

## **Proceedings from the Second Annual Lucid Dreaming Symposium Session 2: Applications of Lucid Dreaming**

### **Panel Discussion: Ethical Issues for Applications of Lucid Dreaming**

**Joseph Dane**  
*University of Virginia*

**P. Eric Craig**  
*Center for Existential Studies and Human Services*

**Morton Schatzman**  
*St. Thomas' Hospital, London*

Dane: I'd like to start out by acknowledging a couple of things. One is thanks to Stephen and Jayne for allowing me to participate in this. I feel a little bit like an interloper. It's been a number of years since my original work, back in 1980, with lucid dream induction on non-lucid dreamers, with hypnosis, personal symbols and waking suggestion. But since that time I've shifted over, to a medical setting using hypnosis with medical conditions. None-the-less, I was originally trained as a psychotherapist and in that context, given that that's still my main identification, I'm delighted to have the opportunity to participate in this. I should indicate, by the way, that since I'm out of the lucid dream and dream research areas, there may well be developments or attitudes that are current and of which I am not aware. I have to acknowledge that right away and apologize right in the beginning, just in case. Again, thank you.

The two general areas that seem to me a good place to start are: 1) dream control and, 2) is or is not lucid dreaming "dangerous." What I'd like to do is go ahead and begin with a couple of general observations on those two topics and then hand it back over to Eric. You can follow along on the handout (see appendix to panel discussion) if you'd like. The first observation is a curiosity and the second will be a bit of a clinical caution. First, I'm curious as to whether or not it's really just the popular press that's pushing for the idea of what sounds like total dream control. Now I wonder about this because I have yet to talk directly with anyone who clearly believes that total wholesale control of dreams by waking consciousness is a desirable goal. I'd welcome being corrected on this but I would like to ask now just for a show of hands, and this is with all due respect, is there anyone here who believes that total waking control of dreams is the way to go?... (Discussion clarifies that no one does). Well we'll probably end up in the same place then from what I'm hearing. My concern is in response to seeing in the popular press lots of "dream control". That is what gets touted. As a matter of fact, Stephen, I saw your audio tape entitled "Dream Control." There is a problem with the position of, "total dream control," which seems to suggest that dreams have nothing positive to offer in their uncontrolled state. I'm not sure that's the implication but it would seem to be that to me.

My suspicion is that the seeming differences in opinion about dream control are really based in lack of clarity, or at least specificity, in what we mean by control. Given our presumably mutual enthusiasm for dreams here, I suspect that we really all basically agree that in some cases, yes, conscious control of the dream content is highly desirable, and I've listed some of those on the third page of the handout for possible discussion. At the same time, however, the dream may have a corrective agenda, or a message of its own which needs to be respected, which I think gets back to the point of balance or mutual control.

If we do basically agree on these points, and I again welcome being corrected, then it just may be that the goal of wholesale conscious control of dreams is more a product of media hype than considered clinical opinion. If that's so, I wonder if we don't have an ethical obligation to actively oppose such "misverbage" in the press about the desirability of dream control, or rather, total dream control. I wonder if the ethical imperative isn't to clarify that we're talking more about conscious control *in* dreams, not necessarily conscious control *of* dreams. Not to clarify this seems logically inconsistent with our touted respect for dreams. It's also contributes by omission to the very dismissal of dreams that we all claim to oppose. At the same time, the realities of dealing with editors and Madison Avenue types, may make such clarification difficult, if not impossible. I would be interested to hear of any accounts of that kind of problem in dealing with this literature.

My second general observation is a clinical caution and a concern having to do with lucid dream training. This may be specific to my own experience, so I'd be interested to hear from others on this topic. My own experience is that such training can be psychologically challenging or even disruptive to some individuals who otherwise seem well adjusted. This may be due to the use of hypnosis in my study, and/or the use of personal symbols. In any event, the experience was clearly disruptive for some of the subjects despite my having screened out subjects for psychological vulnerability. I am disturbed to consider the outcome for these individuals if there had not been adequate follow-up of their experience during and shortly after the study.

I am aware that my comments may be dismissed by some as alarmist and even proprietary - the old "Only the experts can deal with dreams" argument. I do not mean that. I simply find that my own experience suggests that it's useful to ask: "Is lucid dream induction ever dangerous?" "Are there psychologically vulnerable individuals in whom lucid dream induction might be disruptive or inadvisable?", "If so, when? to whom? and how does one know ahead of time?" These are types of questions which all workshop leaders probably face with any sort of psychologically oriented material. But they seem especially pertinent with respect to lucid dreaming where rigid boundaries between waking and dream consciousness literally seem to no longer exist. And they are all the more relevant if one adds the component of hypnosis to the induction procedure. I add this simply because hypnosis was a major component of the induction study that I did.

Again, my biases show. I was recently working in the pain clinic with a radicular sympathetic dystrophy patient for alterations in blood flow. During our second hypnosis session, she said "Gee! I know why I'm so good at this (i.e. hypnosis). This is

what I used to do when my mother beat me!" With that she spontaneously regressed to age three when she was hiding in the closet from her mother. Over the next two or three weeks that person decompensated as she became increasingly overwhelmed by memories of physical abuse by her mother and sexual abuse by her father. She lived several hundred miles away. Fortunately, there was an excellent in-patient setting in her area with an excellent treatment program for sexual abuse, and this person recovered very nicely. She has gradually been able to separate the spontaneous state dependent recall of the original abuse which was stimulated by the state of hypnosis (I am assuming here that her hypnotic capacity was used as a child to separate herself off from the trauma), and can now use hypnosis for controlling the pain and swelling without eliciting these memories. The point is there was a very significant clinical reaction to that particular state identified as hypnosis.

I'm not sure if "hypnosis" is as much the mediating variable of these types of reactions as it is the person's expectations for what hypnosis can do (e.g., uncover painful memories and make one reveal them). My concern is that I have had several psychologically untrained people writing to me that they would like to use hypnosis, and that they would like to get transcripts of the hypnotic induction that I was using because they would like to use it with high school students. I think there are some cautions to be had here. While most people never experience difficulties with hypnosis, the hypnotic state can, especially with any sort of age regression, elicit highly unexpected but clinically significant reactions. Those using hypnosis should be equipped to respond appropriately and the hypnosis should be done in a context that provides genuine opportunity and expectation for redress and follow-up in the event of any untoward reaction. I thought I wouldn't have time to go into examples but there are others that we could talk about.

For now I would like to shift gears and simply establish some background for our later discussions. It seems useful to remember that ethics, in general, implies a host of variables, all of which may be different for different individuals. Ethical decisions imply consideration of value systems, goals, ends, means, purposes, intent, context, et cetera. In addition ethics involves, typically, a continuum from absolutism to relativism -- difference between asking, "Is it good or bad?" versus, "When is it good or bad?" In short, ethics reflects one's basic philosophical stance and perspective on a host of issues.

With respect to the ethics of dream control, however, the fundamental issue would appear to involve one's beliefs and attitudes about the so called unconscious. More specifically, does the unconscious exist, and if so, what is it's relationship to the conscious ego? If one accepts that the unconscious ego exists, then the next question becomes, "To what degree do I accept the somewhat anthropomorphic formula: waking consciousness = ego consciousness, dream consciousness = the unconscious? In short, the ethics of dream control can depend heavily on ones view of the relation between waking and dream consciousness, and this in turn, on ones view on the so called unconscious.

My own bias is that something like the unconscious does exist, although I'm more likely to call it the unaware rather than the "unconscious" dimension. My further bias is that the ethics of attempting control of dreams are the same as those of attempting

to "control" the unconscious in waking life.

Those who believe the unconscious is basically Freud's seething snake pit of repressed id might well favor total conscious control. However, others, including myself, believe the unconscious has both positive and negative aspects. It is both a pit of snakes and a source of creative inspiration and vision. From this perspective the goal is to foster the positive and minimize the negative. The question then becomes, what are the ethics of control in this process of fostering the positive and minimizing the negatives.

Further, I wonder if by "control", don't we really mean "influence", "guide", "teach", "encourage", and even "cooperate"? For example, when we look at the history of mankind, conscious control of the unconscious seems laughably impossible, yet we attempt it every day when we "work" on ourselves and our "bad habits." We say, "I must not let myself do that," as if some part of us could control, prevent or gain permission for certain behavior. To me the ethics of dream control is precisely the ethics of interaction between these so called parts of the individual.

Another major form of attempting to control the unconscious in daily life is called psychotherapy. It's precisely here, I believe, that we have a ready made model for ethics concerning dream control. That is the ethics of doing dream control are the same as the ethics for doing psychotherapy. Of course that raises all of the old questions about who knows best, the therapist or the client, about respect for the client versus therapeutic manipulation, and about overt control versus influence and cooperation. All these questions come back to haunt us in the context of ethical lucid dream induction.

I would further like to suggest that lucid dreaming itself can be seen as intra-personal psychotherapy, where waking and dream consciousness constantly shift back and forth between the roles of client and therapist. I would like to suggest that the question, "Which knows best, waking consciousness or dream consciousness," is more like a zen Koan than a valid question, because the answer is, "both". The solution to conflict between waking and dream consciousness is resolution and integration, not, "I win, you lose." So when we talk about the ethics of dream control and lucid dreaming, I believe that we are talking about the ethics of enhancing *cooperation* between waking and dream consciousness, not about the imposition of one will upon the other. We are talking about the ethics of Yoga, if you will, in the sense of beneficially yoking waking and dream consciousness in the service of a common goal. That goal is wholeness. As a way to expand and flesh out the notions that I've been talking about, I would like to suggest that the process of individuation, as described by Jungian psychologists, is perhaps the best model available of what healthy ethical lucid dreaming really is. In discussions between waking and dream ego, James Hall, whom you probably know as a union proponent, states, "The waking ego is like a gate keeper which can permit or deny entrance into the boundaries which he guards, but who is helpless to command the appearance or disappearance of a particular entrant (content), however much he might desire it." To my understanding of it, this is quite analogous to the type of limits during lucid dreaming on, "control" of dream consciousness by waking consciousness.

Consider, for example, the following account of an attempt to use dream lucidity for complete control over the dream.

Now I realize that I can control the dream sequence. I decide I want the rain to stop. It doesn't. I wonder to myself why it's so important that it keep on raining, and what the rain could represent. I come to a platform where there are some people standing around. I go from one to another asking them, "what time does the next train leave?" But they all ignore me. It's as if I'm not even there. I begin to feel angry and frustrated but I stopped myself and think, the next one I speak to won't be like this.

Well the next character with whom the dreamer speaks not only answers her question but also provokes her to further self analysis about the true source of her frustration and anger by responding, "Well, that depends on where you want to go." And with that the dream ends. It's as if the dream has permitted some sort of alteration or control but simultaneously maintained its own control over the presumed agenda of increasing the dreamers self awareness.

With respect to the process of individuation itself, Hall notes,

Individuation might be described in terms of the complex theory, Jungian complexes, that is - as the gradual reshaping of the ego under the pressure of the self so that it becomes more inclusive, and more comprehensive. In such an individuation process the contents of the ego continually shift, gradually incorporating certain non-ego complexes, such as the shadow. The reworking of the specific contents on which the ego tacitly relies constitutes the point at which the unfolding of the self through the time bound ego, generates the observable individuation process. The point at which this process can be most clearly observed is in," Hall says, "dreams." I would suggest lucid dreams would be an even clearer example, which may be thought of, to again quote Hall, as the, "metabolism of the ego".

As an example of such a metabolic processes within the lucid dream state I'd like to consider, Stephen, your very fine example that appeared in the original in *Psychology Today* in 1980.

I am in the middle of a riot in the classroom. Everyone is running around in some sort of struggle. Most of them are Third World types and one of them has a hold on me - he is huge with a pockmarked face. I realize that I am dreaming and stop struggling. I look him in the eyes and, while holding his hands, speak to him in a loving way, trusting my intuition to supply the beautiful words of acceptance that flow out of me. The riot has vanished, the dream fades and I awaken feeling wonderfully calm.

Here the nightmare has been controlled by confrontation, resulting in spontaneous

resolution. It seems plausible that the reported waking sense of calm was a direct result, or at least reflection, of the dreamer's internal reconciliation with presumably formerly unacceptable tendencies toward hostility and aggression. Consistent with Jungian concepts about resolution through juxtaposition of seemingly irreconcilable opposites, the dreamer's lucidity has enabled him to, "metabolize" or transform the dream from one more instance of unconscious projection into a genuine integration of basic impulses.

The unique contribution which dream lucidity adds to this metabolism of the psyche is the degree to which it can facilitate and enhance this process through active conscious cooperation and participation of the waking ego. The basis for this enhanced facilitation is precisely the ability to consciously influence lucid dream content while not being able to control it completely. This atmosphere of enforced autonomy and mutual respect permits an enhanced level of therapeutic encounter between waking and dream consciousness enabling them to achieve a new level of cooperation and integrative negotiation. The ethics of such negotiation, I would contend, are the ethics of dream control.

Just to sum up my argument in simpler words, I think the most desirable and most ethical type of dream control is enhanced control over the dreamer's response within the dream, and not over the dreamer's response to the dreamer. I would like to add one other question that we might want to address here, and that is, if we except the idea that dreams have an agenda, that they're corrective or whatever, to what degree does the health of the dream's agenda depend on the waking psychological health of the dreamer? In other words, to what degree can we trust the dream to guide us and direct us? And does psychopathology, as classically defined, suggest that some individuals have something so askew that even their self corrective processes are out of line and that, in fact, to induce lucid dreams in those folks would be likely to result in self-defeating phenomena? What are the implications of this anthropomorphic view of the dream's agenda, and of its own source of self-censure, self-correction? Thank you. Eric?

Craig: I also want to thank Jayne Gackenbach for inviting me to participate in this symposium. She presented the idea as a possibility for a friendly and evocative chat and that is the spirit in which I would like to follow Dr. Dane's thoughtful opening, mainly in the manner of raising some questions for those who are involved in the study and application of lucid dreaming. I hope those of you in the audience will also raise your own ethical concerns here today since you are the people who are most deeply involved with lucid dreams.

It probably should be noted that my own involvement with lucid dreams primarily grows out of some modest but worthwhile personal experience as a lucid dreamer as well as from teaching forty undergraduates each semester in a course on the psychology of dreams in which students attempt at least one lucid dream experiment. This is relatively limited exposure to lucid dreams compared with the experience of many of you in this room. Nevertheless, as a somewhat well informed "outsider" and as a philosophically concerned psychologist in private practice, I would like to touch briefly on two of Dr. Dane's interests before going on to some concerns of my own.

To begin with, Joe Dane raised the question of whether lucid dream induction is ever dangerous. I suppose we should first ask what he means by dangerous but, assuming a rough appreciation of his meaning, I can say that at this early stage of our study I have not yet seen nor heard of any instance in which the induction of lucid dreams has been blatantly harmful to an individual. Although it must be said that we haven't even begun to get the kind of evidence we would need to make an informed and reliable judgement in this regard. Of particular interest would be some good feedback on the outcomes of unsupervised experimentation with lucid dream induction by members of the public who have read or heard about this work and decided to try it out on their own. (Editors Note: See Letters to the Editor for such examples.) Although I have heard some anecdotal evidence of significant anxiety during lucid dreams it is not clear how or even if this anxiety is different from that of an ordinary or non-lucid nightmare.

At this point, we still need much more information as well as, of course, a way to reach or at least make ourselves available to people who read our literature unbeknown to us. So the jury is still out and, in fact, hasn't even heard the case with reference to any potentially serious consequences which may grow out of experimentation with lucid dream induction, particularly when this experimentation is conducted without professional supervision or support. Although there is no immediately apparent reason for alarm, it would not hurt at all to proceed cautiously and with our eyes wide open.

Taking up another aspect of Dr. Dane's question, however, it seems much more difficult to know if lucid dream induction is at all "disruptive" or at times "inadvisable", for this touches the conundrums of the nature of the "greatest good". In this case, is the "greatest good" best served by permitting a person's dream life to occur with the least possible interference from waking or is the "greatest good" most likely to be realized through some waking-life influence? Naturally, in any single instance of an individual's life we can never know the answer to this question because only one course may be taken. An individual gets only one opportunity to sleep through any given night of his or her life and must finally accept this one night's "yield" - whether that be from unmodified, precipitant dreaming or from induced lucid dreaming - without ever knowing whether the other course, the path not taken, would have improved or diminished its value.

However, from my point of view as a clinician I can clearly see at least one potential danger with lucid dream induction for patients in psychotherapy or for persons concerned with profound personal growth and it is this: that the induction of lucid dreams may serve the resistance to self awareness and personal growth. Self knowledge and personal changes are necessarily at times quite unpalatable and/or precarious projects. In such unpleasant times, our creativity for devising means to avoid our "own-most" truths and possibilities is quite remarkable and the induction of lucid dreaming is an ideal device for such avoidance since it appears on the surface to be such a so-called "healthy" or "self-actualizing" activity. There are at least two ways in which this kind of "cloaked resistance" may occur.

First, the induction of lucid dreaming, being the intrinsically appealing project that it is, may come to have a priority over the "larger project" of self knowledge. In other

words, there is a danger, when there is cause for resistance to awareness, that the lucidity of one's dreams may become the focus of attention in order that the meaningfulness of one's dreams may be avoided. So, ironically enough, one can work at becoming more lucid at the expense of becoming more aware. Even though this may be the exception rather than the rule it seems to me to be a danger worth noting.

A second way the induction of lucid dreaming may serve the resistance to authentic self knowledge and personal change is in its potential for creating an illusion of health and well-being. I have observed individuals for whom, during certain periods of time, lucid dreams become a kind of fetish, "psychic objects" for self gratification or even self-congratulation, much in the same way that "peak experience" became a fetish for human potential revelers of the sixties and seventies. Certainly lucid dreaming is an important breakthrough to a different quality of awareness while dreaming. And certainly this kind of dreaming awareness has a value in and for itself, as did the "peak experience" of the previous decades. However, it may be costly - clinically, therapeutically, developmentally - if, when there is a tendency to resistance, this admittedly remarkable human capacity is understood only as a special psychic achievement and not also considered in terms of its equally significant potential as a narcissistic flight from one's fuller, though perhaps less appealing possibilities. I personally become especially wary when I hear dreamers speak repeatedly in a language or tone that implies that a lucid dream is some kind of "Medal of Health and Self-Actualization". I would hate to see this kind of enthusiasm, however well intended, result in a new Hollywood production of "Bob and Carol, Ted and Alice" about the "Esalen of Lucid Dreams". Nevertheless, and more to the point, as a clinician I can easily imagine instances where individuals may use their skill and accomplishments in lucid dreaming as evidence of their arrival in the house of psychological well-being and as justification for not returning to those precarious and uncertain paths in the wilderness of self knowledge where ultimately we must all humbly wonder if we are to achieve any substantial acquaintance with our own unique being-in-the-world.

A second and related problem which Dr. Dane raised has to do with the potentially implicit value judgement in lucid dream induction. This has to do with the question of whether any one capacity or way of being while dreaming (or for that matter while awake) is or should be deemed preferable to others. Does or should any one kind of awareness have a moral or psychological priority over any other? In this case, is or should lucid dreaming be considered a "better", "higher", "more important" way to dream or to be than any other? I'm very clear about my own answer to this and that is, I hope not! Human existence is an extraordinarily rich phenomenon and I would never want to grant any one of its capacities priority over any other. In fact, human history (in all of the meanings of this term: social, political, personal, etc.) seems bent on revealing and, fortunately, to some extent correcting the distortions, imbalances and ill-effects of such one-sided and reductionistic thinking. Lucid dreaming may be enchanting and exciting as well as scientifically significant but I doubt it is the gateway to enlightenment that some practitioners and, unfortunately, the press have occasionally made it out to be. I suppose one could suggest that we should beware of lucidity's siren's song, not so much because



of any inherent potential to destroy but rather because of her ability to intoxicate and keep an individual indefinitely moored off her enticing shore when there are many other equally important shores to discover and understand. Still, if we ultimately believe in human growth and in the human tendency toward wholeness I don't think we have too much to worry about. And a bit of dallying, even to excess, on an especially beautiful and informative isle is far from the worst one can do on an odyssey, regardless of whether one's quest is therapeutic, scientific or strictly personal.

There is another aspect of this second concern of Dr. Dane's, however, that merits further consideration and that is the use of lucid dream induction and lucid dreaming to control one's experience. He pointed out, too, the two kinds of control involved: control over one's dreams (lucid dream induction) and control in one's dreams (carried out in the "throes" of lucid dreaming). Even though I agree with him that complete control over or in one's dreams is not possible (nor will it ever be!), we still have the question of whether or not some control is desirable or preferable. We have always had some control over and in our waking existence (actually, both more and less control than we tend to think we have!) but what the scientific study of lucid dreaming is showing us is how much more control we have over and in our dreaming than we had previously believed. So we have both of these human capacities: to permit what is and to influence what is' to accept reality and to change it; to witness life and to participate in it. These two kinds of capacities exist in both waking and dreaming. The question is, is one more valuable or desirable than the other? Again, on the same grounds as stated above, that is, out of regard for the wholeness of human existence, my own answer is, I hope not!

But this now brings me to some thoughts about the existential significance of the practice and study of lucid dreaming and about some of the ethical questions which this perspective might raise. I will be drawing here on some of the views of the German philosopher, Martin Heidegger, especially with reference to the question of technology for, in essence, the study and application of lucid dreaming has become a technology. I would like, therefore, to inquire into the essential meaning of technology and to see how this inquiry may eliminate some ethical concerns in the study, application and practice of lucid dreaming.

Of all of the human modes of being-in-the-world, being technical is only one. And yet in our time this mode of being is a very important one. In the study and application of dreams and dreaming we now have a number of technologies (physiological, biological, neurological, psychological, educational, clinical, etc.) and the effort to understand and make use of lucid dreaming is only one of the areas in which these technologies have been brought together to enhance human knowledge and development. But all technologies have one basic characteristic in common: that they are, in essence, a way of revealing. Thus the technology of lucid dreaming is a way of revealing something of the nature of this phenomenon of realizing that one is dreaming while one is dreaming.

But now we have to ask "What kind of revealing is technological revealing?" and immediately we see that technology is essentially a "kind of revealing which is an

ordering" (Heidegger, 1977, p. 17). Technology gives us a sense of ordering, controlling (predicting), and objectifying. And, incidentally, I say "a sense of" here because I don't think there is any such thing as absolute order, control or objectivity, for as Percy Bridgeman was fond of pointing out, ultimately science and technology are as subjective and "private as my toothache". Nevertheless, in technology we take up a way of revealing that is ordering. And in the study of lucid dreaming what does this ordering involve?

The first thing it involves is a kind of distancing. For example, upon becoming lucid in a dream, we "step back" and recognize that what we are doing is dreaming. On the one hand, this kind of distance frees us for many possibilities. For example, we can reconsider our world from the point of view that it will soon "collapse" and that we will likely wake up quietly resting in our own beds or we can reengage this immediate dream world knowing we can do whatever we please. However, on the other hand, we also lose a degree of freedom for as long as we are lucid we may no longer be completely absorbed by or unselfconsciously abandoned within this world of precipitant experience. Likewise, as scientists studying or applying lucid dreaming our technological distance frees us to consider the phenomenon in new ways, to manipulate certain variables and to observe our results. And likewise, as technologists we lose a certain freedom to know this thing directly, to be spoken to, to be the one spoken to, to be at one with that which speaks. Hopefully, our awareness of both the gains and costs in freedom which are ours as dream technologists will alert us to the importance of continually acknowledging the unique values as well as limitations of this distantiated manner of revealing what is.

A second aspect of technology as a way of revealing is, for lack of a better term map making. What is observed is described, categorized, conceptualized, measured, and assessed. In other words, approaching the lucid dream in a technological manner we become cartologists. Certainly you have seen more than a few examples of such "maps and charts" in this very room this week. Again, there is a certain kind of freedom that is gained when we have such measured, mathematical maps of a phenomenon. They, our "maps", reveal a kind of order of which we could never otherwise be aware. But also, again, there is a certain loss of freedom since staring at a map, a detailed topographical map of the Grand Canyon for instance, is quite different from standing "there", immediately, one dark cold morning and witnessing that first stunning display of sunlight and shadow as the canyon appears red and golden before one's very eyes. Likewise, all of our measuring, categorizing, conceptualizing and hypothesizing as technicians of the lucid dream "state", as valuable and important as these are, do not give us that wealth of once-in-a-lifetime meaning which can only be revealed by listening in complete surrender to the living world of the dream itself. The so-called "danger" here is, of course, that we unwittingly replace our immediate engagement of the phenomenon itself with an increasingly lifeless and repetitious review of our maps of the phenomenon much in the same way that we no longer see what surrounds us on our drive to work but rather follow the various signs and markers that direct our commuter's itinerary from home to work and back home again.

We have already discussed the third aspect of the technological, ordering way of revealing lucid dreaming: the aspect of control. I would like to return to this briefly again.

Actually, dream control is not a very recent discovery. Going back to the nineteenth century, we find Maury's experiments with influencing dream content, for example, which show that we have known for some time that we have a degree of control in relation to our dreams. Today, such technical advances as, for instance, Delaney's phrase focusing technique of dream incubation, LaBerge's MILD technique and the whole remarkable wave of recent research on lucidity have shown us that we have a much greater degree of control, both over and in the dream, than we had previously imagined. Once more we see how this capacity for control, for ordering, for being able to predict, to say in advance what will appear or happen in our dream, gives us an enormous amount of freedom for revealing, for fulfilling the essence of technology as a way of revealing which is ordering. On the other hand, this very freedom, denies us the opportunity to realize another freedom, that is, the freedom to "let be", to observe and understand what is, with the least degree of interference possible. Certainly there is something to be said on behalf of both ways of revealing. But my concern today is with the fact that in the pursuit of technological control we can easily fall into making the assumption that progress is more important than preservation, productivity more important than protection, and pre-diction more important than the thoughtful understanding of immediate human presence. We must not forget that control is only one way of caring for things whether those "things" are dreams, children, friends, or forests and that letting go of control is an equally important form of attention and concern. The danger here is that we fall into the trap of thinking that control is our most important manner of soliciting knowledge and of caring for things and that our dreams therefore become objects for the same kind of disregard we have witnessed with some of our national forests. Indeed dreaming is one of the few remaining "natural wilderness areas" of human behavior. The question is how we might best acquire and use the knowledge of this human territory in a way that respects and conserves its essential structure and nature.

Now you may be asking what all of this has to do with ethics in the study, application and practice of lucid dreaming. The answer is that these reflections, growing out of Heidegger's phenomenological understanding of technology, are grounded in a philosophical and ethical concern, first, for being faithful to and respectful of what is in each instance of this human behavior which we call lucid dreaming and, second, for being faithful to and respectful of the wholeness of human existence with the hope of honoring and preserving all of our uniquely human ways of revealing, including and especially our primordially receptive and permissive manner of seeing and understanding directly that which reveals itself to us in immediate experience.

I hope, however, that this is not understood, in any way, as a kind of judgement or condemnation since I also concur with Heidegger in his understanding that "What is dangerous is not technology" (p. 28) for technology is, in itself, nothing but a way of revealing. In fact, today, technology is a way of revealing upon which our very survival as a species and as a "planet" depends. And certainly in the realm of dreams we owe much to technology. Consider, for example, how much has been revealed and understood simply on the basis of what may be considered our two major technological breakthroughs: first Freud's discovery of free association as a scientific method for

revealing the context of meanings which come as yet unrevealed with every dream and Aserinsky's discovery of REM periods which provided a previously unimaginable power for revealing the very appearance of the dreams themselves. Perhaps some day the more recent "discovery" of lucid dreaming will come to be seen as a technological development of the same magnitude. I don't know. Only time will tell.

So if technology is not dangerous in itself then what is the danger in technology in general and in the specific technology of dreaming and lucid dreaming? In summary, it is simply the danger that human beings, with lucid dream researchers among them, could take up technology, this special manner of "revealing that is ordering", in such a way that, as Heidegger (1977) put it, it "threatens man with the possibility that it could be denied to him to enter into a more original revealing and hence to experience the call of a more primal truth" (p. 28). In drawing our attention to this particular threat, however, Heidegger also reminds us of an essential paradox with which we must steadily contend. He recalls the words of the German poet Holderlin (*ibid.*):

But where danger is, grows  
The saving power also.

Thus Heidegger's understanding of technology may help us to appreciate the wealth of revelations which have been made in the manner which he calls "a more original revealing... of a more primal truth", and which owe their very appearance in the first place to our technological way of revealing which is ordering. Freud's discovery and use of free association and Aserinsky's discovery and investigation of REM sleep are two obvious and prominent examples of technological advances that have made other more "original revelations" of "primal truths" possible. And so these are two ways of revealing that are called for in the acquisition of human understanding, one being "technological" and "ordering" in nature and the other being "original" and "meaning-full". The danger and, in my mind, the unethical possibility is that either of these ways of revealing would be denied to us in the myopic pursuit of the other. I will close with a poem by Walt Whitman (1980) which touches on both manners of revealing and puts them in their existential perspectives:

When I heard the learn'd astronomer,  
When the proofs, the figures, were ranged in columns before me,  
When I was shown the charts and diagrams, to add, divide, and measure them,  
When I sitting heard the astronomer where he lectured with much  
    applause in the lecture-room,  
How soon unaccountable I became tired and sick,  
Till rising and gliding out I wander'd off by myself,  
In the mystical moist night-air, and from time to time,  
Looked up in perfect silence at the stars.

Schatzman: Upon hearing the title of our panel discussion I felt puzzled. "What ethical

issues," I pondered, "are involved in lucid dreaming." Alan Worsley, who is the lucid dreaming subject with whom I've had all my research experience, has told me of certain ethical problems he has faced in lucid dreams. He'll find in a lucid dream, for instance, that he has a desire to urinate and is by a river. Should he pee into the stream? "Well," he reasons, "someone downstream might drink from the stream or wash their clothes in it. It wouldn't be fair to them. On the other hand," he reasons, "as it's a dream the urine is dream urine and no one will really drink it. But," he reasons further, "if he is worried about such a matter, maybe he isn't dreaming at all, but is awake." Another sort of ethical issue he faces is whether to make love with young girls, girls under the legal age, in lucid dreams, that is. In one case he was with a girl, unbuttoning her blouse. He had decided that as it was only a dream, it was all right. In this case, the trouble was that she was resisting. He thought, "Oh, that's typical. They always say no when they mean yes." But she continued to resist. He finally said, "Look, it's only a dream, and I'm going to wake up soon. So if we're going to get anywhere, we'd better get on with it." So these are some of the sorts of ethical issues involved.

In a lucid dream an attractive patient says to me, "Oh, come on. Let's make love on your office floor. No one will know. It's only a dream." I've never actually had such a dream. I'm just wondering if that's what's meant by ethical issues. Or, in a lucid dream, can one ask a wealthy patient to donate venture capital for one's favorite research project. We've heard in various other presentations that so called archaic tribes believe that a deed in a dream must be atoned for as if it were real. Is that what's being referred to?

It wasn't until a few days ago that Jayne Gackenbach explained to me what she meant by ethical issues and as I then understood it, it had to do with whether or not it was dangerous in a spiritual sense, possibly, to encourage people or patients to have lucid dreams, who might not be ready to have them. In a sense, the question was, can a lucid dream precipitate psychopathology in a vulnerable individual? At least that is another version of the question. My own experiences in this matter are limited to the experiences of one practitioner, myself, of psychotherapy in private practice seeing no more than about ten people at any one time, that is in any one week or month. The people I see vary widely in diagnostic classification. Some have no psychopathology at all and are simply in therapy because they are training to be therapists. Others are neurotic. Some suffer from personality disorders and some are psychotic. Among these people, some recall no dreams and some have never had a lucid dream. And of course, most of dreams reported to me aren't lucid. I can say that no one has reported to me a lucid dream that they regretted or which I regretted their having dreamed. As a result, the question about ethics had never occurred to me before I was asked to appear on this panel. If the question is should we avoid telling a certain group of people or suggesting to a certain group of people to have lucid dreams, my guess, and it's only a guess, is that those people who would suffer as a result of having lucid dreams might not have them in the first place or might wake up before they preceded very far with them.

Dane: Stephen, you had some comments. Do you want to make them now?

LaBerge: Sure. I guess now is as good a time as any. Thank you all for your intriguing comments. In many ways, I share your concerns. I want to say, first of all, how close I am to the view that Joe presented. Since the topic has come up, I would like to point out that although I have a tape entitled "Controlling Your Dreams," if you actually listen to the tape you will hear the advice "control yourself, not your dreams." Further, I make the same point in my book, which is that I am not advocating manipulative control of dreaming; I'm not advocating forcing dreams to follow the whims of the ego.

I'm advocating a more sensitive responsiveness to what's going on and how to deal with it. So, for example, suppose in a dream you are running away from something. That's the point where consciousness can say, "Wait a minute. Let's not run. Let's see what I'm doing. What am I running from?" So it's not a global control in which you try to control everything in the dream like was implied by the dream Joe quoted. There may be just one moment where conscious control is important, for example, as when I stopped struggling with my ogre and stopped trying to get away and remembered what I was trying to do. What I remembered then was that I was trying to accept--not reject--this shadow figure. The rest of the dream was intuitive, it flowed unconsciously. It's a question of balance.

Having expressed my personal view of the control issue, I think it might be helpful to take a devil's advocate position, since nobody else seemed to do this, about total control. Let me give you an example of how our concern with dream control might sound to some ears. Let's consider total control of waking thought. I want to know if anybody thinks that this is the way things should be done. We all have had the experience of trying to think about some particular topic when an intrusion occurs. Some other thought pops into our heads. Is it wicked to suppress that other thought and go on with what you were trying to think? I should say not. What I would say is that the question ought to be, should we be able to have total control over our dreams in the sense that we could dream anything we wanted. Now I think that there is nothing wrong with that. The problem comes up, if we had that power, would we use it to suppress dreams about things that we would otherwise have to deal with? The approach that I took to this problem was to make an agreement with myself in the very beginning. Whenever I became lucid there are two questions I agreed to ask myself: 1) is there anything I'm running away from? if so, face it; 2) is there any conflict going on? if so, resolve it. Beyond that I was free to do anything I wanted, but I wouldn't use my lucid dreams to avoid those kinds of issues. I think that is the kind of policy we each have to work out for ourselves. What am I going to do with my lucid dreams? The lucid dream state itself doesn't necessarily help your waking consciousness. It depends on what you're doing with it, whether or not you're learning lessons there. It isn't the experience that is important, but what you make of it, as the proverb puts it, "Two reeds drink from the same stream, one is hollow, the other sugar cane."

Ted Rockwell: These questions are part of a bigger question of what in research or science or technology should be kept safe. I think in America right now we're seeing a mood that we must never do anything that's unsafe. So we keep insisting that the FDA

prove that a new drug is safe before they release it and meanwhile people continue to die from the non-use of the drug. In any new thing I think we have to balance the alternatives. To imply that we might be better off by not understanding more about how our mind works, I think is dangerous and fallacious thinking. I think that we always have to try to understand more and to look at the alternatives of ignorance because you don't have the option of no danger or no action. Anything that you do or don't do has to be balanced against the alternatives.

Question: I think what you were saying, Steve, suggests that if there is power in lucid dreaming that you can learn from it. But I think that there is also power to make mistakes. I think that that may be a question that people haven't considered.

LaBerge: It might or it might not. We don't know how serious a problem this is. We haven't seen a case where someone has persistently done that sort of thing, other than the case quoted in my book of Ram Narayana who got into a very inflated position of thinking that he was the God of the dream world and had all of his creatures bowing down, until he got his comuppence from a dream Yogi who said he was in the same boat with the rest of them. I think that for those who do that sort of thing, the dream characters react to the more inflated ego.

For example, if this were a dream and I, as the dream ego, were to say to you, "You're all just figments of my imagination," I would be wrong because I'm a part of the dream just as much as any of you are. How do you think you would all respond to that? Not well! So you find that it doesn't work in the dream either.

This is the importance, I think, of giving people plenty of information on the topic. You've got to be able to tell people about what to do and also what not to do. So you just shouldn't say, "Here is a lucid dream machine. Have fun with it." We don't intend to do that either.

Dane: Well that's my concern, not with your's, but the popular press's use of, or way of conveying this material. And again, I doubt we are going to cause any world wars doing this but it does smack of something and conveys an attitude towards dreams that I think is totally opposite of what we would intend, particularly those of us who would attend a conference like this.

Question: I would like to ask something of the panelists and Stephen and the audience. Has anyone or does anyone actually know of a case of someone who has been harmed as a result of a lucid dream?

Brylowski: It was actually a reverse situation. When I was working at the Harris County Psychiatric Hospital a young gentleman about thirty years old was committed. Upon extensive interviewing I recognized that he was different than the rest of the patients. I didn't think he was schizophrenic. What had happened was that he had been telling some people about his out-of-body experience, a misinterpreted lucid dream, and his family

had him committed. So it was a reverse effect. The therapist and the psychiatrist had been indoctrinated into the belief that anybody who had out-of-body experiences is a provisional schizophrenic and needs to be committed and put on anti-psychotic medications. He was harmed by the falsehoods.

Dane: Let me give a quick answer. This was an experimental situation and there were varying degrees of this sort of thing. A female who had never had a lucid dream before, very eager to have one, and who also associated lucid dreams with out-of-body experiences, got into the laboratory and had what seems to me, not having had an out-of-body myself, a classical pro-dronal kind of experience. Buzzing, the bed began tilting up and down, spinning, et cetera. resulted in her becoming very disoriented and panicky each time she tried to drop off to sleep, and, as confirmed by the polygraph, she would reawaken. It became very disturbing for her. I ended up turning off the polygraph to confirm that anything that she was doing was for herself. There was no demand characteristic within the situation (i.e., no demand to produce evidence of a lucid dream via eye signals through the polygraph). This ended up with her having two very brilliant lucid dreams, neither of which were records on the polygraph but which were a very nice demonstration of a resolution of the initial competitive edge that she came in with. The conflict went back to conflict with a brother, and the dream content confirmed that. That's a mild version of psychological disruption caused by lucid dream induction.

A heavier version was a woman who, when she came into the study, reported a seemingly long resolved psychiatric history. In the process of the study, she began responding to lucid dream induction, but this was very disruptive to her because it was also associated with out-of-body states, which she had never before experienced, and it wakened earlier memories of what she experienced as a psychokinesiology, telepathy and telekinesis.

LaBerge: Joe, are you saying that she had a lucid dream that caused this as opposed to your trance induction . . . .

Dane: No. I'm not at all clear what the precipitant was. I am only clear that there was a correlation between the occurrence of the lucid dreaming, the experimental situation, the demand characteristics, and this subject's own personal and intrapersonal situation. I was throwing this out simply because there were several such instances. In one instance with another woman, it took me about two and a half hours to get her calmed back down after her initial experience of becoming lucid. As you know, I had done some psychological screening. I don't know if it was the setting or what. There were a number of variables that might help account for what happened, but it seemed an intriguing question to ask if others had seen the same sort of thing.

Comment: I don't know if this is going to come out coherent or not but I think when we're talking about warnings and caution in teaching people about lucid dreaming, we have to be very careful not to bring in trappings that may come from our particular belief system



about dreams and lucid dreams. I think it has to do with whether or not we believe, for example, that dreams are fictional experiences or whether or not they are nonfictional experiences. We warn people about what may or may not be an appropriate behavior. We caution them not to use this to ignore messages from the subconscious that might have something important or integrative to bring to us. To me that still presumes that this is a kind of fiction or symbolic making experience. When Stephen encounters a monster in a lucid dream and flies away from it, is he ignoring something that he had better confront? I think that tends to come from a certain interpretation of what dreams are for. On the other hand, if I don't necessarily presume that lucid dreams are fictional experiences, if I encounter a monster right here in this waking hard physical reality I will avoid it. If I encounter a monster in my lucid dream and I avoid it, am I avoiding some important message or am I avoiding a monster? If I see a purple person in my lucid dream it could just be a purple person. It may not be an internally generated or symbolic phenomenon.

LaBerge: Can I respond to that? Yes, I think that is a very good point because people who view lucid dreams as astral projection, for example, have great difficulty with those "unpleasant" characters. For example, after van Eeden's beatific lucid dreams in which he floated in heaven, feeling as holy as can be, he would be plagued by demon dreams in which classical devils with horns and pitchforks would follow him around mocking his holiness. He would always try to get rid of them because he considered them beings of a low moral order. You see, if the attitude is that these things are objectively existent and that you don't have anything to do with them and then you always have problems. So it's a matter of, I think, experimenting. Find out what happens when you do make friends with one of those monsters. Then if it transforms I think you'll learn that it's better to treat them as if they are a part of yourself and subjective and symbolic than objectively existing characters that you don't want to deal with.

Craig: I think in line with that last question, an important point was made that not only is escaping or confronting figures in lucid dreaming a method of dealing with the unconscious, I think that it also establishes behavior patterns that might be carried through in waking life. For example, when an athlete visualizes a race before actually going out and running the race to improve performance. In so far as we can exercise consciousness in lucid dreaming any of our habits or our behaviors may shape future behaviors, right now or in lucid dreaming. There is an ethical question along those lines. If we permit ourselves all kinds of freedom and excess as a conscious behavior in lucid dreaming that may carry over, just as any other behaviors do.

Schatzman: Well, I'd like to know if anybody has some data about that. You would probably know more than any of us about this. I mean do experiences that people have in lucid dreams affect their behavior in waking life? (Editors Note: Paul Tholey, of West Germany, has extensive data on this question. His psychotherapy program with lucid dreams is summarized in a chapter in the forthcoming [June, 1988] book edited by Gackenbach and LaBerge, *Conscious Mind, Sleeping Brain: Perspectives on Lucid*

*Dreaming.)*

Dane: I have some "soft" data on that from one subject. This is a thirty-five-year-old woman who had a lifelong history of nightmares involving male figures pursuing her. To make a long story short, this is a subject in a one night study who had never had a lucid dream before. The techniques used to induce lucid dreaming worked for her. She developed the skill at home and over a period of several lucid dreams did encounter that nightmare figure but became more and more playfully confrontive. At first she merely scared the intrusive figure away. Then she gradually began to materialize popcorn balls to shoot at it, put on a crash helmet when they shot at her, et cetera. What she reported in waking life was no great bells and whistles and revelations other than a gradually increasing sort of playfulness, in her experience anyway, towards what she had earlier perceived as great trauma and victimization in her life. Whether or not that is a cause and affect, I don't know, especially since she was in ongoing psychotherapy at the time. However, she had not been able to control her nightmares in several years of therapy prior to learning lucid dreaming, and still has no trouble with nightmares four years later. It's an interesting correlation.

LaBerge: Well, I think there can be a process of generalization. It's observational learning. In one sphere (the dream) you find out how to deal with a situation, let's say, for example, facing your fears and dealing with them in some way. You find out you get very positively reinforced for doing that in the dream when you manage to overcome your fear and make friends with the monster and you feel wonderful afterwards. You are going to tend to think that in other spheres (say, waking life) it might make sense to deal with your fears instead of avoid them.

I'd like to raise one final point about this whole question of should we be controlling our dreams, as if in any dream, lucid or not, the ego is not always controlling to a certain extent what is happening, namely the interpretations of it. Because we don't interpret perceptions without some kind of script or ideal of what's going on. The unconscious mind may present some elements, but how the conscious part of the mind takes it is going to determine what happens next. For instance, say there is a shadowy figure. What is my ego attitude about shadowy figures? "That's interesting," or, "Shadowy figure! I'd better get out of here?" You see, that's going to make a new dream. When I decide I better get out of there the next thing that happens is that that shadowy figure, of course, will follow me. In the dream account that you gave, Joe, about the person who went around asking people all this stuff, getting no answer until thinking "The next person that I talk to is going to answer." That expectation now caused a change in the dream. Expectations of the dream ego are always playing a role. There is always an interplay between the conscious and the unconscious minds. I think it's wise for us to educate the dream ego to the point that it makes the best kind of responses for the overall benefit of the conscious and the unconscious mind, the whole psyche. That is where I see a potential for lucid dreaming if it's used wisely. Obviously it's something that can give you problems if you don't know what you're doing with it and so obviously more

education is what we need. We're running out of time here, actually, so perhaps if any of the panel have any last words on this...

Dane: The only thing that I wanted to say is I thought it was really important, the difference between what's going on and what's getting reported to the press. I think that's something that really needs to be considered quite seriously.

LaBerge: You mean reported "by" the press? Of course, the press over-simplifies everything. You know, you tell them things like "control yourself, not your dreams" and they write "control your dreams."

Comment: Controlling the press is no easier than controlling your dreams. [Laughter.] Any time for more questions?

Dane: Ok, we've got two. We'll take both of you.

Question: I've got a question for the panel. It seems that there is a possibility that people with past traumas could potentially have more problems with lucid dreaming and also the possibility of people who have frequent nightmares. On the other hand, it also seems logical, at least with people's experiences with lucid dreaming, that it could be potentially therapeutic as well. Joe Dane gave an example with the hypnosis and the spontaneous regression leading to hospitalization. That brings up the issue, is that person better off now that they have dealt with that problem than they were before.

Dane: Definitely. She is better off, but only because she had access to appropriate assistance in dealing with the problem. That's a good point.

Question: So even that, though not a pleasant way to go through it seems that it may have been beneficial. I don't know. On the other hand, bringing up another point, as happened with you with one person who had psychiatric problems and didn't tell you. If people are giving workshops on lucid dreaming and people lie to them to what extent would the facilitator be responsible? I think that a key thing here is responsibility. If participants are not, how can facilitators be responsible for them?

Dane: Thank you. I'll offer one brief comment and then turn it over to anyone else. Every opportunity, every difficulty, every problem is an opportunity, both for patients, for workshops leaders, et cetera. I think that all of this that we are talking about today is basically intended as a reminder of, "be aware, it works both ways."

Question: I have an interest in the issues that you raised concerning hypnosis and control. I'm sympathetic to the ones that you raised also concerning the FDA. I also thought of a parallel case, in terms of radiation. We really undercontrolled it early and have just, through the decades realized the importance of control of radiation. The point is that there

are models of control some which have worked and others which I would certainly hate to see adopted. One would be the model of the actions that we've taken sociologically with regard to certain psychoactive drugs. LSD is a major example and MDMA a more recent one. I think there has been some really destructive control exercised there. Another is the current model of control in hypnosis by the Society for Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis and the American Society for Clinical Hypnosis. I'm sympathetic to their motivations. However, the ways in which they exercise control over who can and can't practice hypnosis, having had experience with that, I've found really lacking. So the general thrust of the comment is, if there is going to be any control exercised by a body let's be careful.

LaBerge: Yes. Thank you. Get your lucid dream machines now while they're still legal! [Laughter.] Thank you very much!

### References

Heidegger, M. (1977). *The question concerning technology and other essays*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.  
Whitman, W. (1980). *Leaves of grass*. New York: New American Library.

### Appendix (Dane Handout) Ethical Issues for Applications of Lucid Dreaming

**Curiosity:** Is it really just the popular press that is pushing dream control?  
Who at this conference believes that wholesale conscious control of dreams is desirable, let alone possible?  
What, exactly, is meant by "control?"  
Is there an ethical obligation to not foster or even to actively oppose inappropriate media overemphasis or "misverbage" on dream control?  
Having control in one's dreams vs. control over one's dreams.

**Caution:** What are the responsibilities of ethical trainers in lucid dream induction?  
Is lucid dream induction ever "dangerous?"  
Are there psychologically vulnerable individuals for whom lucid dream induction might be disruptive or inadvisable?  
When? To whom?  
How does one know ahead of time?  
What are dangers of one shot work shops on lucid dream induction, especially if using hypnosis?  
Who is qualified to claim use of "hypnosis" as part of induction technique?  
"Hypnosis," especially with regression, can elicit unexpected, clinically significant reactions.

Persons using hypnosis should be equipped to respond appropriately.  
Context should provide genuine redress/follow-up for untoward reactions.

### **Ethics**

Implies value system, goals, ends, means, purposes, values, intent

Absolutism vs. relativism

"Is it good or bad?" vs. "When is it good or bad?"

Reflects one's basic philosophical stance/perspective

Belief or disbelief in the unconscious

Beliefs about the unconscious

Ethics of dream control depends on one's view of the relationship between waking and dream consciousness.

Ethics of attempting dream control equals ethics of attempting control of the unconscious.

Laughably impossible

Yet attempt it daily in waking life

"working" on ourselves

"I mustn't let myself do that" (as if some part could control, prevent, give permission)  
equals doing self-therapy/psychotherapy

### WHEN IS 'DREAM CONTROL' DESIRABLE?

When it enhances personality functioning

--Optimal dream "control" equals resolution and facilitation of the conflict/anxiety being processed

--Overcoming victim stance in life

--Recognition/exertion of one's own power to create one's personal reality

--Overcoming waking neurotic tendencies

--Enhanced assertiveness, self-confidence

--Creativity

--Fun/adventure

--Nightmares

Productive versus debilitating anxiety

--Confrontation

demonstration of personal competence

exerting conscious creation versus "co-"creation

--Exploration of human potential

--Creativity

### WHEN IS 'DREAM CONTROL' UNDESIRABLE?

When it interferes with the "corrective" function of dreams

Avoidance of:

productive anxiety

self-confrontation

Pure "egomania"

Crushing the initiative of intuitive, right brained processing

The most desirable control is over the dreamer's response within the dream, not over the dream's response.

QUESTION:

Assuming that dreams can be said to have an agenda, does the "health" of the dream's agenda depend on the dreamer's waking psychological health?

What are the ethical implications of this for who should be encouraged to pursue lucid dream induction independently?

Most agree that unconsciousness has both positive and negative aspects  
Freud's pit of snakes versus source of creative inspiration and vision

Goal: foster positive and minimize negative

Question: What are the ethics of "control" in this process? (Semantic problem?)

Are "foster" and "control" incompatible?

Does "control" really equal influence, guide, encourage?

When does "control" equal Control

(equal wholesale conscious manipulation of dream to conscious ends)

Is Control even possible?

Ethics of psychotherapy as model

Who knows best, client or therapist?

Need for mutual respect

Therapeutic "manipulativeness"

Cooperation/influence versus control

Proposed model:

Lucid dreaming as intrapersonal psychotherapy

Which is the (best) therapist: waking or dream consciousness?

Both!

Interactive versus directive

Cooperation versus manipulation

Yoga ("yoking") of waking and dream consciousness

Jungian individuation process as model of ethical lucid dream application:  
Total control not possible -- Dream maintains own agenda  
Health of dreams agenda depends on dreamer's waking psychological health?  
Individuation as "metabolism of the ego"  
Lucid dreaming facilitates/enhances this metabolism  
Atmosphere of enforced autonomy and mutual respect  
Fosters mutual influence/cooperation not control  
Leads to enhanced level of therapeutic encounter  
Achieve new level of cooperation and integrative negotiation  
Exact outcome is unpredictable