eye contact and socialization

are minimized. Two common ways of placing chairs are in the form of a spiral and the form of a snowflake.

The goal of these arrangements gives participants their own space within the cluster of the others to access their internal and dream lives.

While Jung also took up the use of free association in his clinical work, he had his reservations about its use. From his perspective, free association runs the danger of taking the patient further and further afield from the original dream material. He developed the concept of amplification, which encourages the dreamer to connect dream images to current cultural and social experience. His idea is “to stay as close as possible to the dream itself, and to exclude all the irrelevant ideas and associations that it might evoke” (Jung 1964 [1970] p. 12). For him, the dreams “are the facts from which we must proceed” (Jung 1961 [1995] p. 194).

This has consequences for those hosting social dreaming, where a matrix can be permeated by one clever association after another. As host, I remind participants of this potential by stating in my opening statement: “Free association means anything that comes to mind. Freud viewed free association not so much as a response or a reaction to what another has said, but as an expression of one’s own inner response to the dream material.” During the matrix, it is important for the host to keep hypotheses connected to original dream material as much as possible.

These notions of how dreams are produced and the ways in which their unconscious elements are accessed in the treatment room and in the matrix do not cover what actually causes a dream to happen. For purposes of working in social dreaming, how can we understand how particular dreams come when they do? What in either one’s inner life or one’s reality (and probably somehow both in tandem) leads the dreamer to dream such a dream?

Freud’s concept of condensation suggests (metaphorically) some sort of machinery of selection. Problematically, though, this suggests that inputs from the unconscious are somehow operated upon to create consciousness. I would propose a more interactive and porous metaphor

to characterise the space between the unconscious thoughts and their conscious representation, i.e. the dream. This in-between space makes possible an active interchange between these realms, similar to the fit that Freud describes between elements of the unconscious in the course of dream formation. We know that all of the infinite possibilities available in the unconscious cannot or need not be “tapped” for the production of a dream. In my view, it is the context of the dreaming experience that influences which unconscious elements make up the dream.

This notion of a porous membrane is central to Lawrence’s concept of the matrix. He sees that matrix as the external context that influences the dream material. As he has written:

The existence of the matrix alters the nature of the dreams The matrix becomes a different “container” for receiving dreams, with the result that dream contents change (2011 p. 333).

This harkens back to the notion that dreams belong to the whole, i.e., the concept that dreaming is innately a social process and what stimulates certain dream material to be mobilised, stems from a social stimulus. The dream emerges, not as an isolated volcanic explosion from within, but in conjunction with the social forces and context of reality. Thus, the context for any dream exploration, whether at the individual or the associative unconscious level, influences its production. This has consequences for how a Social Dream event is thought of and communicated to participants. For example, using a particular theme for a social dreaming event may lead dreamers to bring dream material related to that theme.

The notion of a porous membrane between the dream thoughts and the manifest dream already exists in psychoanalytic theory. For example, Freud and others emphasise the influence of external factors on dream material, i.e. the state of one’s body or the noises of the night. In describing the reality theory, he notes the influence of daily experiences on manifest dream material in terms of “dream-instigators” (1901 [2001] p. 656).

Contemporarily, Lansky (2003 p. 357) theorises that an “instigating disruption” is what “drives the dream into being. It is the instigator of the

dream that connects the working of the inner world with events in the external world.” Lansky’s perspective links up with Meltzer’s idea (1983) that the dream process is designed to “solve a problem” not yet in one’s consciousness.

Perhaps we can tentatively hypothesise that a dream without an external context would not emerge, particularly given the technical production processes described above. It does not just pop up due to pressure from within; it exists always in relationship to the dreamer’s real experience in the external world. As Lawrence further notes (2003 p. 610): “The content of the dreaming alters to take account of its context and becomes social in orientation”. This reflects an active, rather than a passive process, coming in two directions, i.e. from the outside in and from the inside out. The unconscious is an active element that participates, along with the stimulus or context of reality, in forming the seemingly chaotic material of dream thoughts into a dream.

The great mystery is how this occurs without our awareness. As Lopez-Corvo (2006 p. 209) notes:

Where and how is the intention of the unconscious message precisely manufactured? Where and how can all of this have been decided without the awareness of our conscious self? What exactly is this concealed intelligence, capable of conceiving, so speedily, beautiful condensations and displacements in order to produce a dream? These are mysterious questions that still lack an answer.

This mystery is at the heart of dreaming and somehow, we must live with this wonder.

What appears to be amazing about the process of dream formation is how such complex selection and transformation of memories, sensations, and metaphorical visual ideograms take place without any conscious intervention, behind our back, so to speak, where the whole process is generated outside of our selfness as if the unconscious was always several steps ahead (ibid. p. 213).

In holding social dreaming events, we work to set up the best possible conditions for these processes to take place. When social dreaming is part of a larger event with its own theme, the choice of who hosts the matrix must be considered. For example, for the 2017 ISPSO regional meeting, whose theme was “Identity and Identification in Europe in Crisis”, there were three hosts, each coming from a different part of Europe. The idea behind this choice was to provide a certain amount of containment by encompassing a broad spectrum of hosts from across Europe.

This process for furthering thinking, in relation to social dreaming, takes place in reflective events following the matrix. “As I see it, the reflection group is the setting for this apparatus of thinking to undertake its task of transforming the thoughts from the infinite into actual thinking relating to reality” (Mersky 2012 p. 37). In order to reach its full potential, space needs to be taken for reflection. Without that, participants are left with many stimulating thoughts with no context for action and insight.

Conclusion

The ways of organizing and hosting Social Dreaming in whatever context are influenced by what theory of dreaming underlies the event. From the decision of what space and how to arrange the chairs; what, if any, theme to choose or relate to; who is chosen as host and what does he or she represent to the participants; how the opening statement is constructed; how dreams are associated to both by hosts and participants; how hypotheses linking dream material are formed; how to divide the available time to ensure reflection (and probably more) are all important factors to take into account.

In this chapter, I have outlined elements of the theories of dreaming developed by Freud, Jung, Klein and Bion, which form a theoretical support for my theory of dreaming underlying social dreaming praxis. In a social dreaming matrix, one is presented with rich, creative and seemingly chaotic material from the unconscious. In order to work with this material to bring insight and understanding to the system at large, hosts need to have a comprehensive internalized theory of dreaming that they can rely upon. This chapter is written in the hopes of making such a contribution.

References

- Bion, W.R. (1962). "A theory of thinking". In: E.B. Spillius (1988) (ed) *Melanie Klein Today. Developments in Theory and Practice* (Vol. I, Mainly theory). London: Routledge, pp. 178–186.
- Bollas, C. (1987). *The Shadow of the Object: Psychoanalysis of the Unthought Known*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bollas, C. (2007). *The Freudian Moment: Second Edition*. Reprint. London: Karnac, 2013.
- Coxhead, D. and Hiller, S. (1976). *Dreams: Visions of the Night*. New York: Thames and Hudson.
- Crociani-Windland, L. and Hoggett, P. (2012). "Politics and affect". *Subjectivity*. 5(2), pp. 161–179.
- Edgar, I.R. (1999). "The Imagework Method in health and social science research". *Quali-tative Health Research*. 9, pp. 198–211.
- Freud, S. (1900). *The interpretation of dreams*. S.E. Volume 4–5. Reprint. Middlesex: Penguin, 1976.
- Freud, S. (1901). *On Dreams*. S.E. Vol. 5, pp. 633–686. Reprint. London: Vintage, 2001.
- Gosling, J. and Case, P. (2013). "Social dreaming and Ecocentric ethics: Sources of non-rational insight in the face of climate change catastrophe". *Organization*. 20(5), pp. 705–721.
- Haartmann, K. (2000). Review of Grotstein, James S. (2000). *Who is the Dreamer Who Dreams the Dream?* Hillsdale: The Analytic Press. *Kleinian Studies Ejournal*. www.psychoanalysis-and-therapy.com/human_nature/ksej/hartmangrotstein.html. [accessed 08.09.2014].

Jung, C.G. (1930). *The Red Book: Liber Novus*. Reprint. New York: The Philemon Foundation & W.W. Norton, 2009.

Jung, C.G. (1961). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Reprint. London: Fontana, 1995.

Jung, C.G. (1964). *Man and His Symbols*. Reprint. New York: Dell, 1970.

Klein, M. (1975). "Our adult world and its roots in infancy". In: M. Klein (ed) *The Writings of Melanie Klein: Vol. 3 Envy and Gratitude and Other Works, 1946–1963*. London: Hogarth, pp. 247–263.

Lansky, M. (2003). "Shame conflicts as dream instigators: Wish fulfillment and the ego ideal in dream dynamics". *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis*. 63(4), pp. 357–364.

Lawrence, W.G. (2003). "Social dreaming as sustained thinking". *Human Relations*. 56(5), pp. 609–624.

Lawrence, W.G. (2011). Intuiting knowledge from the social unconscious with special reference to social dreaming. In: E. Hopper and H. Weinberg, (2011) (eds) *The Social Unconscious in Persons, Groups, and Societies. Volume I: Mainly Theory*. London: Karnac, pp. 321–336.

Long, S. (2016). The transforming experience framework and unconscious processes. In: S. Long (2016) (ed) *Transforming Experience in Organisations: A Framework for Organisational Research and Consultancy*. London: Karnac, pp. 31–106.

Lopez-Corvo, R. (2006). *Wild Thoughts Searching for a Thinker*. London: Karnac.

Meltzer, D. (1983). *Dream Life*. Strathtay, Perthshire: Clunie Press.

Meltzer, D. (2009). *Dream Life: A Re-examination of the Psychoanalytic Theory and Technique*. London: Karnac.

Mersky, R. (2012). “Contemporary methodologies to surface and act on unconscious dynamics in organizations: An exploration of design, facilitation capacities, consultant paradigm and ultimate value”. *Organisational and Social Dynamics*. 12(1), pp. 19–43.

Moses, S. (1999). “The cultural index of Freud’s Interpretation of Dreams”. In: D. Shulman and G.G. Stroumsa (1999) (eds) *Dream Cultures: Explorations in the Comparative History of Dreaming*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 303–314.

Symington, J. and Symington, N. (1996). *The Clinical Thinking of Wilfred Bion*. London: Routledge.

Walde, C. (1999). “Dream interpretation in a prosperous age?” In: D. Shulman and G.G. Stroumsa (1999) (eds). *Dream Cultures: Explorations in the Comparative History of Dreaming*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 121–1.

