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In recent years, there has been a coverup of J. L. Moreno's early theory of the Godhead in the literature and practice of psychodrama. This is a summary of a theology of psychodrama based on the writings of Moreno. As a therapeutic procedure, psychodrama is considered in light of a paradoxical relationship between humanity and divinity. Specifically psychodrama is interpreted as the resolution of a person's wish to be God with a realization of being human. The dynamic separation and connection between an individual and cosmic universe is explored in relationship to the psychodramatic theory of child development, role reversal, and surpleness. Attention is focused around Moreno's notions of the Godhead, the marriage of science and religion, and experimental theology. Various religious and philosophical personalities have influenced Moreno's pragmatic theology of psychodrama. The present psychodrama profession is apparently separated from its own theological origins.

"I try to give them the courage to dream again. I teach the people to be God" (J. L. Moreno, 1946, p. 6).

J. L. Moreno introduced psychodrama with the intention of enlightening people regarding their shared divinity. Perhaps no idea of Moreno's philosophy is as misunderstood and controversial as his writing on the Godhead. The present literature and practice of psychodrama hardly mentions it. What follows is a review of Moreno's early theological constructs in the hopes of reviving an interest in psychodrama's original dream.
This essay summarizes a theology of psychodrama based on Moreno’s pronouncements about the Godhead and his seminal ideas of the marriage between science and religion, and experimental theology. It is a theology of the paradoxical separation and connection between humanity and divinity. According to this theology, the ambitious aim of psychodrama is to reconnect a person with God. Psychodrama was Moreno’s way to reunite mortals momentarily with an eternal world of all-spontaneity. It is a method for people who have fallen from their dreams. Each fall affirms their separation from God, and their mortality from their immortality. Through a therapeutic procedure, psychodrama picks up fallen angels and points them towards the realization of hopes and desires.

As a young child, Moreno enacted the first psychodrama with his playmates by taking the role of God. He sat on a throne atop chairs and a table while his angels scurried around him. At that moment he wanted to fly and so surged off his throne. He discovered that the role was indeed a fantasy because he crashed to the ground and broke his arm. He got up from the fall and kept trying to put his dream into action. In spite of the fall, Moreno never stopped believing he could be God.

I recall that I was brought to a gypsy healer to treat the broken arm and the great effect it had upon myself, my belief that I am a special case, that I am God and that God permitted me to play God and also that the one who plays God is punished for his daring. It was as if I had become a “fallen” God. The experience has never left me and has saved my life up to now. . . . How to embody God, to give him a tangible reality was my question and still is. (Moreno, 1972, pp. 206-207, 205)

This incident crystallized Moreno’s notion of psychodrama as an attempt to reconcile the fantasy of being God with the reality of being human.

Moreno was enacting a “normal megalomania” while playing the role of God. He was the powerful center of his universe. According to his theory of child development (Moreno & Moreno, 1944), the infant inhabits a universe which is indistinct from the self. Fused with this first universe, the child is the megalomaniac of it. Early in infant development there is a break from this universe and the infant discovers that what he or she perceives as his universe (fantasy) is not exactly what others perceive (reality). Through the course of development, however, Moreno asserts that the child tries to make a bridge between fantasy and reality by realizing fantasies. The supreme fantasy, which is the hardest to realize, is the role of God, the creator universe. According to Moreno,

All the other roles revolve around this core, and all other roles are subordinated to it. . . . With a rather sophisticated phrase Moreno described the child as “Megalomania ‘Normalis’—Dosim Repetant.” Thus, using previous training as a medical doctor, Moreno diagnosed the child’s role as megalomaniac and then stated that the prescription to resolve this inner core of the first role is to repeat it. (Bishof, 1970, p. 22)

In short, the role of God is embodied in the infant, lost from through learning how to take another’s perspective, and regained by the as a central guiding dream.

This theology of psychodrama is characterized by a longing to the paradise of infant megalomania. The playful paradise of in which spontaneity is abundantly accessible was certain idée de Moreno. He thought of this realm as “a sort of primordial which is immortal and returns afresh with every generation; universe which contains all beings and in which all events are [He] liked that realm and did not plan to leave it ever” (M 1955, p. 10).

Separation from this paradise was comparable to hell, or cosmology, according to Moreno. Anxiety “is provoked by a cosmic to maintain identity with the entire universe” (Moreno, 1956, ). The identification of person with entire universe is complete in first universe of infancy. But as that universe is broken and individual ego differentiates itself from it, the ego finds itself in a situation with an unfamiliar second universe. The ego discovers its solitude alienation from a prefabricated world which the individual had in constructing. The ego’s stagnant response is withdrawal and separation from that world. “The effort to escape from the con world appears like an attempt to return to paradise lost, the for verse of man, which has been substituted step by step . . . by the universe in which we live today” (Moreno, 1939, p. 14).

The process of reclaiming this alien universe is accomplished through an engaging reversal of roles. In describing the development of his son Jonathan, Moreno writes that by role reversal, his child now returns the whole cosmos unto himself and re-gains the ‘paradise lost’ ” (1956, p. 162). This is the model for Moreno’s original an aversive vision of a role reversal with God. The role reversal will aims to reincarnate, for the moment, omnipotent creativity and spontaneity in a person. It is a reintegration of a person into the universe of megalomaniac paradise.
In order to reverse roles with God, a person must first recognize his or her separateness from God. This follows Zerka Moreno’s (1975) developmental stages of childhood. “The child is not able to role-reverse with significant others until he recognizes his separateness. He cannot yield what he does not own” (p. 57). Although there is a degree of connectedness inherent in reversing roles, the connection cannot be experienced fully without a prior understanding of the separation. The very fact that a person is not God makes the role reversal with God meaningful. A sense of self, of unique I, is necessary before a reversal with God can be completed. Likewise, God has a certain unique identity. According to Moreno (1947, pp. 186-187), “it is a different kind of subjectivity from that of man.”

Role reversal with God is a momentous communion of the individual with the universe, but it does not last. The communion and all that it recalls of childhood is a reminder of the interconnection between humanity and a cosmic network. Without this effort of encounter, this warming up to spontaneity, there is a sharp separation between the individual and the supreme creator God. There is the reminder of mortality, fallen angels, and impossible dreams. There is a longing for a paradise lost. There is social isolation and cosmic alienation.

The Godhead

The Godhead is Moreno’s way of representing the source of creativity within a cosmic framework. He wrote extensively about the Godhead in Das testament des woters, which was published anonymously in 1920, translated by its author into The words of the father in 1941, and revised into The psychodrama of God, a new hypothesis of the self in 1947. Power (1975) and Simmons (1982) have written discourses on J. L. Moreno’s theology of the Godhead.

Moreno makes it clear that the Godhead is a changing concept for a permanent universal law. Each person has a version of the Godhead. Each culture and era has its own version. “No construction of the Godhead can be final and each new moment may require a new construction” (Moreno, 1947, p. 191). And yet, Moreno asserts that his version of the Godhead as total spontaneity and total creativity is “the highest and most universal Godhead of all... [because] in Him none of the individual and national Gods—no particle of them—is lost” (1947, p. 314). “We can say with greater certainty than ever that the supreme power ruling the world is spontaneity and creativity” (Moreno, 1956, p. 117).

Here is a contradiction familiar to theology. On the one hand, there are many ways to express God. On the other hand, only one way, Moreno’s way, is the most appropriate expression. Moreno believed during that moment of history in which he wrote, the Creator God was indeed the most adequate explanation of the universe. The interaction and connection between people and God at that moment clarifies the reason why Moreno idealized one particular Godhead: several other versions.

The evolution of the Godhead describes a progression from a God to a close God. According to Moreno (1947, 1972), three stages in this evolution are the He-God, the Thou-God, and the I-God. Yahweh, distant third-person God of power and wisdom in the Old Testament, was the creator of the universe who was separated from the human person from the creation on earth. Only occasionally did Yahweh engage the earthly world. The physical distance of this third-person He-God to the children of Israel provided an external locus of protection: Hebrew nation struggling for survival (Moreno, 1972).

In the New Testament, Jesus Christ, man of love and goodness, a God who could be addressed directly as Thou. To Moreno, as a living God embodied in a human, whereas Yahweh was a God separated from humanity in the heavens. The personalization of God provided the hope of fellowship and community in a world of enemies (Moreno, 1972). Thou-God symbolized a tight connection shared between people and their deity.

The locus of creativity resided on earth in the Godhead of the Testament. But for Moreno it was still one-person-removed from individual. Moreno claimed to initiate the third stage of evolution in the publication of the I-God in a testament authored anonymously (1920). “Everyone can portray his version of God through his own actions and so communicate his own version to others. That was the simple meaning of my first book, in which I proclaimed the ‘I’” (Moreno & Moreno, 1969, p. 21).

In his own version of the Old Testament, Moreno used the person “I” as the mouthpiece for God in The words of the father. He published it without claiming authorship. In Moreno’s view, all past and yet to come had created the “Words”; all were responses to these words, hence personal authorship would have been (Moreno, 1972). The book was an invitation to an encounter with the saving source of creativity: the “I” (Power, 1975). In effect, Moreno had to repeat, “I am God, the Creator.” The result is that are theoretically a million gods. Unfortunately, the book has been interpreted as empty pathological megalomania. “None of my invocations and pronouncements,” writes Moreno (1969, p. 21). "
been more severely criticized, misunderstood and ridiculed, than the idea that I proclaimed myself as God."

Not only is "I" a living creator in each individual, but it is also a cosmic God of creativity which each individual shares. "It is the I-God with whom we are all connected. It is the I which becomes the We" (Moreno & Moreno, 1969, p. 21). It is a Godhead which makes every person uniquely responsible for whatever is created, and which connects each person with the common principle of creativity and spontaneity that rules the universe. At one moment a person is close to the Godhead when that person has warmed up to the common link of spontaneity and is on the verge of creating a new part of his or her surrounding world. At another moment a person is far from the Godhead when that person is socially isolated from all other "I's" and surrounded by an alien world created completely by strangers.

Moreno’s God is spontaneity. Hence the commandment on the frontispiece of The words of the father (Moreno, 1941) is, "Be spontaneous!" This also means, "Be responsible for creating a world around you! Be aware that you share the universe with a million creative Gods."

Why retain the theological vocabulary in psychodrama? Why not relegate the Godhead to "the dark corners of library shelves" (Moreno, 1955, p. 8)? Because a recognition of the solid separation between I and God is a prerequisite for the union of I and God. The Godhead provides that clear vision of something more than "I."

The Marriage of Science and Religion

Moreno’s intellectual model group

In an interview late in Moreno’s lifetime (Sacks, 1971), he said that those who had had the greatest influence on his psychodramatic concepts were people with religious and philosophical personalities. Since the age of five, he had been brought up through the study of the Old Testament in his Sephardic Jewish family. As a result, he developed an early interest in the cosmos, which set the stage for all his successive work in psychodrama.

The experiences which I had I tried to put into words in a book which has become known as Das Testament des Vaters (1920) in which the idea of the I-Creator and the principles of creativity were proclaimed as the first principles of the universe. All that I know about these elusive things and all I have done on an experimental level since stems from these days leading up to the composition of the book. (Moreno, 1953, p. 391)

According to Moreno (1972), Das testament des vaters literally exploded from him in a fit of religious ecstasy. He recalls how he rushed to the top of a castle tower and scribbled for hours on the walls very seemingly to come from outside himself. A long warming up proceeded that spontaneous moment of creativity. Moreno’s theo psychodrama then was a gradual warm up to the prevailing attit the times.

Several memorable events during Moreno’s childhood and adulthood in Vienna between 1894 and 1920 are reported succinctly in his Preludes to my autobiography (1955). In it he describes the birth of the idea to create a marriage between science and religion. At that time science was considered a profession of facts and so-called as opposed to religion which was considered exclusively a profession of fanaticism and romance. A network of historical and contemporary thinkers, writers, and artists debated the relative merits of science and the surrounding Moreno at the turn of the century. These philosophical personalities formed a model of intellectual debate. Out of this spade of ideas blossomed Moreno’s theology of psychodrama in Das testament des vaters (1920).

The Jewish prophets had a tremendous influence on Moreno. They had encountered the distant Godhead directly in the course drama of everyday living. They made themselves the mouthpieces of Godhead. Moreno understood the Old Testament as a psychodrama in which the children of Israel held an ongoing dialogue with Creator, Jesus and Buddha also left lasting impressions on them particularly in their messages of fellowship and love. The spontaneity nature of Jesus’s Sermon on the Mount was a prime example of living roles with the Godhead. The history of the prophets as religious and social outcasts, never trusted but always vindicated in the end, n a consolation to the present psychodrama community struggling voice in a medically and technologically oriented society.

The religious character of psychodrama is well illustrated by the.

Moreno contrasts psychodrama with the ideas of Marx and I. "The one thing in common between Marxism and psychoanalysis, writes Moreno (1955, pp. 6-7), "was that they both rejected religion. To them, the church represented a conservative institution that quizzled the masses in the name of a delusional father-God. Moreno would have agreed with their critique of religion as an instrument, which church dogma and ritual chokes off spontaneity from its mated devotees, and in which the father-God of the Bible is a distant projection of one’s omnipotent and omnipresence theology. Moreno offered was “just as much in contradiction an position to the official religions as it was to the agnostic, psychoanalytic political doctrines of the times” (Moreno, 1955, p. 8). But
eno never extended his critique of institutional religion to a rejection of all things spiritual, as did Marx and Freud. Instead, he took a position opposite to both, the side of “positive religion,” in which the concept of God was a fantastic reality, rather than an unrealistic fantasy.

[His] contention was that religion should be tried again, a religion of a new sort, its inspirations modified and its techniques improved by the insights which science has given us... and by no means excluding some of the insights which Marxism and psychoanalysis have brought forth. (Moreno, 1955, pp. 6-7)

For Moreno (1969), the valuable contribution of Marx was the socio-dynamic person. This view of the person as primarily a social being bound in a network of relationships is the basis for Moreno’s concept of the social atom. In addition, Moreno’s crusade against the depersonalizing effect of the industrial society was to praise human creativity, just as Marx’s struggle against capitalism was an effort to bolster human productivity. Marx and Moreno maintained that alienation (entfremdung) was the modern malaise of technological growth. Marx argued that this alienation from the various parts of production and from fellow workers was at the root of the person’s inability to organize resistance. Moreno used this notion of social isolation as the primary condition for a total lack of spontaneity and creativity. A cooperative community was their common solution for restoring the dignity and creativity of individuals.

The valuable contribution of Freud to Moreno’s theology was the concept of the psychodynamic person. Psychoanalysis validated a rich and highly influential fantasy life in every individual. Mind, rather than social intercourse, was viewed as the seething mass underlying personality. Conscious and unconscious perceptions, dreams, and illusions are the building blocks of psychodrama.

Moreno’s position of positive religion offered a third dimension of personality: the cosmodynamic person (Moreno & Moreno, 1969). The cosmodynamic person participates not only in an interspsych social dialogue and an intrapsychic psychodramatic dialogue, but also in an extrapsychological dialogue with the Godhead, the universal principle of spontaneity and creativity. The particular dynamics of a person interconnected with the cosmos revolve around the universal questions of birth and death, creation and extinction. Moreno asserts that this third dimension of humanity is particularly appropriate to the present era in which birth control, abortion rights, genetic engineering, and the threat of a nuclear holocaust calls immediate attention to the daily realities of birth and death on an individual and collective level.
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Moreno grouped Marxism and Freudianism as philosophies of economic and psychological determinism, respectively. On the site of philosophical perspective, he posed Henri Bergson’s étan évolutionism which was a “total denial of determinism” (Moreno, 19103). Moreno’s spontaneity-creativity hypothesis was conceived intermediary philosophy (Moreno, 1946). Creativity is not the dependent derivative of social and psychological factors. Not magical force completely independent of human control. It is woven with socioeconomic and psyche in a cyclical process of up, spontaneity, creativity, and cultural conservation.

For Moreno, psychodrama was the living antithesis of psychosis for pulling the patient off the couch and onto the stage (1971), and for taking the analyst out of his priestly confessional and into the semidormant in a face-to-face encounter in the group. Morenoobj ected to the psychoanalytic theory that hero-geniuses “are all mental patients... or at least touched by insanity” (Moreno, 1955, p. 11). He proposed the theory that persons with all the signs of paranoia and megalomania, exhibitionism and maladjustment can still be fairly well controlled and healthy, may show greater productivity by acting their symptoms rather than constraining and resolving these symptoms. The on to get rid of the “God-syndrome” is to act it out (Moreno, 1955) psychoanalysis’s rejection of religion, “it remained for psychodrama to take the God-act seriously and to translate it into valid thea r terms” (Moreno, 1946, p. 8).

In the theology of psychodrama, the I-God encounter enacted role reversal with the Godhead represents one’s relationship with cosmos. Spinoza, Kierkegaard, and Sartre had a specific impact on the way Moreno conceptualized this encounter. According to M. (1947), Spinoza was the greatest modern agent in driving God from earth. Spinoza intellectualized God and set God at such a distance from human experience that an encounter was unrealistic. He gained a logical understanding of God, but he lost the sense of God’s growth and existence. On the other hand, Moreno consi
that Kierkegaard brought God too close to a person's subjective experience, again making an encounter impossible (Sacks, 1971). Kierkegaard's self-absorbed faith bottled up the potential for connecting with anything outside of the self. Moreno clustered Kierkegaard and the atheistic Sartre as two monological existentialists whom he stepped beyond by proposing a dialogical existentialism comparable to the improvised dialogues of Socrates. Monological existentialism views the individual as essentially alone. Dialogical existentialism views the individual as essentially connected in a relationship.

In addition to the prophets and the philosophers in Moreno's intellectual model group, there were also the expressive artists, notably Shakespeare, Beethoven, Goethe, and Nietzsche. Moreno weaves Hamlet, Othello, "Ode to Joy," Faust, and Zarathustra throughout his writings as examples of creative genius. Beethoven's home of Baden was a neighboring town which Moreno visited. The influence of Nietzsche was profound (J. D. Moreno, 1977). Moreno used Zarathustra as the central character in the first public psychodrama (Moreno, 1946). Zarathustra's adventures as the prophet descending into the masses to announce the death of God and the birth of the Overman is an allegory for Moreno's prophetic testament of the new Godhead, the I-God. These playwrights, poets, and musicians were masters of creative expression, not just creative thought. Thoughts are not enough for psychodrama. Putting brilliant ideas into action and making dreams come true is at the heart of creative genius.

These prophets, philosophers, and artists warmed Moreno up to the moment when the core theology of psychodrama burst out of him and onto the castle walls in red print. From this historically significant catharsis sprang the new perception that cosmology in theory is nothing, and cosmology in action is everything. A living theology provides the framework for a marriage of science and religion.

Science without religion

Moreno introduced psychodrama into a rapidly automated culture in which every advance in technology was reciprocated by an increase in depersonalization. Machines became objects of devotion because of their efficiency, predictability, and aura of perfection. Technological idolatry was the new science without religion. Time magazine's popular choice of the computer as its 1982 "Man of the Year" acknowledged the age of the robot. The value of finished products was overshadowing the value of the creative labor that went into the design and production of these holy machines. Moreno predicted that people would turn into robots themselves if they continued to let their lives be shaped by robots. He called this automated species of humanity "zoomat" and he held them responsible for the disappearance of the Creator.

It was not God who was guilty. Man was the guilty one—man and world which he had placed between himself and God. This view of "world" is the source of the modern separation of man from his God (Moreno, 1947, p. 199).

By themselves, machines and computers represent a total lack of creativity. Their superabundant creativity is monotonous. They play the same thing over and over again. According to Moreno, they are an intervening factor to become truly creative. That factor is human spontaneity.

We build up the conserves and try to make them look like idols. I see ghosts of Plato and Aristotle coming back. It makes creativity look at and makes a puppet out of God. Not! Not! Aristotle and Plato have idols; the conserves like hundreds of the philosophers [and scientists] western civilization... Cultural conserves are like a sleepy beauty—they need a prince charming to awaken them. (Moreno, 1947, pp. 27, 31)

Machines have amounted to "the illusion of the finished perfect product whose assumed perfectibility was an excuse for excellence to taking its past, for preferring one phenomenon to its whole real (Moreno, 1946, p. 33). Moreno tried to reintroduce the creative aspect of the machines, thereby uniting the cultural conserves with the process of creativity and spontaneity. Rather than smash the idols, he thought Moses in the Bible, or withdraw from them as an ivory-towerer. Moreno tried to breathe new life into the idols by reconnecting them with their creator.

Another form of science without religion is egotistical idol: Moreno's I-God concept is not simply grandiose narcissism, as critics suggest (Power, 1975). The individual who cannot see beyond himself is just as alienated from the source of creativity as a robot.

Ethnocentrism is egotistical idolatry on a collective level. Writing prayers for Christians, Jews, Buddhists, Negroes, Communists, Nazis, Americans, pagans, and children, Moreno couches The Psychodrama of God (1947) with universal prayers. The purpose of Moreno's "Prayers of Specific Groups" in this book is to affirm cultural diversity and at the same time to reconnect warring groups to their common Creator. The same section begins with individual pra
in order to affirm the integrity of the single “I” before moving to ethnic, national, and universal identity. This affirmation is not to be confused with egotistic or ethnocentric idolatry. Each individual is unique. Each ethnic group is unique. But no individual is the center of the universe, and no ethnic group is the center of the universe. There is, according to Moreno, something more.

Finally, secular humanism is ethnocentrism and egotistical idolatry on a grandiose scale. It is anthropocentric idolatry. Moreno tried to show that there is more to the universe than humanity. There are animals, vegetables, minerals, molecules—a whole cosmos. The space shuttle mission can validate the expanse of the universe. Herein lies the clue of Moreno’s theological vocabulary. It persuades the individual to come out of himself or herself and reverse roles with other parts of the cosmic network, which includes other people, other cultures, and other parts of the ecosystem. Ultimately, the individual can reverse roles with all-spontaneity and all-creativity as the person did once before unconsciously in the first universe of infancy.

The theological language of I-God and Godhead preserves the separateness of the cosmos and the individual. Moreno retained an open alliance with his controversial theology in his final publications (1972). Why did he do this? Why not secularize his language into a humanistic doctrine as did Marx and Freud, and completely dissociate himself from one of the most conservative institutions of the time, the church? Because he had to preserve the paradox of the human condition as he saw it: one’s wish to be God and one’s alienation from the divine; the fantasy of omnipotence and the need to face reality (Sacks, 1971). By affirming the separate identities of I and God, he affirms the hope of their communion. Denying an identity to God brings an egocentric focus around a lonely isolated humanity, and covers up the ultimate cosmic paradox which psychodrama dares to resolve.

Creativity and spontaneity are not simply human traits, according to Moreno. They are cosmic principles. The current literature on psychodrama translates its classical theology of the Godhead into a secular, scientific language which conceals the split between humanity and the source of creativity. Has the psychodrama profession lost sight of its own cosmological genesis and idolized the techniques and directors of psychodrama? Psychodrama was meant to be more than a science of techniques and a cult following charismatic professionals.

Religion without science

In a world constantly changing, religion without science quickly turns into conservative dogmatism and mass delusions that do not ade-
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quately account for the changing facts of everyday living. Why McChesney chose the theater instead of founding a religious sect, join a monastery, or developing a detailed system of theology is important: an understanding of his marriage of science and religion in psycho-drama. Indeed, before 1918, he had organized a religious group with a friend of his youth, Chaim Kellner (Moreno, 1955), and roamed streets of Vienna with several bearded men, telling stories to chi and living a life of poverty. But his kabbalistic sect was short-lived.

As for joining a monastery, Moreno considered himself “a fig saint, not a recluse” (1955).

There is a profound difference between the theoretics of religiosity, sainthood, and altruism. St. John, St. Augustine, Plato, Plutini, Spinoza, Kant, Hegel, and Sorokin, and the experimenters, produce and practitioners of religion and sainthood. Experimenters like Jesuit Buddha, St. Francis, Baal Schem, and less luminaries as Tibetan Tsongkhapa and Savonarola, and Pascal often look inadequate, imperfect, overbearingly eccentric, ebullient, stupid, even pathological, but they are trying to li a life of truth and prefer an imperfect existence to a perfect theo (Moreno, 1956, p. 134)

After introducing the Creator-Godhead (Moreno, 1920), he felt next step is the realization and concretization of the idea in the rather than its further intellectual extension” (1955, p. 8). McChesney brought his religious ideas to the arena of play and spontaneous action. He chose the therapeutic theater because, in his view, theater was the greatest effort of man to train and express his imagination in act (Sacks, 1971). Moreno wanted to extend his theology out of the world and into the drama of everyday living. This drama provides a testing ground for a science of human and cosmological relations.

Experimental theology

Moreno created the first psychodrama stage as a laboratory for ing. It was an active forum for what he called experimental theology: “The canon of creationism is the basis upon which theology can develop experimental procedures” (Moreno, 1947, p. 196). The theater of spontaneity was an improvisational laboratory, not a stage for sc free, refined character actors, and repeat performances. Spontaneity provided that unknown, unpredictable dimension of everyday li so necessary for a laboratory simulation of life. The theater of spontaneity is a place where a person warms up to the universal process: spontaneity and creativity so that one may assume any number of at will, and appropriately meet an infinite number of expected and
expected situations. Role playing is child's play. It is a return to that enchanting universe of spontaneity. The psychodrama "is in our time the only modern invention adapted to people who live in a disrupted, technological world, which combines a religious and a scientific spirit in a unique group expression" (Moreno, 1956, p. 135).

The experimental procedure of psychodrama deals directly with the relationship between reality and fantasy. In doing so, it creates a marriage contract with scientific "facts" and religious "truths." In psychodrama,

There is a theater in which reality or being is proven through illusion... [a theater] which restores the original unity between the two metazones—through a process of humorous self-reflection; in the therapeutic theater reality and illusion are one. (Moreno, 1946, p. 31)

As a therapeutic procedure, psychodrama treats people who exclusively inhabit either the world of illusion or the world of reality, and who are consequently in need of bridging these two metazones in order to live a spontaneous and creative life.

Those who live completely in a world of fantasy are said to have a psychotic disorder with delusions of grandeur. These people believe they are the center and creator of the universe. In fact, they live in their own isolated worlds, and they have created very little outside of themselves. They are the gods, Jesus Christ, presidents, and rock stars that roam the back wards of psychiatric hospitals. Sometimes they are elected to political office or lead a religious cult. Moreno calls them spontaneous idiots (1953) because they have a minimal concern for what is socially appropriate and hence they do not respond effectively in the metareality zone. They are unable to co-create with other people. They turn instead to a rich fantasy world where their creativity is acceptable. The psychodramatic treatment of psychotics is to help them realize that they share the world with other gods around them, without letting them abandon their own dreams of omnipotence. These angels are flying high, but they are all alone. Psychodrama tries to reconnect them with the pain of their fall and with a world of fallen angels looking desperately for fellowship.

Those who live exclusively in a world of reality are said to have a neurotic disorder. They push themselves through endless work, seemingly in a hurry to finish something so that they can go on to something else. These people have abandoned their flights of fantasy after numerous discouraging falls. Perhaps while asleep they still have dreams or nightmares. But in their waking hours, they have sold out their dreams and settled for a mediocre world of reality. They have a lot of creativity but very little spontaneity. Moreno calls this person a creator without arms (1953, p. 39). Such a person makes a lot with other people, but seems like a redundant robot impotent when facing a most profound need for love. The psychodramatic treatment for neurotics is to help pick up these fallen angels and teach them to their winged arms, and teach them to reach for God again. These angels crawl through their routines like an insect, deeply resenting their inability to fly and love. Psychodrama is a way to reconnect them with something worthy of their love and greatness that is greater than themselves, and with a world of fallen angels just like themselves that is waiting to play God.

**Experimental theology**

Moreno created the first psychodrama stage as a laboratory setting. It was an active forum for what he called experimental theology: "The canon of creationism is the basis upon which theology evolved experimental procedures" (Moreno, 1947, p. 196). The role of spontaneity was an improvisational laboratory, not a stage for writers, refined character actors, and repeat performances. Spontaneity provided that unknown, unpredictable dimension of everyday life necessary for a laboratory simulation of life. The theater of reality is a place where a person warms up to the universal process of spontaneity and creativity so that one may assume any number of roles at will, and appropriately meet an infinite number of expected situations. Role playing is child's play. It is a return to the enchanting universe of spontaneity. The psychodrama "is in our time the only modern invention adapted to people who live in a disrupted technological world, which combines a religious and a scientific spirit in a unique group expression" (Moreno, 1956, p. 135).

The experimental procedure of psychodrama deals directly with the relationship between reality and fantasy. In doing so, it creates a marriage contract with scientific "facts" and religious "truths." In psychodrama,

There is a theater in which reality or being is proven through illusion... [a theater] which restores the original unity between the two metazones—through a process of humorous self-reflection; in the therapeutic theater reality and illusion are one. (Moreno, 1946, p. 31)

As a therapeutic procedure, psychodrama treats people who exclusively inhabit either the world of illusion or the world of reality, and who consequently in need of bridging these two metazones in order to live a spontaneous and creative life.
Those who live completely in a world of fantasy are said to have a psychotic disorder with delusions of grandeur. These people believe they are the center and creator of the universe. In fact, they live in their own isolated worlds, and they have created very little outside of themselves. They are the gods, Jesus Christs, presidents, and rock stars that roam the back wards of psychiatric hospitals. Sometimes they are elected to political office or lead a religious cult. Moreno calls them spontaneous idiots (1953) because they have a minimal concern for what is socially appropriate and hence they do not respond effectively in the metareality zone. They are unable to co-create with other people. They turn instead to a rich fantasy world where their creativity is acceptable. The psychodramatic treatment of psychotics is to help them realize that they share the world with other gods around them, without letting them abandon their own dreams of omnipotence. These angels are flying high, but they are all alone. Psychodrama tries to reconnect them with the pain of their fall and with a world of fallen angels looking desperately for fellowship.

Those who live exclusively in a world of reality are said to have a neurotic disorder. They push themselves through endless work, seemingly in a hurry to finish something so that they can go on to something else. These people have abandoned their flights of fantasy after numerous discouraging fails. Perhaps while asleep they still have dreams or nightmares. But in their waking hours, they have sold out their dreams and settled for a mediocre world of reality. They have a lot of creativity but very little spontaneity. Moreno calls this type of person a creator without arms (1953, p. 39). Such a person makes and does a lot with other people, but seems like a redundant robot who is impotent when facing a most profound need for love. The psychodramatic treatment for neurotics is to help pick up these fallen angels, show them their winged arms, and teach them to reach for the sky again. These angels crawl through their routines like an insect colony deeply resenting their inability to fly and love. Psychodrama tries to reconnect them with something worthy of their love and greater than themselves, and with a world of fallen angels just like themselves, who are dying to play God.

Pragmatic Theology

The practical scientist in Moreno brought him to the shores of pragmatic America in 1925 where business was booming and social science was blooming. It was in this country that Moreno translated the theology of the Godhead into the science of sociometry. Thirty-three years after Das testament des vaters (1920), he published his testament of human relations, Who shall survive? (1953). As a science extension of the Godhead, Moreno’s opus on sociometry proclaims that faith in something greater than self, namely human fellowship, the universal principle of creativity and spontaneity, is a matter of human survival. “One of the greatest dilemmas of man in our time, writes Moreno, “is that he has lost faith in a supreme being, and in any superior value system as a guide for conduct” (1966, p. 39).

The other side of Moreno’s theology of creation is his theology of destruction. In Who shall survive? (1953), Moreno prophesied two divergent species of humanity: the robot and the spontaneous creative person. His title asks which of the two will become extinct. He modifies his deterministic theory of natural selection and indicates that each person is responsible for the future of his species. He describes how an increase in spontaneity improves a person’s chances for surviving in adverse conditions. However, if people choose to act spontaneously, the species of creative human beings will become extinct, placed by a breed of automatons. The truly creative person is the only one who can survive in a world of robots or on a post-nuclear holocaust planet, but human species would survive to participate in it.

In the surplus reality of psychodrama, a person is set free from the fetters of facts and actualities, although not without its highest respect for them. And he has a good foundation to believe, as science has repeatedly taught us, that things are changing and can be changed, even conditions which seemed for millennia absolutely fixed [Psychodrama] is not a plea for the illusionism or escape from reality but, just the opposite: a plea for the creativity of man and the creativity of the universe. It is therefore, through man’s faith in the infinite creativity of the cosmos that what he embodies in a psychodramatic world may or may not actually become true. (Moreno, 1966, pp. 155–156)

Experimental theology on the psychodrama stage is a prelude of pragmatic theology in the drama of everyday living. “The true spirit of the therapeutic theater is the private home” (Moreno, 1946, p. 202). The pragmatic creed of psychodrama is that all dreams are meant to be put into action.

Faith in a Creator-God is unusual in a society that worships products rather than the process of creation. Moreno (1916, p. 30) wonders “why all the writings of man [about God], both affirming and negative, have neglected almost completely His attribute Creator.” People have conserved and idealized the finished product, including the image of a perfect God. And because of its prospec
status, mankind “forgot the status of creation itself, its silences, its deserts, its imperfections, its hopelessness, its inferiorities. . . . The work was finished and the creator seemed to be at an advantage compared with his various phases during evolution” (Moreno, 1946, pp. 32-33). Moreno wanted his Godhead to differ from the modern technological image of God as the abstract being of pure love and complete stability. These divine attributes focus on the status of God during the seventh day of creation, the day of rest. In contrast, Moreno imagined God as He was “in the beginning.” during the first six days of creation in the Bible. “There is another status of God, which even as a symbol has been neglected, that is the status of God before the Sabbath, from the moment of conception, during the process of creating and evolving the worlds and Himself” (Moreno, 1946, p. 32). The Creator-God is a “growing, fermenting, actively forming, imperfect being, striving towards perfection and completion” (Moreno, 1946, p. 32). Moreno imagined the God of Genesis like the first-born infant: struggling, stumbling, hollering, and rejoicing in the creative work that is life itself.

The Creator-God is Moreno’s symbol for all to create their universe. Through creativity “the world becomes our world, the world of our choice, the world of our creation—a projection of ourselves” (Moreno, 1947, p. xvi). We combat alienation and isolation by fulfilling our dreams, growing into a world which we have co-created. This is the practical therapeutic relevance of creation theology. In the process of creation, we grown into a familiar world and connect with our co-creators in a network of relationships.

The integration of the isolated fallen into a community of fallen Gods and into a cosmic universe of all-spontaneity and all-creativity that is accessible at any given moment is the aim of psychodrama. The method recapitulates J. L. Moreno’s fall and subsequent healing as a child. It attempts to reconcile normal megalomania with the lonely realization of mortality and individuality. It teaches how to warm up to spontaneity and reverse roles with the all-creative Godhead. It embraces every scientific advance as a means to reaching impossible dreams. It puts every fantasy into action so that a world of choice can be created in reality. It provides a live experimental laboratory for the drama of everyday living. It is a simple religion and an ambitious science. It is “a truly therapeutic procedure [which does not] have less an objective than the whole of mankind” (Moreno, 1953, p. 3).
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