

A DISSOCIATED PERSONALITY.*
WITH AN ANALYSIS OF ITS PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS.

BY EDWARD E. MAYER, M. D., PITTSBURGH, PA.

I am reciting below the history together with my observations of one I. S. B., not so much in order to place his case on record as to use him as a basis of discussion concerning some of our viewpoints in connection with the psychoneuroses in order to focus attention upon their validity.

I. S. B. had been engaged for some years in evangelistic work. At the same time he carried on a business which consisted of borrowing money from people, whom he told, either personally or through his agents, that he was using this money to finance business men who were unable to lift their shipments from the railroad, and who would pledge with him the bills of lading as security for the money that he would lend them. He would explain that these clients, as he called them, would be willing to let him have 10, 15 or 20 per cent for a 20- or 30-day loan, because they could make that much money, or more, on their shipments, and this he would offer to divide with those who loaned him the money. He combined his evangelistic speaking with the money-borrowing business; that is, the people who were in his evangelistic party would act as his agents in getting money for him. He had been carrying this on for about four or five years. The big volume of business was done by him in the last year or two. For some months prior to his exposure, he had allowed his checks to go to protest, but he had such a hold on his agents and customers that this circumstance did not seem to prevent him from borrowing money long after his checks would be returned unpaid.

When he could not stave things off any longer, he had certain of his associates enter judgments for large amounts against him in court, and this precipitated the filing of a petition in bankruptcy against him on October 17, 1918. A receiver was appointed by the United States Court, who took possession of his property at half-past 10 in the morning, and while the receiver was there, B. himself came in and took a keen interest in the matter, and acted and spoke as any average man would have under the circumstances; that is, he inquired as to the best method, and the quickest method, of lifting the receivership, and consulted with the coun-

* Read at the seventy-fifth annual meeting of The American Medico-Psychological Association, Philadelphia, Pa., June 18-20, 1919.

sel on this very point in the presence of the receiver and others. His counsel told him that in the meantime he would have to recognize the order of court and submit to it, and that if he wanted to ask for the vacation of the receivership, he would have to do that later, to which he submitted. He entered into the spirit of the thing so far as to show the receiver through his offices and gave him the combination of the safe and other things of that kind, and while the receiver was busy about the office, he disappeared.

Nothing more was heard of him by the receiver or his counsel until a few days later, when they were informed by B.'s counsel and by others who were present at the time that he had left his offices that day and walked across a very narrow hall to the office of his counsel, that his counsel had said to him "B., I told you that this thing would be inevitable," whereupon I. S. B. lapsed into this condition from which he appeared to be suffering thereafter; that is, a lapse of memory.

We quote the following excerpt from the request to court for permission to examine him:

"That your petitioner is satisfied from information received from persons who have observed the said I. S. B., that the said I. S. B. is shamming and feigning loss of memory, that while in the hospital he has communicated with members of his family by Morse Code, he and the members of his family understanding telegraphy, and that he is feigning his symptoms and is acting in collusion with members of his family and others to have himself declared insane so as to avoid the consequence of his criminal acts and to avoid being compelled to disclose in court the whereabouts of his assets."

This petition was made consequent to a confinement in St. Francis Hospital from October 23, 1918, to November 20, 1918, and after his removal to jail at the request of the police department. In November, 1918, a hearing was held to determine why the said "I. S. B. should not be punished for contempt, in not appearing before the referee in bankruptcy to testify in said proceedings." His physicians testified that he was incapable of answering questions intelligently, and that his appearance in court might render his mental state more intense. A diagnosis of hysterical amnesia was made by them and so testified to at these proceedings.

At this hearing, counsel made the following statements:

"1. That I. S. B., after he lapsed into this apparent condition of lost memory, accused some of his friends with having stolen from his pocket two papers which he took out of his desk while the receiver was there.

"2. That while the receiver was there he managed to get into his private office and into his desk and put some papers into his coat pocket, and after he was taken home in an automobile, he accused the people in the automobile with having stolen these papers from his pocket.

"3. That since he has been in this condition of having his eyes closed, when a certain special friend would come into his hospital room, he would say, 'Oh! where is my friend'—naming this man—but that he never called for this man when he was not in the room.

"4. It was further claimed later that upon leaving the hospital for jail he asked for an automobile instead of the hospital ambulance and that when leaving the jail for home, he signed his discharge himself without any apparent difficulty."

My observations of I. S. B. were carried on in the unpropitious environment of the county jail. His cell was in the dark so that he was free, while in it, from close observation. He was rarely still. His hands and feet moved constantly. He would pull at his unfastened shoes or at his tie, or rub the back of his hand across his nose, or place his hands closely against his body. On being asked to get up and go for a walk, he would rise immediately and shuffle out. His steps were very small, with slightly bent and fixed knees, without any ankle motions, with arms flexed at the elbows, and with his hands slightly clenched. His eyes were constantly closed. He entered readily into conversation after being seated at a table. Some of his answers to personal questions representing conversations of many days were as follows:

"I am 26 years of age."

"This is 1900."

"I am the telegraph operator here."

"This is Mohawk."

"My home is at Loudenville."

"I went to school there until I was 17."

His voice was a drawling, high-pitched one, infantile in type, his lips being pursed, and his jaw slightly protruded.

On being asked why he did not open his eyes he commenced to cry, saying, "Oh! my eyes. They are nailed shut. They nailed a board to the back of my head. They drove the nails here, and here, and here, and here"—pointing to four places and asking me to feel them. "Here they come out just below my eyes. Dr. Purdy wishes to grease the nails and pull them out."

Q. Was Dr. Purdy here?

A. No, he wrote about it to Lloyd.

Q. Who is Lloyd?

A. Lloyd helps me in everything. Are you McKim? (He is the train dispatcher.)

Q. Don't you know McKim's voice better than that?

A. No, I don't know his voice. You might be McKim.

Q. Why doesn't your wife visit you?

A. Why doesn't my wife visit me? Why, she lives 16 miles away. I haven't time to go to see her.

Q. Why not take an auto?

A. What is that, an auto? I don't know what that is. We have a horse and buggy.

Q. Why don't you go back to work?

A. Why don't I go back to work? Well, I am out here in the waiting room with you. Someone is calling me now. I will go back to the office, if you will help me. He thereupon arose, turned from the chair directly to the door, fumbling at it and then remarked, "I can't find the door," and then started to feel along the iron rail in an endeavor to get his bearings.

A. What am I wearing? Why, this is a sweater. Yes, it is a shawl sweater.

Q. Do you know that those kind of sweaters were only made in the last six or seven years? (No answer to this.)

Q. Why do you walk this way?

A. Why, I walk all right.

Q. Don't you hear the guard telling you to turn to the right?

A. No I don't hear anybody saying anything. Didn't you call me? Didn't you ask me to come into the waiting room?

Q. Where is this waiting room that you are talking about?

A. Why at Mohawk, of course.

Q. Where is your wife?

A. Why she is still at Kilbuck. I will take Sport and drive over when I get time to see her. Lloyd Stats takes care of things while I'm gone.

In recounting episodes of his boyhood life, upon several occasions his face would light up as he would tell how the boys one day found Checker Davis drunk and rolled stones down on him. He would always add to this that this man was dead now. On one occasion, therefore, I asked him this question:

Q. How about your own life at present, is Davis better off?

A. Oh! that would be all right, I am going to heaven you know.

Q. Why do you think so?

A. Because the Bible says "Whosoever wishes," and I want to.

On several occasions when the jail gong would sound, I would ask him what that was, but he always answered, "I heard nothing."

On occasional visits he would find difficulty in getting out of the chair to arise and upon one occasion cried and said, "Please help me." Somebody has got me tied. Won't you untie my legs?"

Q. You are a good man, B.?

A. Yes, when my baby was 11 months old I told God that if it was saved that I would never smoke or chew and I never have.

Q. What did you do at the hospital?

A. Hospital? I never saw one.

Q. Never in your entire life?

A. No, we have no hospital at Loudenville.

Q. But you have been to other places?

A. Well, there is none at Coshocton.

Q. But you have been at Toledo?

A. Yes, but I never saw a hospital.

Q. What do you do to amuse yourself?

A. I like to go fishing.

Q. Do you like to catch suckers?

A. No, they are too full of bones.

Q. Do you remember what Pickwith said about fishing?

A. Who is Pickwith? I never heard of him.

Q. There is a darkey coming down the railroad track, who is he?

A. There is no darkey at Mohawk. We only have 43 people here.

Q. Don't you hear his dog barking? (A colored prisoner was just below him playing with the warden's dog. (Without his knowledge the negro with the dog approached him.)

Q. (To the negro.) Do you own the dog?

A. No, it isn't my dog.

Q. (To I. S. B.) What did he say?

A. There is nobody here. I don't hear anybody. (The colored boy was standing between the two of us.) Speak louder, I said to him, and tell this gentleman about your dog. He then spoke very loudly, "I don't own this dog.")

Q. Do you hear him now?

A. No, he answered. I don't hear anybody but you, Everett. (On several occasions he assumed that I was some boyhood friend.)

Q. You know that I have been away, won't you help me pass the time this evening, since I will be alone?

A. What do you want me to do?

Q. Come over and play checkers.

A. I cannot see. I cannot play. But I will sit down beside you. I will sit with you as long as you wish.

Q. Will you come now?

A. No, no. I have to cross the railroad track to go to your house and I am afraid, because I cannot see.

Q. Will you come down to Johnson's store?

A. Yes, I will do that.

Q. You are not very keen about it, though, are you?

A. Keen? I don't know that word.

Q. You would be glad to do things for me.

A. Oh! yes, I'd do anything for you. Where did you get those words? Was that when you went to Oberlin?

Q. What is that broken-down gondola doing at the crossing?

A. Gondola? Oh! yes, I know what a gondola is.

Q. Don't you know me to-day?

A. Who are you?

Q. Everett Darling.

A. Everett Darling? I used to know someone by that name. I don't know you. Lloyd, there is Jim trying to get us. Where is my stylus? Don't you hear 423 going through, Lloyd? Take care of it while I get Jim's message.

Q. Are you concerned about your suit, Ira?

A. My suit is still good. Its warm enough for this cold weather.

Q. What does your father do?

A. He makes barrels.

Q. Didn't you tell me that he was a justice of the peace? (After some reflection, at first denying, he finally said, "Yes, I guess he was." (To Lloyd, "Don't you know. Answer all these questions of this man.")

Q. Didn't you tell me that you had a Blackstone which belonged to your father and which you loaned to Lloyd?

A. I haven't any books. Blackstone, no, I haven't any such book. I don't know what kind of a stone that is. You answer him, Lloyd. Tell him what books of mine you have.

Q. How would that sound on a dictaphone?

A. The only phone I got is the one here I am telegraphing with.

Q. That is the only one in your cell, you mean.

A. Cell? I have two cells here. I use two cells to run my instrument. (Turning to Lloyd, whom he assumed to be present.) He seems to repeat things like a phonograph, doesn't he Lloyd?

Q. What kind of a phonograph are you using?

A. Never heard of such a thing. (I had another prisoner join in the conversation.)

Q. We have to be satisfied here, don't we, Mr. B.?

A. What's that? What's that you are saying? (Repeating it in a loud tone, he answered, "I don't know what you are talking about.")

Q. Well, we are both prisoners and that is not very nice.

A. I am not a prisoner.

Q. Well, I am, and I am here with you.

A. (In a louder voice to Lloyd) Somebody is in this office. You see what he wants and what he is talking about.

Q. Are you still at Mohawk?

A. Of course, I am.

Q. Don't you know by this time that I am aware that you realize your surroundings?

A. No answer.

Q. Who is this man beside me? (It was the guard.)

A. No answer.

Q. Feel his brass buttons, here's his officer's cap, put it in your hand. (The guard placed it there.) He then looked up and said "Oh you are George Starret, aren't you? You are on engine 432. The guard asked him, "Don't you think you have carried this bluff far enough?

A. What bluff? We just had an engine go down the river and it stuck its nose clear into the bluff. There is Walker's Bluff and there is Slate Bluff.

Q. Didn't you tell me, I. B., that you played poker?

A. Yes, when I was a boy.

Q. Do you not know what kind of a bluff I mean then?

A. No, I am telling you the kind of bluff I know.

Q. Don't you think you should realize by now that you are in jail and not at Mohawk?

Concrete	I don't know.	
Wine	Don't know anything about it.	Never heard about it.
Pretend	Anything (after some delay.)	
President	McKinley.	F
Soldier	We have three at Loudenville.	
Fire	Why, a fire.	
San Francisco fire.....	Never heard of any.	
Biggest city	Ask Lloyd.	
How about New York? ..	Yes it's big.	
Truck	There is one in the freight house. No it's not run by electricity. A telegraph instrument. We put stuff in jars.	
Carbon	To make three copies at once. That is the paper used in our 31 orders, also in our 19 orders.	
Roses	We have them in summertime.	
Arithmetic	Study it.	
Justice	My father was a justice of the peace.	
Dictaphone	Don't know.	
Charity	The Bible says if you have charity you are good.	
Sport	He's over in the barn.	
Woman	Just a woman.	
Loyalty	Oh! I work hard for the company. That's loyalty.	

Corporation Don't know. Who are you anyhow? You know
so much. I wish you would teach me.

Child Just a child.

Suit Why, I got a suit on.

Some other kind of a suit I don't know any.

Well now your father was a justice of the
peace. People would go to him for cer-
tain reasons. Yes, that would be suing.

But what is it called otherwise, the action
itself? I don't know what you mean.

Well, what are lawyer's trials called? Lloyd is studying law, ask him. He has Black-
stone.

What do you know about Blackstone? Well, Pa used to be a justice of the peace and
I gave Lloyd his Blackstone.

Trust Hiram Johnson would trust me to payday. I like
him, and he likes me.

Varnish I have heard of it.

Billy Sunday Don't know. Are you Billy Sunday?

Evangelist Moody is an evangelist.

Iris Don't know.

Commerce Don't know.

Blind (He immediately started to repeat the story about
the nails through his head, crying and shaking
his right hand.)

Lola She is my wife.

Paint It's just paint.

Beet sugar I don't know. I know sugar.

Bicycle I got an old bike.

Travel Trains go to Coshocton.

Dog Just a dog.

Grass Summertime.

Steal Stole \$20.

Democracy Don't know.

Arctic No answer.

Arctic Ocean Oh, yes, I know.

Preach Make you good.

Steam 432-437 engines.

Brick

Interest What do you mean?

Why you know what interest means. Oh! yes, I get interest at the bank.

Sun Just sun.

These tests are interesting in showing that he has no seeming memory for any new words and he hesitates or gives generally a meaning to simple words which have nothing to do with the experiences which connect him with the present situation. We failed to get, in most instances, any response to the words, bank, trust, interest, suit, and similar words dealing with the experiences for which he is held in jail. With some words he persistently took a meaning for the word which has nothing to do with what we had in mind. Notice, for instance, his answer to suit, speaking of his clothes; and upon our insisting for some other meaning, his reply, that he did not know any other meaning to the word suit, until it was recalled to him that he claimed his father had been a justice of the peace and that, therefore, he must be aware of another meaning to the word. Yet, even after acknowledging this he assumes no understanding of the word. And with other words, such as interest and bank, he always first hesitates, asking the question, what is meant by the word? He also denies any knowledge of what a corporation is or what commerce means. Yet, assuming that his mind is occupied with his experiences of 1900, he must have had at that time knowledge of these words. Note also his reaction to the word hospital. His rejoinder also to my question concerning Billy Sunday is interesting. It was, "are you Billy Sunday?" A peculiar name like this would hardly be answered in this way if the name was entirely out of memory. I repeatedly asked him

whether he heard the gong sound in the jail corridor, or the call of the guards or the noise made around him by the prisoners. He never hears, anything, however, except occasionally upon being directly addressed. "This is a waiting room, or this is a telegraph office, or there isn't any noise." My voice he always hears. He enters readily into conversation with me. He is never occupied for long with any supposed duties in connection with a telegraph office. It is always February. It is always snowing. He always speaks of Hiram Johnson or Lloyd Stats or his horse Sport, or his former trips to Mohawk and Coshocton, or messages from McKim, the dispatcher. He is very eager, in fact, to impress you with these things and to go over them repeatedly with you.

He doesn't consider it peculiar that he is helped in dressing or in getting around. He sleeps well. He never has any trouble in helping himself to eat.

To words which have come into use since 1900, we could get no response; parcel post, jitney, addressograph, censor, chiropractor, dictaphone, radio, feminist, dry-farming, etc. At the same time, as remarked before, many words which were in use in 1900 receive apparently no association in his mind. Unless the words deal with this narrow or circumscribed environment and duties connected with it, we are unable to elicit, as a rule, any answer from him.

About one month after he had been placed in jail, he commenced to have "spells." My report concerning them was received from several guards. He imagined he was raising rabbits in his cell. Upon one day he threw a chair at the cell door to kill a snake which was getting at them. Upon another day he imagined he was in the loft of a barn and threw himself out of his cell cot, making a lot of noise and yelling that he was hurt. Upon several occasions, in trying to get anything from him concerning these episodes, if the matter was pressed too far, he would get excited, call for Lloyd and start to assume that I was interrupting him from getting some telegraph messages. These hallucinatory attacks lasted a very short time. After they had been present for about one month, they gradually grew less. Early in February he had one about every third to fourth day and none occurred in the latter part of February before his removal from jail to his home. Since that time, I have had no access to him and do not know his further history. Court proceedings have been dropped.

A reading of the above history will give anyone a clue to classification, even though one would differ somewhat in the label attached. B. can be variously grouped as an hysterical dissociation, an amnesia, or as a dual personality. None of them are satisfactory. He is still I. S. B., it is true, but it is not only an I. S. B. of years ago, but an I. S. B. that never actually existed, living as he does only a single day of his life. He is acting a scene of his life.

But it is rather a circumscribed period of his life. The environment and the experiences attached are very simple. He is a railroad telegrapher. He is at his office. He telegraphs to his superintendent or receives train messages. He calls in his assistant for help. There are no other situations. He is aware of the necessity of other attachments, but he has detached his personal life from them. His family are, therefore, away from him. He wishes he could be near his wife and child. He wishes he could have some of his family with him, but they are not an active part of his present life. There could have been no period of his life exactly like the one he is enacting at present. Dispositional changes reveal also that he is acting something which is not his real personality. His voice has taken on a high-pitched, querulous note unlike the voice which he formerly had. His gait has become cramped and stiff. His steps are small. His knees never bend. His back is stooped forward. His hands are clenched. His head is stretched forward. And walking is accompanied by a gross trembling which is unrhythmical and shows on the face of it its functional nature. In other words, his attitude, his gestures and his facial expression are abnormal. They are like those often noted in hystericals. He is suggestible, but only to an extent which does not come into conflict with the part he is enacting. I am frequently one of his old acquaintances. I am not always the same one. I remain such as long as an interview lasts. My next visit to him requires a renewed acquaintance. He retains no experiences from day to day; that is, he blots out all memories of the life he is living at present. Suggestions, therefore, cannot live with him either. In any single interview, as long as I am content to act the part of some former acquaintance of his in this circumscribed environment in which he assumes to live, a well-ordered, quiet conversation ensues. Any attempts of doubt of the place and time he gives to his life are met with protest—vehement protest—accompanied at times with great excitement. He beats the table with the outer side of his clenched hand. He raises his voice and shouts: "I am I. S. B., I am in my office. I am sending messages." Physiological responses to his present situation are lacking. His skin anesthesia is complete. He is apparently deaf to his surroundings. This is definitely, however, of a functional character. He hears perfectly any one addressing him, but he

never entertains in consciousness two voices. No conversation, therefore, can be carried on by two persons with him at the same time. He is deaf to all noises and sounds of his environment. Gongs, tuning forks, and a Galton whistle were all futile in experimenting with him. He is deaf to everything which has no seeming relationship to this episode of his life which he is acting out. He carries out consistently his part of being mentally away from the present, both in time and place. He is blind also. This blindness is acted out by the obsession that he cannot see and cannot even open his eyes to see by reason of the fact that they are nailed shut. And they cannot be opened either, because the only man that can open them, a physician whom he formerly knew, lives miles away and is inaccessible. He refused to come. There is no one to go and get him. He cannot go to him either. He must wait patiently until some time when this physician can leave. It is not merely a lapsed memory. He differs from the real person who existed in 1900. He has blotted out every memory, everything of the present and the past, back to the period where he was content, ambitious and had his self-respect. This amnesia is a dissociated state seemingly. The repression of his entire life back to 1900 is accompanied apparently by interference with normal motor and sensory responses, and an independent automatic personality exists antagonistic to suggestion. The blocking of his mind in this way is indicative of a prolonged conflict in his mind between the two I. S. B.'s which actually existed together for many years. The one bent upon financial success, allowing nothing to thwart his purpose. The other, a simple, religious I. S. B., overcompensating for the obliquities of his other self. The struggle ended with the disclosure of his actions. Relief came with a monoideism—all ideas, all functions which had to do with his conflicts in life, with his experiences in life, became dissociated, carrying along with them all of his experiences back to 1900. In other words, a total amnesia occurred. We may assume that a certain type of wish fulfillment was present for a long time—the wish to be back again to his peaceful days and the knowledge that the life he was leading could not go on forever and that some day disclosure would come. He had an emotional repression, therefore, which helped when the dénoue-

ment came to bring on the present personality, which not only knows nothing of the real I. S. B. of later days, but more particularly nothing of the shame or self-reproach or of the disgrace.

The persistent desire of escape from an intolerable position became so organized mentally that it finally succeeded in blotting out 18 years of this man's life and carried with it all associations which dealt in any way with other memories except the few we have indicated above, which deal with his life as a telegrapher at the railroad office.

It has long been recognized that the dissociation of a set of experiences, whose principle setting is one of emotion, may involve, also, many other experiences in life and on the physiological side certain functions which have apparently no correlation, such as sensation, producing in this way a complete amnesia. There has resulted in this case more than an amnesia, however. For I. S. B. has resurrected the remaining memories of only one day of his life. He is continually living over the conserved experiences of that one day alone. It is always February, 1900, snowing, very cold. He is sending messages, his assistant being with him. This neurogram from his subconscious life, to use Prince's apt designation, offered to him an opportunity of escape from present conditions and he is utilizing it subconsciously. Hypnosis was impossible. Narcosis under chloroform was negative, inasmuch as he simply went to sleep under it and emerged without revealing any other memories. In addition to this, however, a definite obsession obtrudes itself, that of his shut eyes. We have here a peculiar conversion phenomenon giving evidence of the existence in his subconscious life of the hurt and misery of his position. The actual memories are blotted out, but the emotional reaction exists, shall we say, subconsciously. It is present though he is not aware of it. It remains present. He cannot remove it. "The nails cannot be taken out. The only doctor who can do it cannot be made to come." He is inaccessible to him. But hope exists subconsciously that his intolerable situation will be ameliorated. Some day he will come, that is, some day I. S. B. will get relief and all will again be well with him.

With I. S. B. there is no loss of personal identity. The change in his personality is complete enough, however, to make him seem a different individual. There is, strictly speaking, however, no

new personality evolved. In any consideration of an actual dual personality, we should find that one personality is utilizing entirely different experiences and adjusting itself by proper responses to different situations than is the other part of the individual. This variation may only have occurred once in an individual's life or may be almost daily. Inasmuch, however, as I. S. B. has lost recognition of the present and of almost all his former life, he represents a person who never really existed. He is an I. S. B. with no apparent memory of the I. S. B. that actually existed for 18 years. There is retentiveness of associations for his experiences back to 1900. One can readily recall to him and get him to talk of his life before that. There is, however, no retentiveness of anything which occurs at the present. What he does one day is blotted out the next. What he hears one day is forgotten by him the next day; and what he hears must not deal with his environment. There is no real activated person existing, therefore, at present. He is not really a personality or a self. A real self must comprise a body and mind which is undergoing experiences, further which utilizes those experiences, which can adjust itself to the varying circumstances of its environment, and which develops from these experiences and interests in life adequate psychic responses, attaching value to them as well as evaluating them for others. Such does not exist with I. S. B. Though he is not a real personality, we feel justified in speaking of him as representing more than amnesia. There exists at the present time an I. S. B. who is different from any I. S. B. who ever actually lived before, who is apparently utilizing memories of one episode of his life and reacting to them day after day. They are the conserved experiences of his former vocation. What I understand by the subconscious state is merely that those memories and experiences which are conserved in an individual's mental life can again activate his conscious life in some way or other, *i. e.*, by hypnotism, in dreams or by a change of those emotional factors which may have produced their submergence. I need hardly say that we are deviating from the conception of consciousness as a state of awareness being the fundamental concept of mental life. Psychology to-day is taking more and more into account the value of experiences for themselves alone as well as in respect to their setting. Whenever, therefore, we have a disaggregation of personal

synthesis or, in other words, whenever the conscious life of an individual is broken up, so that only a portion of what is called our subconscious mind governs our activities, as is the case with I. S. B., we have no right to consider that the rest of his experienced life has been lost; for at some other period other experiences may be revived to influence and dominate his actions in the same way as does his telegraphy experiences carried out as of a day in February, 1900. May not, even admitting a dissociation from his present environment, his present surroundings produce some memory images which later on would be revived? Nor have we the right to assume that by considering his present life to be that of a subconscious state, it is separate and independent of his conscious mind. Strictly speaking, two or more personalities never exist together in the same person, but only various phases of the one personality. It has simply become split-up and our conception of dissociation is based upon this narrower view rather than by inferring mechanisms related to our primary instincts being involved unless we can with reasonable certainty have a basis for such a conclusion.

The psychological settings which we have interpreted in this way obviously ignore some of the factual evidence of the earlier part of my narrative and which render it necessary to take up the question of whether I. S. B. is a malingerer.

A defense reaction resulting in a neurosis may have as causative mechanisms the same drive of motives which produces malinger-ing. Both are dynamic reactions to disagreeable situations. An emotional experience always has a motor component to which we adjust ourselves consciously or unconsciously or fail to do so. The difference between malinger-ing and a neurosis lies therefore: firstly, in that from the psychopathologic side, the reactions which produce a neurosis are accepted as in accordance with our conceptions of its causation and are not regarded as intentional ones, and on the medico-legal side the existence of a neurosis is deemed simulation unless it can be proven that an individual is not conscious of the reactions compensating in this way for an intolerable situation; and secondly, since responsibility is an ethico-legal conception, it does not or must not enter into a medical viewpoint of mental mechanisms. Nevertheless, inasmuch as the law does not entirely accept our point of view and does not accept the

factor of instinctive trends as a motor drive conflicting with a volitional motive and we are required to answer inquiries according to its viewpoint, is there a method of approach which can reconcile legal and medical conceptions? Let us review the problem of I. S. B. from this dual standpoint:

1. We may assume as true that shame, remorse and despair were present in I. S. B. and also that these emotions represent the dynamic forces which may effect a disintegration of mind. When exposure came there was no outlet for his activities, his inborn strivings and trends reached an impasse, and a breakdown resulted.

2. We may also assume that there must have been a conscious realization of this ultimate end to his activities; in other words, an anticipatory fear may also be assumed. Reasoning fear may be productive of the same reactions as an unreasoning fear state.

3. A constant conflict must have existed in the effort to keep his emotions and fear from external expression.

4. This abnormal mental attitude terminated upon the day of his exposure, resulting in a fixation of his secret desire for peace of mind and the consequent production of an antero-retrograde amnesia.

5. The actuality of his memory loss is supported by the presence of (a) anesthesia of his entire body; (b) tremors; (c) contractions of his hands; (d) a spastic-like gait; (e) a bent back; (f) a loss of awareness of his surroundings; (g) a spasm of his eyelids, with a delusion that they are closed by nails hammered through his skull; (h) hallucinatory attacks and seizures of an abortive type consisting in his fictitious rabbits being eaten by snakes, his falling from his cot with a wierd yell, etc.

Taking up the same points from a legal standpoint, our formulation of them would be about as follows:

1. If he actually was doing wrong, the admission of the presence of remorse and despair does not imply that a mental state different from that of any law breaker exists.

2. Fear of the consequences of his acts may be accepted as being present without, however, solving the problem existing.

3. Mental conflicts and defensive mobilization of one's mental resources occur with normal persons also and are not acceptable as proof of an abnormal mind without further evidence.

4. There is apparently a loss of memory and a failure to register and consequently to remember present occurrences. Nevertheless, since crime is involved, this must be proven or disproven and not be merely an opinion based upon the behavior of I. S. B. His evasion of any associations which deal with words which involve his present situation, as hospital, corporation, suit, bank, indicates disagreeable memories rather than lost ones, his indifference to articles of dress which he could not have used at the time he supposes himself to live in, his request for an automobile and his signing his name to his discharge papers, indicate that he is aware of his present situation. No evidence is offered of any previous neurosis. There is nothing in his history which indicates any instability of his nervous system. The formation of a protective mechanism which was caused by the secondary instincts of self-respect being broken down and that of ambition being thwarted is admitted. No primary instincts, however, dealing with his innate trends and which were not under his control were involved. His problem, therefore, is not different from that of every criminal, for their antisocial activities may always be construed as antagonistic to those of normal human beings. In fact, one school of abnormal psychology regards all antisocial individuals to be unduly influenced by unconscious strivings. Accepting this standard whenever crime is involved would not be a good precedent. In the case of I. S. B., therefore, his amnesia must be proven at a different bar of judgment. This is admitted by your setting up of your fifth paragraph as corroboration of this amnesia being a reality. Let us briefly consider it.

5. The corroborative symptoms which are set forth may all be simulated. A variety of hearing which hears only one voice—and generally only the voice of one who has nothing to do either with his surroundings or with the environment in which I. S. B. supposes himself to live—appeals to us as deceit. The ability to withstand any betrayal of feeling from needle-pricks and other painful stimuli may be possible. It is easy to be hurt and not show it if one is put to the test. You cannot prove either that he is taken unawares when these tests were performed, inasmuch as your very presence serves to prepare him for such an ordeal, for I. S. B. is a highly intelligent man who has studied psychology and medical methods. The attacks likewise cannot be proven to

be hallucinatory any more than that they are fabricated. And in order to evade punishment, cannot one who was an evangelist and therefore accustomed to autohypnosis suggest to himself his present gait and tremors? He eats alone without trouble and only cries out about his eyes whenever he is asked about them. Does he really, therefore, never see and constantly have a delusion about his eyes?

In the above manner, we may assume, can two viewpoints based upon the same evidence be presented. Does it suffice for physicians to stand behind our present-day principles of mental mechanisms which being based upon many observations can be adduced as confirmatory of the first viewpoint? Can we ignore the possibility of another interpretation of the facts when the question of responsibility is interjected into the argument? This is like erecting a house of straw in order to knock it down; yet a legal point of view which entered into this case rendered necessary its being taken up from this double viewpoint.

We will admit, considering I. S. B. from either standpoint, that his symptoms are purposive in origin, but whether he is aware of them and has intentionally produced them is quite a different thing. If we premise the existence of a subconscious state, we imply that dynamic forces work in our minds which we have at the start volitionally brought into being, but which are later beyond our control. In asserting that there is a specific purpose back of all mental reactions we are not at liberty to conclude that such a deterministic assumption decides that these reactions later became fixed and automatic and therefore were not simulated but involuntary. We find in his desire to escape from shame and punishment, a specific reason for his state of mind and which he has no means of alteration under present circumstances. He has made a compromise in his choice of reactions which conflicts with his former ideals of life and which therefore brings into being the physical phenomena elicited. After they are once brought into being, only a removal of their cause, which implies a removal of the fear of punishment in order that his normal trends have an outlet, can effect a change. The causes are no longer consciously volitional because the factors which produced his state are no longer active except in his submerged self. Thus reasons the psychopathologist. But many crimes are undiscovered and many

criminals evade the consequences of their acts. Deathbed confessions are not uncommon and prove this assumption, and also very few criminals when their crimes are discovered have amnesia though they have convenient lapses of memory. And even the fact that such states do occur does not nullify the necessity of proving its presence in any given instance. That hysteria is a commonplace disease (if we may call it such) is the reason that many physicians are prone to be impatient of any criticism of its presence. But the mechanisms must lie close to the surface whenever, as does happen, the symptoms are caused to disappear in a few hours even if they had been present for months. Between "free-floating" inhibitions which a person is conscious of and which we style malingering and protective mechanisms resulting from a temporary failure at adjustment to some given situation, there lies no middle ground. They are the same.

I. S. B.'s mind was a highly suggestible one, inasmuch as otherwise he could not have been a spellbinder. And if hysterical amnesia is only a form of suggestion, as some regard it, it is but a little step further to assume that a person could continuously suggest such a state if we do not introduce any conception of subconsciousness into the argument. The validity of motivation must depend upon the valuation we place upon our ratiocinations. This is just as true of the physician as of his patient and this principle of psychology leads to various persons interpreting facts differently. Ideas should be based upon facts, but just as often what are supposedly facts are based upon ideas. The desire to avoid the consequences of his business dealings, acting subconsciously, cannot therefore be invoked to prove his symptoms are those of hysteria any more than malingering can be proven by asserting that this same desire is acting, but that he is aware of it.

Implanted deeply in every normal human being is a desire to go through life with self-esteem. When one loses this trend, if its loss is likewise accompanied by fear of the consequences of one's acts, the citadel of ambition falls and striving for honor and future success ceases. There is lost not only self-respect, but also the good opinion of others. Character is the foundation stone of personality. To defend ourselves from an impairment of our self-regarding instinct is strongly entrenched in us—so strongly, that to protect it a breaking up of mental forces may be produced

and a dissociated state of mind come on to save us from the hurt entailed through the loss of this instinct and its associations. The conservation of human forces implies a threefold trend to this dissociation; endocrine, physiological and psychic, as far as our medical researches can go.

It does not really matter, therefore, from a medical standpoint, whether hysteria or malingering is present, except that it raises the question of conscious or subconscious mechanisms at work, for both are abnormal reactions. Every neurologist has had to question himself in respect to this problem in handling cases of hysteria. This is the social aspect which should loom more largely in our minds. Good imitations of hysterical gaits and tremors occur, but the very imitation, if persisted in, is proof of abnormal mental reactions; for normal persons do not stoop to such procedures and could not malingering week after week without being caught up. If we assume that even to malingering requires an over-suggestibility, or autohypnosis, there only remains the question of consciousness of the state of mind present to be considered. Since we realize that one can be made conscious of even our subconscious memories by hypnotism or be influenced to break up the mental state which produces hysterical symptoms by suggestion, the connection between malingering and hysteria is even closer.

A detailed examination of our literature, in respect to amnesia, reveals that the viewpoint of the observer influences his conclusions rather than the evidence presented by patients themselves. Janet in his writings sketches for us fragmentary amnesia: Marcelline, for instance, has an hysterical memory loss merely because she is surprised at seeing him upon his second visit to her and asks the nurse who he is. He accepts her statement and considers this amnesia therefor. It is commonplace to read of an amnesia occurring after an accident without any proof being adduced except the individual's statement. It is not surprising, therefore, that often closer investigation reveals that there is order to escape thinking of it. Even in those complete memory lapses which go to make up dual personality cases, a perusal of the histories given us are unsatisfactory in this respect. Rev. Ansel Bourne could have, perhaps, acted as he did, voluntarily, in

order to escape intolerable home or pastoral surroundings and later when he decided to return to them and the opportunity was offered without loss of self-respect through hypnotism and William James, he took advantage of it. At least, the recorded account does not disprove such a possibility, except that our respect for James' opinion would not permit us to entertain such a view. Ch. W., whom I described 18 years ago, likewise, could have made up for me his "lost personality" as far as I had any proof at that time that he had been in a railroad accident and that 19 years later he awoke with a gap of that many years in his memory and commenced a new life. I mean as far as I proved the authenticity of his dual personality. This is true also of Charcot's Mme. D., the autopsychic amnesia described by Jones, the Lowell case of amnesia,—but I need not recall more of them to you. The good faith of the observer as well as of the observed person is involved. I do not doubt their honesty. I do not imply that these classical cases were fictitious, but merely that there is nothing in the recorded histories which prove their truth or with some other histories in medical literature which remove the possibility of autohypnosis on the part of the examiner as well as the patient. Lost personalities like Weir Mitchell's Miss Brown and Boris Sidis' Dr. Hanna are, however, definitely pathological types. So are the moods and simultaneously appearing other personality of Sally in Morton Prince's description of Miss Beauchamp.

In admitting, as some do, that hysterical inhibitions, especially at the lower levels of sensory and motor response, are practically of similar origin as are volitional inhibitions of any kind except in a greater degree of suggestibility, we are perilously near the lay mind's opinion of hysteria being something "put on" for the occasion. This can be sidestepped as some neurologists did in their army service by looking upon their problem as being one of getting the soldier back to the front. Whether malingerer or hysteric did not matter much if they secured by sublimization and rationalization a new initiative in the soldier and thereby effecting a "cure," which meant sending the soldier back to the front. It is, perhaps, for this reason that they regarded the neuroses of war as something different from those of peace and yet in their

analyses utilize the same basic principles of causation as are understood to be at work in the peace neuroses. The settings or *Erlebnisse* are, of course, various, but there are no differences in the mechanisms at work. Physicians are occupied, of course, as a rule, with eliciting symptoms and ignore any interpretation of the motive which may be responsible for them, though the word "morale" has become a favorite among the army neuropsychiatrists. The same conclusion I repeat again governs my point of view concerning malingering in contrast to hysteria, both being nonsocial, dynamic and dealing with submerged memories which influence the reactions of the individual. The difference lies in whether unreasoning and instinctive trends are at play as well as conative processes.

The problem of responsibility does not enter therefore into the interpretation of results, or of cause in respect to the psychoneuroses, as a rule. When it does, it is a problem which is not as easily solved as some assert. Mental mechanisms must be studied independently of this question, but nevertheless I believe I have shown that whenever deceit is premised, the influence of the factor of guilt and the evasion of punishment as a "conscious" protective mechanism must be entertained. I would recall to those who contend that malingering and hysteria can always be distinguished, the words of Babinski that intentional deception and unintentional simulation are often indistinguishable.

In dealing with intentional acts of dissimulation, we realize that our conclusions are based upon the accumulated experiences of many observations and not to accurate criteria based upon the evidence of a single case. Our bias is predetermined for us to a certain extent. Our own psyche is a history as much as is the patient's mind and the lay observer cannot enter into our experiences which make us distinguish hysteria or malingering and therefore he is unable to visualize the thought processes which have formulated our viewpoint. This does not negative the necessity for our opinions being based upon evidence which is irrefutable, concrete and factual if it is possible to have it so. This "if" looms large whenever we bring into our opinion conceptions of the unconscious strivings of a person. For our conscious motivations are always secondary to more deeply

implanted trends which often decide for us our tendencies in life. Viewed in this way, I. S. B. had working in him forces he could not control, which broke through his protective covering of "religiosity" and which deeper trend—when its protective mechanism was uncovered through exposure of the crime his true self brought him to,—again was covered over by a complete stoppage of his conscious activities and the formation of a dissociated state. The factor of exposure and consequent punishment is therefore not the beginning but the last phase of trends which had their origin far back and whose repression produced motor-laden emotions which were "carried over" into the physical phenomena described above. Here, however, cerebral physiology and abnormal psychology still speak different languages and therefore permit the erection of a controversial contra-opinion such as has been outlined above.

The questions which I have considered and which I will conclude with are:

1. The necessity for a realization that terms like amnesia, dissociation and dual personality are merely descriptive and not diagnostic.
2. The delving into psychogenetic mechanisms is commendable, but the evidence of the existence of a specific mechanism does not prove that it is the determining influence in a given patient.
3. Defence reactions and protective mechanisms are too often accepted as diagnostic explanations which they are not.
4. The instinctive trends and their unconscious reaction upon conscious motivations have not as yet explained the psychoneuroses.
5. Malingering and amnesia are essentially similar in their protective mechanism, but different in their physiological response to situational influences.
6. A closer study of emotional upheavals in respect to their connection and correlation with physiological responses, as well as instinctive trends is necessary in order to interpret behavior-patterns, such as are outlined in the history of I. S. B.