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ABSTRACT      A comparison of Freud’s and Moreno’s theories with regard to their implications for psychodrama therapy. Basic differences in the theories are discussed with special regard to therapist role, transference and tele, insight and catharsis, the time concept, the body, and developmental psychology. Other topics treated are concepts of drive or energy, psychic structure and role theory, psychic determinism contra the doctrine of spontaneity-creativity and differences between an intrapsychic and an interpersonal approach. An outline of the relationship of psychodrama and its philosophy and practice to other schools of psychotherapy is given.

I met Dr Freud only on one occasion. It occurred in 1912 when, while working at the Psychiatric clinic in Vienna University, I attended one of his lectures. Dr Freud had just ended his analysis of a telepathic dream. As the students filed out he asked me what I was doing. ‘Well, Dr Freud, I start where you leave off. You meet people in the artificial setting of your office, I meet them on the street and in their home, in their natural surroundings. You analyse their dreams. I try to give them the courage to dream again. I teach the people how to play God.’ Dr Freud looked at me as if puzzled. (Moreno, 1946, pp. 5–6, about his only meeting with Freud)

Introduction

This thesis is an attempt to contemplate my personal experience of developing from an ordinary Swedish psychiatrist to a practising psychodramatist. This means comparing and discussing the two main theoretical perspectives, the Freudian and the Morenian, which have had a major influence on my clinical thinking and practice. I first got acquainted with the psychoanalytic theories, which provided me with a basic frame to think about human beings. Later I struggled to fit Moreno’s writings to my earlier knowledge. Though exciting and inspiring it seemed difficult for me totally to let them replace the
fundamental psychoanalytic ideas I was accustomed to. It needed sustained psychodramatic practice and extensive reading to make Moreno’s concepts practically useful in my work.

Nowadays both these conflicting theories coexist inside me and can be a source of richness and understanding but may also be a source of doubts, confusion and subsequent paralysis. This thesis can thus be regarded as a product of the ongoing process of integration that contributes to my development as a psychodramatist. It is my hope that the account of my struggle can be of value for other psychodrama students in their efforts to find a sound theoretical basis for their work. It is important to mention that I have chosen to compare the basic concepts of both theories from a psychodramatist’s perspective, not from a neutral position.

I am concerned that—at least in Sweden—the great majority of psychodrama trainees, after finishing their training, stop practising psychodrama. One reason could be that the training has not provided a solid practice in using action methods. Another reason might be a lack of confidence to use the method in a context of ignorance and mistrust. Lack of confidence may also mirror theoretical conflicts—as described above—in the psychodramatist to be. Many trainees are employed in organizations where the frame of reference (i.e. biological, psychodynamic or cognitive) may be at odds with psychodrama. A firm backbone of theoretical knowledge about psychodrama and how it relates to other approaches as well as having support from one’s training institute seems indispensable. One has to argue for one’s own conviction about what is useful. New applications of psychodrama have to be supported and encouraged, not ‘nipped in the bud’.

It is true that a range of sources has influenced most psychodramatists when they have formed the theoretical base that underpins their practice. Trainees have varied professional backgrounds, experiences of training and theoretical orientation. In Sweden the biological tradition has been dominant. The early pioneers of psychotherapy were mainly psychoanalytically influenced and had to fight hard for recognition. Now the psychoanalysts, though still in the shade of biology, risk becoming a conservative establishment, suspicious of new ideas. Beside psychodrama many other approaches now are found like cognitive and behavioural therapies, family and systemic therapies, body-oriented therapies, different approaches of group psychotherapy, new identity process and Gestalt. In this variety it is important that psychodrama manifests its distinctive character, not least because so many of Moreno’s techniques have been taken over by these other therapies, often without mentioning the source and definitely without integrating the underlying philosophy.

The early psychodrama trainers in Sweden initially coming from abroad, also have represented varying theoretical positions alongside their psychodramatic orientation and have integrated them into their psychodramatic teaching. Psychoanalysis, body psychotherapy, Jungian psychology, Greek mythology, art therapy and systems theory have been among the ingredients of psychodrama training in Sweden.

Moreno wrote extensively and in a rather impressionistic and not very systematic way, which makes it difficult to identify the outlines. His works still provide a unique philosophical and scientific contribution to the study of human relations and an outline of a theory of the personality, the role theory. Peter Felix Kellermann has undertaken the task of systematizing and clarifying fundamental aspects of psychodrama (Kellerman,
1992). Jonathan Fox has made Moreno’s writings more accessible through collecting important articles in a volume of moderate size (Fox, 1987) Two basic books about psychodrama have been translated into Swedish, Anne Ancelin Schützenberger’s Précis de psychodrame (Swedish title Psykodrama) and Howard Adam Blatner’s Acting in (Swedish title Praktiskt psykodrama). Recently a book written by Swedish authors, Skapande ögonblick (Creative Moments) has been published. Still, to grasp the underlining philosophy, I find Moreno’s own writing indispensable.

Below follow some comparisons between psychodramatic and psychoanalytic theory and practice based on my own reading and practical experiences. They have emerged during my efforts to overcome my own confusion and difficulties arising from what is mentioned above and to strengthen my own identity as a psychodramatist. I also had the privilege of discussing the theory of psychodrama with colleagues in an advanced study group.

Some basic differences between Morenian and Freudian theory

Determinism and the doctrine of spontaneity-creativity

One of the fundamental hypotheses in psychoanalysis is the principle of psychic determinism: Freud used his eloquence to convince a possibly sceptical audience about this principle:

Let us now call in someone who knows nothing of psychoanalysis and ask him how he explains such occurrences. His first reply will certainly be: ‘Oh! That’s not worth explaining: they’re just small chance events.’ What does the fellow mean by this? Is he maintaining that there are occurrences, however small, which drop out of the universal concatenation of events—occurrences that might just as well not happen as happen?

If anyone makes a breach of this kind in the determinism of natural events at a single point, it means that he has thrown overboard the whole Weltanschaung of science. Even the Weltanschaung of religion, we may remind him, behaves much more consistently, since it gives an explicit assurance that no sparrow falls from the roof without God’s special will. I think our friend will hesitate to draw the logical conclusion from his first reply; he will change his mind and say that after all when he comes to study these things he can find explanations of them. (Freud, 1974, Vol XI, pp. 27–28)

Charles Brenner, author of Introduction to Psychoanalysis, a book which is well known to most Swedish psychotherapy students, puts it like this:

The sense of this principle is that in the mind, as in physical nature about us, nothing happens by chance, or in a random way. Each psychic event is determined by the ones that preceded it. Events in our mental lives that may seem to be random and unrelated to what went on before are only apparently so. In fact, mental phenomena are no more capable of such a lack of casual connection with what preceded them than are physical ones. Discontinuity in this sense does not exist in mental life. (Brenner, 1955, p. 12)
This principle is the basis for the psychoanalytic techniques of analysing transference phenomena, dreams and the pathology of everyday life, for instance attributing significance to slips and ‘accidents’ as well as giving psychic symptoms a meaning. It also means seeing the personality as a distinct functional unit.

Let us compare this with what Moreno writes about his basic concepts—spontaneity and creativity. He regarded spontaneity as an ‘unconservable’ kind of energy that was consumed instantly in the here and now. His definition of spontaneity is quoted below. Intimately related is the concept ‘warm up’ defined as ‘the operational expression of spontaneity’ (1953, p. 42). Differently expressed one could describe spontaneity as the momentary freedom to make new choices and to free ones creativity to find new solutions. Moreno describes creativity as something existing everywhere, needing spontaneity as a catalyst to express itself. The universe, he says, is infinite creativity and its visible definition is the child:

‘The universe is filled with the products of spontaneity-creativity interaction . . .’ (Moreno mentions as examples birth and the rearing of babies, new works of art, new social institutions and technological inventions). ‘Creativity without spontaneity becomes lifeless . . . spontaneity without creativity is empty and runs abortive . . . Spontaneity operates in the present, now and here; it propels the individual towards an adequate response to a new situation or a new response to an old situation . . . A great deal of Man’s psycho- and sociopathology can be ascribed to the insufficient development of spontaneity. Spontaneity ‘training’ is therefore the most auspicious skill to be taught to therapists in all our institutions of learning and it is his task to teach his clients how to be more spontaneous . . . Anxiety results from ‘loss’ of spontaneity.’ (Moreno, 1953, pp. 11–14)

The concept of drive or energy

The concept of a genetically determined drive energy, libido, is fundamental in psychoanalytic theory. The energy manifests itself from birth through the expression of infantile psychosexual needs. The focus of gratification shifts between different bodily functions as the child passes through the oral, anal and genital stages. In accordance with prevailing scientific ideas Freud considered libido energy to be constant, analogous with physical energy. Moreno criticizes this assumption:

In such a closed psychodynamic or sociodynamic system there is no place for spontaneity. If libido energy must remain constant sociopsychological determinism is absolute. (Moreno, 1953, p.16)

As mentioned above Moreno regarded spontaneity as ‘unconservable’ energy. For him man is first of all an ‘actor’ with freedom to make his own choices, and is connected to the universe, sharing its divine creativity. He resented Freud’s biologically inspired interest in the driving forces of the individual being. His interpersonal approach is more in agreement with the views of the object relations theorists, who also abandoned Freud’s drive theory.
Psychic structure and role theory

The psychoanalytic theory of psychic structure describes three hierarchically arranged functionally related structures:

The id comprises the psychic representatives of the drives, the ego consists of those functions which have to do with the individual’s relation to his environment, and the superego comprises the moral precepts of our minds as well as our ideal aspirations. (Brenner, 1955, p. 45)

According to psychoanalytic theory, anxiety and psychoneurotic symptoms emanate from a conflict between oedipal wishes (id-impulses) and the ego. The anxiety is the reaction to the threatening of the ego (e.g. a child’s fear of losing the love of the parents) which the id-impulses imply. The psychoneurotic symptom is the result of a compromise between id and ego, implying a repression of the content of the wishes from consciousness, at the cost of a loss in psychic energy spent on defending the ego. The ‘primary gain’ is freedom from an anxiety provoking awareness of the conflict. This process, an unconscious function of the ego, can be effected in different modes. In psychoanalytic literature a great number of defence mechanisms are mentioned such as repression, sublimation, denial and projection (A. Freud, 1936). If much energy is needed to neutralize a conflict, a ‘restriction of the ego’ may occur, which means a more or less severe impairment of the ego’s functioning. The neurosis may be triggered during adulthood, when a threat e.g. a marital conflict reawakens the oedipal conflict.

The ego is generally described as the reality-adapting functions of the psyche. After Freud the concept of the ego has been further elaborated by among others Anna Freud (see above) and Heinz Hartmann and collaborators. The functions of the ego include the neutralization of drive energy, which is altered from its original, sexual or aggressive character. This energy is made available to the ego as a necessary pre-requisite for its proper functioning.

As already mentioned Moreno showed little interest in focusing on natural scientific understanding of the individual. His perspective was religious and sociological. He outlined an interpersonal psychology:

... Human beings do not behave like dolls, but are endowed in various degrees with initiative and spontaneity ... If there is any primary principle in the mental and social universe, it is found in this twin concept (of spontaneity and creativity) which has its most tangible reality in the interplay between person and person, between person and things, between person and work, between society and society, between society and the whole of mankind.

The fact that spontaneity and creativity can operate in our mental universe and evoke levels of organized expression which are not fully traceable to preceding determinants, causes us to recommend the abandonment or reformulation of all current psychological and sociological theories, openly or tacitly based upon psychoanalytic doctrine, for example the theories of frustration, projection, substitution and sublimation. These theories have to be rewritten, retested and based on spontaneity-creativity formulation. (Moreno, 1953, p. 45)
Moreno did not elaborate the theme of psychic structure. Instead he offers his theory of roles. According to Moreno the self develops from the roles. He defines the role as:

... The functioning form the individual assumes in the specific moment he reacts to a specific situation in which other persons or objects are involved. (Moreno, 1987, p. 62)

This defines the role as part of an interpersonal system. Every role needs a counter role.

Moreno distinguishes between three different kinds of roles expressing the physiological, psychological and social dimensions of the self, the psychosomatic, the psychodramatic and the social roles. Every role has a cognitive, an emotional and a behavioural component. Past experience and the cultural patterns of society form the role, which has a private and a collective side. One might add that roles could have a genetic basis, especially the psychosomatic ones. Important psychodramatic roles may be modelled after parents and other important persons in early life as well as counter roles against these roles (Lynette Clayton).

Moreno writes:

... The function of the role is to enter the unconscious from the social world and bring shape and order to it. (Moreno, 1987 p. 63)

This sounds like a good description of the way the society imperceptibly influences our deep layers. According to Moreno every individual develops and carries a wide range of roles and meets corresponding counter roles among people around him. An abundance of roles and flexibility in changing between roles is regarded as a richness of the ego. A narrow and rigid range on the other hand seems to correspond with the psychoanalytic concept ego-constriction. Roles, which are not expressed, may exert a pressure on the manifest roll, which can create anxiety. The development of new or latent roles as well as role training (rehearsal of roles to perform adequately in future situations) becomes an important part of therapy. Moreno writes:

The tangible aspects of what is known as ‘ego’ are the roles in which he operates, the pattern of role relations that focus around an individual. (Moreno, 1987, p. 63)

It is obvious that both the formation and the emergence and disappearance of roles essentially are unconscious or subconscious processes that may become temporarily brought to consciousness during the role analysis during a psychodrama.

Roles that are functionally related can be brought together in ‘clusters’. Dalmiro Bustos, Argentinean psychodramatist and psychoanalyst has described three basic clusters, related to mother figure, father figure and fraternal relations. The Australian psychodramatists Lynette and Max Clayton divide roles into: (1) fragmenting and dysfunctional; (2) coping; and (3) progressive. They also put descriptive names to the roles, which helps to give the psychodramatic work a direction. Lynette Clayton also strongly emphasizes the importance of a central integrating principle of the personality, ‘The Creative Genius’. Dalmiro Bustos and Max Clayton have both contributed with chapters in ‘Psychodrama since Moreno’ edited by Holmes et al. where they present their approaches.
Two Prospects—intrapsychic and interpersonal

I have so far briefly described two theories with very different basis. Psychoanalytic theory has its roots in scientific concepts from the beginning of the 20th century using the laws of cause and effect and conservation of energy. Freud had the ambition to create a picture of the human mind based on natural scientific principles. He should not be blamed for sharing the views of his contemporaries but one must bear in mind that these views have been surpassed by the results of modern scientific research but are still in use as a basis for psychoanalytic thinking.

Psychoanalytic theory focuses on the individual. The self is described as a structure characterized by continuity and unity. Indeed, deficits in structure are regarded as criteria for psychic illness. The basic conflict is between the needs of the individual and the environment. The goal of the therapy is to obtain insight into the unconscious parts of this conflict. In the psychoanalytic situation this is accomplished mainly through analysis of the transference to the analyst.

Psychodrama theory is inspired by existential philosophers from Kierkegaard onward and also by Henri Bergson’s and Martin Buber’s teachings about ‘*élan vital*’ and ‘*I-Thou*’ respectively. Moreno had ambitions to bring science and religion together. As a scientist his interest was on society and groups and not on natural sciences. In psychodrama the focus is on inter-personal relations in the here and now and on the multiplicity of roles. The individual may be regarded as more polycentric and changeable. The self is thus described as a function of the actual situation and is ascribed a great potential for change. The basic difficulty for the individual is a lack of spontaneity and an insufficient role-repertoire. The goal is to increase spontaneity and develop adequate roles through warming up and psychodramatic action.

These theories focus on the human being from two different perspectives, the intrapsychic and the interpersonal. Freud’s emphasis on the individual psyche is natural in an educated person in Western culture. Individual fulfilment is a much-preferred goal for most of us. To examine the individual is also inherent in the health care tradition. Gestalt therapy and body psychotherapy also focus on the survival of the individual (the organism). In fact a conflict is often presupposed between the individual and a threatening environment. Systems theorists like Gregory Bateson and Humberto Maturana bring the view about the uniqueness of the individual to the extreme. Also in a psychodrama group it is impossible to ignore the uniqueness of the different individuals. In fact much therapeutic work has as a goal to strengthen the borders of individual persons. We also emphasize that the protagonist projects his inner pictures on the stage, not the real persons.

Still—psychodrama is an interpersonal theory and the method implies interaction and role reversal with other persons. It investigates what goes on in the interplay between persons, tele, roles and counterroles. A protagonist centred drama benefits both the individual and the group.

In early psychoanalytic treatment focus of attention was exclusively on the client. The understanding of communicative aspects (see for instance Robert Langs) has brought attention to the interpersonal space also in psychoanalysis.
Maybe both perspectives are indispensable to grasp the psychotherapeutic process regardless of method. They describe things from different angles and add richness to our understanding.

**Specific points of difference between psychoanalysis and psychodrama**

*The therapist*

The psychoanalyst is ideally ‘a blank screen’ on which the client projects his transference-fantasies. Technically it means maintaining a strict neutrality, refraining from satisfying the infantile needs and the curiosity of the client and carefully watching the outer frames. The task of the therapist is to understand the unconscious aspects of the communication of the client and through interpretations and other interventions help the client to insight. Freud outlines the attitude of the analyst:

> The technique, however, is a very simple one. As we shall see, it rejects the use of any special expedient (even that of taking notes). It consists simply in not directing one’s notice to anything in particular and in maintaining the same ‘evenly suspended attention’ in the face of all that one hears. In this way we spare ourselves a strain on our attention, which could not in any case be kept up for several hours daily, and we avoid a danger which is inseparable from the exercise of deliberate attention. For as soon as anyone deliberately concentrates his attention to a certain degree, he begins to select from the material before him … and in making this selection he will be following his expectations or inclinations. (Freud, 1974, Vol. XII)

Moreno emphasizes that a meeting between two individuals always has a major part of authentic and undistorted reciprocity (tele). That gives the therapist (the director) the freedom to be himself, be transparent and possibly to function as a realistic model. To be a director is to put on a very active stance with responsibility to produce a psychodrama which is meaningful for the protagonist and the group. It implies managing a very complex task in a very complex situation, having to shift focus of attention and trust one’s own spontaneity to make immediate interventions. According to Moreno the director has three functions, as producer, as therapist and as analyst. Peter Kellermann added a fourth, the group leader.

Freud’s approach was based on the assumption that the observer (the analyst) does not influence what he observes. Quite early it was understood through the discovery of counter transference phenomena that he is influenced by what he observes. It is nowadays also well understood and will be elaborated under the section about tele and transference that the observer influences what he observes. A two-way communication, mostly unconscious, is unconditionally established which undermines the basic idea of the blank screen.

Also the concept ‘working alliance’ implies a necessary input of mutuality in the relationship between client and therapist (Greenson, 1981). Kellermann summarizes his view regarding the attitude of the psychodramatist:
Since it is in practice impossible to conceal oneself totally behind a blank screen, the psychodramatist prefers to maximize the positive elements of the therapist-patient interaction and encourage an open, warm respecting, empathizing attitude. (Kellermann, 1992, p. 108)

This defines the therapist-patient interaction in psychodrama as an encounter based on their defined roles and is in agreement with the most convincing findings in psychotherapy research, that a warm and empathetic therapist gets the best results regardless of technique.

This excludes by no means a discussion about to which degree the therapist’s intentional transparency is desirable. I have personally experienced sharing from the director as beneficial and as a good help to understand my own projections. It also has a generally modelling effect on group members through playing down the risks of self-revelation. However one must be aware of the asymmetrical character of the relation between therapist and client and of the risk that the therapist abuses the group. Even among psychodrama directors there is diversity of opinion regarding sharing from the director and social contact outside the therapy room.

The setting

Psychoanalysis occurs in the office of the therapist. The client lies on the couch. The therapist sits behind the client out of sight. In fact this arrangement is derived from Freud’s early practise as a hypnotist. Regularity and continuity is emphasised to establish the frame. The client is asked to follow ‘the fundamental rule of psycho-analytic technique’ of free associations. Freud’s instructions to his clients follow below:

One more thing before you start. What you tell me must differ in one respect from an ordinary conversation. Ordinarily you rightly try to keep a connecting thread running through your remarks and you exclude any intrusive ideas that may occur to you and any side-issues, so as not to wander too far from the point. But in this case you must proceed differently. You will notice, that as you relate things various thoughts will occur to you which you would like to put aside on the grounds of certain criticisms and objections. You will be tempted to say to yourself that this or that is irrelevant here, or is quite unimportant, or nonsensical, so that there is no need to say it. You must never give in to these criticisms, but must say it in spite of them—indeed, you must say it precisely because you feel an aversion to doing so. Later on you will find out and learn to understand the reason for this injunction, which is really the only one you have to follow. So say whatever goes through your mind. Act as, for instance, you were a traveller sitting next to the window of a railway carriage and describing to someone inside the carriage views which you see outside. Finally, never forget that you have promised to be absolutely honest, and never leave anything out because, for some reason or other, it is unpleasant to tell it. (Freud, 1974, Vol. XII)
Ralph Greenson writes in *The Technique and Practice of Psycho-Analysis*, a textbook used by many Swedish training institutes:

The patient is asked to try, to the best of his ability, to let things come up and say them without regard for logic or order; he is to report things even if they seem trivial, shameful, or impolite, etc. By letting things come to mind, a regression in the service of the ego takes place, and derivatives of the unconscious ego, id, and superego tend to come to the surface. The patient moves from strict secondary-process thinking in the direction of the primary process. It is the analyst’s task to analyse these derivatives for the patient. (Greenson, 1967, p. 26)

This implies a focusing of the client’s attention on his inner thoughts. Also the maintenance of constancy and a relative stimulus deprivation facilitates this process. The client is normally not encouraged to notice body signals. On the contrary, any kind of action is interpreted as a resistance, ‘acting out’, to stop emergence of unconscious material, which is too threatening. One could argue that the instructions both to the client and to the therapist are to maintain a state of spontaneity in the inner flow of thoughts, even of the concept of spontaneity is not used. Seeing it from a psychodramatist’s point of view one could discuss how the warm up to spontaneity on the couch develops. One would guess that the motivation and expectations of the client as well as the special arrangements of the setting are important factors.

The psychodramatic stage may be located anywhere where the clients are, in their home or at their work, if necessary. For his regular work Moreno designed a circular stage with different levels and a balcony to ‘permit mobility and flexibility of action’ in all directions, also in the vertical one. He also used theatrical facilities like coloured lights to emphasize emotional moods. Most practising psychodramatists have to cope with what could be called a ‘good enough’ group room and may use different kinds of available props like coloured material, masks, encounter bats, etc.

The main feature of the psychodramatic stage is its possibilities—whilst performing in the here and now—of moving in time and space and from outer to inner reality:

The stage space is an extension of life beyond the reality tests of life itself. Reality and fantasy are not in conflict, but both are functions within a wider sphere—the psychodramatic world of objects, persons and events. In its logic the ghost of Hamlet’s father is just as real and permitted to exist as Hamlet himself. Delusions and hallucinations are given flesh—embodiment on the stage—and an equality of status with normal sensory perceptions. (Moreno, 1980)

Moreno called these extensions:

... Surplus reality, a new and more extensive experience of reality ... there are certain invisible dimensions in the reality of living, not fully experienced or expressed, and that is why we have to use surplus operations and surplus instruments to bring them out in our therapeutic settings. (Moreno, 1987, p. 5)

According to Moreno the human being is first of all an actor, whose ‘act-hunger’ needs to be satisfied. Below is quoted how the stage can be used to fulfil these requirements of the protagonist:
He is told to be himself on the stage, to portray his own private world . . . Once he is warmed up to the task it is comparatively easy for the patient to give an account of his daily life in action, as no one is as much of an authority on himself as himself. He has to act freely, as things rise up in his mind; that is why he has to be given freedom of expression, spontaneity. Next in importance to spontaneity comes the process of enactment. The verbal level is transcended and included in the level of action . . . Further comes the principle of involvement . . . The psychoanalytic interview in its orthodox form . . . tried to be pure and objective, by reducing the involvement with the analyst to a minimum. In the psychodramatic situation a maximum of involvement with other subjects and things is not only possible but expected. (Moreno, 1980, p. b)

In the psychodramatic action all senses are used including those which register the body sensations. There is a freedom of expression using movement, music, art etc. The whole group can be actively involved in the action. The importance of the body in psychodrama will be more extensively discussed below.

I have given a long quotation from Moreno’s description because it describes some basic differences between the psychoanalytic and psychodramatic settings. Psychodrama is in a unique way characterized by clarity and flexibility. Events as well as the protagonist’s inner world are distinctly concretized on the stage and can there be subjected to any possible change. Psychodrama is a group method and the interpersonal relations are the focus of treatment. Psychoanalysis on the other hand is in its classic form an individual treatment, the focus is on intrapsychic structure and the setting implies a consciously selected rigorous restriction to facilitate the free associations of the patient and eliminate interfering elements. The differences between the two methods can hardly be described more distinct than in these two contrasting pictures of the calm psychoanalytic setting and the experience-loaded psychodrama session.

Still there are similarities, some of which can be traced in the instructions: Both emphasize the freedom of the client to present his personal material. As has been pointed out one could well say that the psychoanalyst encourages his client to a spontaneous flow of thinking. Both the free flow and the psychodramatic production can be blocked by resistance. Anyone who has been a psychoanalytic client knows the difficulty to comply with the fundamental rule. Protagonists often get stuck and paralysed or simply refuse to act. In both cases the reason can be attributed to a deficiency of spontaneity although this expression is hardly used in psychoanalytic literature. A strong motivation for treatment is regarded as essential in psychoanalytic treatment. In psychodrama the director may encourage the motivation through a warm up process.

Transference and tele

These concepts have already been mentioned in the section dealing with the therapist. Transference is what Freud called the irrational feelings for the therapist which the client develops in the analytic situation. Otherwise stated, feelings directed to important persons during childhood are redirected to the therapist in the here and now. All situations, which have a similarity to the child-parent-relation, can activate such feelings. The process in
which the therapist directs his irrational feelings to the client is known as ‘counter transference’. It may reflect unresolved conflicts in the therapist in regard to important persons in his history and may be destructive if unconsciously acted out. An important function of supervision is to make these feelings conscious for the therapist, both to disarm them and to use them in the ongoing analytic work. As mentioned above the analysis of transference is the cornerstone of psychoanalytic therapy.

The concept tele is initially derived from Moreno's sociometric work. An early definition is:

... The process which attracts individuals to one another or which repels them, that flow of feeling of which the social atom and the networks are apparently composed. This process may be conceived as tele. Tele is two-way empathy, like a telephone it has two ends. (Moreno, 1953, p. 25)

Tele means distance and is usually described as a reality-based inter-perception between two human beings. The word has been used rather carelessly among psychodramatists and Moreno has contributed to certain confusion through describing it differently in different parts of his writings: He has used the word 'auto-tele' to describe relations between different parts of a personality. He introduced the term ‘incongruent tele’ to describe the situation where a positive choice is reciprocated with a negative. He also speculated on a genetic basis for tele. Kellermann (1992) suggests that the term should be restricted to 'a new response which is appropriate in the here and now'.

Kellermann suggests the use of Martin Buber's theories to illustrate the difference between tele and transference: the theory of I-Thou conveys the idea that 'I cannot be I except in relation to a Thou'. On the other hand, in the 'I-It'—relation the 'I' treats the other person as an object rather as a subject. 'Tele assumes in this context the significance of an I-Thou relation, while transference can most nearly be characterized as an I-It relation.'

Transference and counter transference are phenomena regularly met in any psychotherapeutic context. Moreno used the expression 'distorted tele' for both projection and transference. Moreno and Freud would agree that transference is a pathological phenomenon. The difference in approach is a difference in emphasis. In psychoanalysis the features of the situation are technical means to cultivate transference reactions. Moreno used psychodramatic techniques with the intention of facilitating 'genuine encounters' through reality based tele. Most psychodramatists nowadays agree that transference occurs regularly between group members and in relation to the leader in the psychodrama group and can be elucidated through the technique of role reversal. Transference thus can be described as a specific role counter-role constellation, where the client assumes a child role in relation to the therapist.

As mentioned above tele was first used in the field of sociometry and is regarded by Moreno as a basic phenomenon, a mutual emotional flow, occurring between two beings. We see much anecdotal evidence of tele, i.e. how protagonists choose auxiliaries with great accuracy and how two alcoholics in a psychiatric ward immediately become connected. Moreno's speculations about a genetic basis for tele are perhaps supported by such phenomena as the immediate connection between identical twins that have been
separated. A popular expression among laymen, ‘inter-personal chemistry’ has a similar meaning.

Tele is probably based mainly on unconscious reciprocal non-verbal communication. In a recent experiment Professor Ulf Dimberg at the University of Uppsala, subliminally exposed facial expressions to subjects, whom all unconsciously and automatic responded with muscle activity in corresponding muscles in their own faces. There were indications that the muscle activity also triggered emotions. Such and similar observations can elucidate some of the underlying mechanisms about tele. They also offer an interesting connection to the early work of Darwin on expression of emotion, later expanded by Silvan Tomkins as the affect theory.

Insight and catharsis

The concept of catharsis means purification and stems from Aristotle. He used it to describe the emotional release resulting from watching a drama. In his early work with hypnosis Freud emphasised catharsis as a cure but soon abandoned this idea. Rather, the goal of therapy was modified to insight, that is, helping the client to understand the problems and shortcomings in his initial attempts to solve his oedipal conflict and how it affects his life as an adult. Insight is still the goal of classical psychoanalysis. The concept has been criticized: some clients seem to attain good intellectual insight but do not recover. It seems likely that insight needs to be rooted in a person’s emotional life for a clinical change to occur. Other critics maintain that the dependency character of the psychoanalytic situation forces the client to accept the analyst’s views whether true or not. The word, ‘interpretation’, indicates that the therapist possesses a knowledge, which he conveys to the client. A notorious example of this is the classical interpretation of childhood memories of sexual abuse as the child’s own oedipal wishes.

Moreno described what happens within the spectator as a ‘passive catharsis’ in contrast to the ‘active catharsis’ in the participant of a religious ceremony or a psychodrama. Instead of the passive catharsis most people in Western culture attain through the consumption of all kinds of ready made products (theatre, film, TV, etc., which Moreno called cultural conserves) he offered psychodrama as a means for the ordinary human being to play his own drama and attain an active catharsis. Moreno argued for catharsis as a powerful way for the individual to attain equilibrium and for drama as the method of choice:

... We often see a patient, who puts up great resistance when asked to act out his problem. It may also happen that his mind is willing and he is able to make a start on the verbal level but the body lags behind ... In situations like these, the spontaneity associated with verbal and mental images does not have the power to carry the body along with it. Analysis does not help; action is required. The method is to warm the subject up by means of mental and physical starters ... It is a training in summoning spontaneity. In the course of overcoming the disequilibrium between the somatic and mental processes, larger and larger portions of the organism are brought into play, pathological tensions and barriers are swept away, and a catharsis takes place. (Moreno, 1987, p. 55)
No doubt Moreno attributed catharsis a great importance and regarded it as a main goal in sociodrama and psychodrama. However, he used the concept in a very wide meaning to:

... Include not only release and relief of emotions, but also integration and ordering... not only an intrapsychic tension-reduction, but also an interpersonal conflict-resolution; not only a medical purification, but also a religious and aesthetic experience. (Kellermann, 1992, p. 83)

So formulated catharsis obviously covers also most integrative aspects of therapy. Moreno also coined the concept ‘action-insight’ to emphasize that the process of self-discovery in psychodrama is achieved in action, which also reflects the efficacy of action as a tool for learning and recollection. Kellermann devotes this concept a whole chapter well worth considering.

The idea of the importance of catharsis is by no means restricted to psychodramatic practice but is also held by a wide range of other therapeutic movements, in different kinds of body oriented psychotherapy from Reich on, in narcoanalysis, primal therapy, the new identity process, etc.

Reviewing literature about psychoanalysis it is still hard to find a common opinion about the therapeutic way to insight. James Strachey writes following about the diversity of opinion about the techniques of interpretation:

What, then, is interpretation? And how does it work? Extremely little seems to be known about it, but this does not prevent an almost universal belief in its remarkable efficacy as a weapon: interpretation has, it must be confessed, many of the qualities of a magic weapon... In non-analytical circles interpretation is usually either scoffed at as something ludicrous, or dreaded as a frightful danger. This last attitude is shared, I think, more than is often realized, by a certain number of analysts... And there might seem to be a good many grounds for thinking that our feelings on the subject tend to distort our beliefs. At all events, many of these beliefs seem superficially to be contradictory; and the contradictions do not always spring from different schools of thought, but are apparently sometimes held simultaneously by one individual. Thus we are told that if we interpret too soon or too rashly, we run the risk of losing a patient; that unless we interpret promptly and deeply we run the risk of losing a patient; that interpretation may give rise to intolerable and unmanageable outbreaks of anxiety by ‘liberating’ it; that interpretation is the only way of enabling a patient to cope with an unmanageable outbreak of anxiety by ‘resolving’ it; that interpretations must always refer to material on the very point of emerging into consciousness; that the most useful interpretations are really deep ones; ‘Be cautious with your interpretations!’ says one voice; ‘When in doubt, interpret!’ says another. (Strachey, 1963, pp. 344–345)

Strachey remarks that the word interpretation is synonym for ‘making what is unconscious conscious’ and suggests the interpretations of the transference towards the therapist as the ‘mutative’ ones.
It is generally agreed that difficult clients resist interpretations and that timing and respect for the client is essential. The important difference between an intellectual insight and that in which there is a concurrent emotional substance is hardly discussed in psychoanalytic literature. I have earlier mentioned that reviews concerning results of psychotherapy so far have convincingly demonstrated one thing: The personality of the therapist and the empathetic relation to the client are the most consistent curative factors. These facts indicate that insight is only one and probably not the most important curative factor even in psychoanalysis.

The time concept (past, present and future)

Freud compared psychoanalysis to an archaeological investigation where deeper and older layers of the client are carefully investigated. Psychoanalysis thus implies an emphasis on the past, which could also be labelled a vertical view. The actual therapy, however, occurs in the therapy-room in the here and now. Asking the client to follow ‘the fundamental rule’ as well as the analyst’s maintaining of ‘free-floating attention’ also refers to the present. That means that expressions of transference, defence mechanisms etc. and the analyst’s reactions occur here and now but are analysed with reference to the past. Among modern psychoanalysts Robert Langs has put an emphasis on analysing the conscious and unconscious elements of the ongoing communication between therapist and client. There is evidence enough that the psychoanalytic couch can be the place for strong emotions experienced in the here and now. Very probably a positive outcome of psychoanalysis presupposes the surmounting of intellectual defences. Maybe the use of the power of the moment as well as an empathetic therapist is a necessary prerequisite for good outcome also in psychoanalysis.

A psychodrama session happens in the here and now. The focus is on exploring the problems of a group member in the context of the group. Moreno often worked with trained and prepared auxiliaries to meet the therapeutic needs of particular clients. Nowadays psychodrama is usually performed in the frame of an ongoing psychotherapeutic group. A special feature of the stage is the freedom to move in time from the present to the past or the future. Moving back in time is mentioned already in Moreno’s famous treatment of ‘Barbara and George’. Goldman and Morrison introduced the concept ‘The therapeutic spiral’: this model outlines the proceeding of a psychodrama from a scene in present time to earlier ones to explore the roots of the presenting problem and to integrate the experiences. Antony Williams, in his book The Passionate Technique, suggests that although never denying the importance of the past or of the unconscious, Moreno was more interested in resolving problems in encounters between people here and now (horizontal approach), while Zerka favoured the vertical approach, looking backward to childhood events. The Argentinean psychodramatist (and psychoanalyst) Dalmiro Bustos also strongly advocates to move back to ‘status nascendi’, the original birth of a maladaptive role. Paul Holmes writes:

As a psychotherapist and a psychodramatist I am interested in how inner objects, laid down as a part of the psyche in childhood, influence (and at times control) a person’s life. Object relations theory provides a meta-psychology that
explains how early (childhood) experiences and relationships affect relationships in the present: two horizontal (there- and-then and here-and-now) systems linked by the inner world created by the vertical psychological system of the individual . . . Many psychodrama sessions move from scenes from the present to dramas in childhood. This ability to integrate the encounter (horizontal) and the regressive (vertical) views of psychic function is one of the therapeutic strengths of the technique of psychodrama. (Holmes, 1992, p. 13)

Similarly Lynette Clayton (1982) describes in her individual work with severely disturbed clients ‘the pathological or dysfunctional gestalt’, which according to her view ‘represents the unresolved pathological aspects of the parents personalities together with the role responses of the child’. A second gestalt she calls ‘coping gestalt’, which ‘represents the best means of coping that the person learned in the family system’. They are considered to be ‘modelled on the behaviour of parents and significant others who provided solutions to developmental crises and the family pathology’. This is a good example of the vertical view, very close to the idea of inner objects.

Anyhow, a psychodrama is always performed here and now, in the present tense and involving action, which inexorably puts focus on the immediate experiences of the protagonist (and the group members) including feelings and body sensations. The risk that the therapeutic process is reduced to an intellectual game is less than in most other forms of psychotherapy.

Individual and group

Freud wrote his work *Group Psychology* at the time when Moreno was experimenting with ‘the Theatre of Spontaneity’. Freud was mainly influenced by Le Bon and Mc Dougall and one would guess that he was also impressed by the experiences from the first world war and the political upheaval in Europe, although it is never mentioned in his writing. But how would he be able to avoid it! He describes the primitive and regressive phenomena of groups in a way very much resembling what Bion many years later wrote about as ‘basic assumption groups’:

It might be said that the intense emotional ties which we observe in groups are quite sufficient to explain one of their characteristics—the lack of independence and initiative in their members, the similarity in the reactions of all of them, their reduction, so to speak, to the level of group individuals. But if we look at it as a whole, a group shows us more than this. Some of its features—the weakness of intellectual ability, the lack of emotional restraint, the incapacity for moderation and delay, the inclination to exceed every limit in the expression of emotion and to work it off completely in the form of action—these and similar features which we find so impressively described in Le Bon, show an unmistakable picture of a regression of mental activity to an earlier stage such as we are not surprised to find among savages or children. A regression of this sort is in particular an essential characteristic of common groups, while, as we have heard, in organized and artificial groups it can to a large extent be checked.
We thus have an impression of a state in which an individual’s private emotional impulses and intellectual acts are too weak. (Freud, 1974, Vol. XVIII, p. 117)

Freud uses the concept ‘social drive’ about the ‘primitive’ emotional expressions of groups.

He points out that groups are formed based on a single or a few criteria, all very different from the basic qualities that characterize the family. This gives room for the expression of the primitive social instinct unhindered by behaviour rules acquired from upbringing. But a few lines down the same page he adds, apparently considering a link between the family and other groups:

The relation of an individual to his parents and to his brothers and sisters, to the object of his love—and to his physician—in fact all the relations which have hitherto been the chief subject of psychoanalytic research—may claim to be considered social phenomena.

In the individual’s mental life someone else is invariably involved, as a model, as an object, as a helper, as an opponent; and so from the very first individual psychology, in this extended but entirely justifiable sense of the words, is at the same time social psychology as well.

... The social instinct may not be a primitive one ... it may be possible to discover the beginnings of its development in a narrower circle, such as that of the family. (Freud, 1974, Vol. XVIII, p. 69)

Freud quotes ‘army’ and ‘church’ as examples of groups with the features of strong leadership and obedient group members and traces it back to early stages in human developmental history:

Human groups exhibit once again the familial picture of an individual of superior strength among a troop of equal companions, a picture which is also contained in our idea of the primal horde. (Freud 1974, Vol. XVIII, p. 122)

Freud conveys a certain dismay in his way of describing groups and there is no evidence that he saw the group as a possible therapeutic instrument or even realised its possible potential. The great majority of psychoanalysts after Freud have shown little interest in groups and their dynamics. Foukel, founder of the group-analytic movement, was a psychoanalyst but rather inspired by Goldstein and other Gestalt psychologists when he developed his group approach. Other group-psychotherapy pioneers with psychoanalytic background like Burrow, Slavson, and Bion also seem to have developed their interest in groups from other sources than inspiration by Freud.

Moreno saw the individual as defined through the roles he developed in relation to other individuals’ counter-roles. Moreno regarded this ‘nucleus of relations’ the smallest social structure and named it ‘the social atom’:

Social atoms are again parts of a still larger pattern, the psychological networks ... Psychological networks are parts of a still larger unit, the psychological geography of a community. A community is again part of the largest configuration, the psychological totality of human society itself. (Moreno, 1987, p. 27)
Moreno also coined the expression ‘the primary dyad’:

The theory of interpersonal relations is based upon the ‘primary dyad’, the idea and experience of the meeting of two actors, the concrete-situational event preliminary to all interpersonal relations. The limiting factor in the individual centred psychologies and mass centred sociologies is the non-presence of the ‘other actor’. (Moreno, 1993, p. 36)

Moreno’s interest in groups appeared very early and is manifested already from around 1910 in his interest in the ‘House of Encounter’, the prostitutes in Vienna and in the Mitterndorf Refugee Camp. It is no exaggeration to say that the study and the treatment of all kinds of groups were the most important issue for him. He spent much time in the thirties developing sociometry and undertook his studies at Sing Sing and Hudson. Besides psychodrama he developed sociodrama, an action method ‘dealing with inter-group relations and collective ideologies’. He coined the word ‘sociatry’:

Sociatry treats the pathological syndromes of normal society, of inter-related individuals and of inter-related groups. It is based upon two hypotheses: (1) ‘The whole of human society develops in accord with definite laws’; (2) ‘A truly therapeutic procedure cannot have less an objective than the whole of mankind’. (Moreno, 1953, p. 119)

The body

Freud writes that the ego is mainly a body-ego. In his early practice with clients he used body manipulations like massage. In classical psychoanalytic practice the client lies relaxed on a sofa. Reference to the body generally does not occur. Generally all sorts of body contact is avoided. Even to shake hands and similar culturally accepted habits are controversial things. It is remarkable that these rigorous rules exist in a form of psychotherapy that has been blamed for its emphasis on sexuality. Aside from the fact that these rules are of course in accordance with the rules of abstinence, one could guess that they constitute some kind of defence, possibly necessary to protect the method from accusations concerning sexual abuse. The Hungarian analyst Sandor Ferenczi caused commotion among his colleagues when he introduced body contact in therapy. Wilhelm Reich, besides being politically radical, developed body psychotherapy as a therapeutic method and was eventually excluded from the psychoanalytic movement.

Moreno emphasized that Man is an actor and his action hunger needs to be satisfied. In any kind of psychodramatic enactment, action and movement are obvious ingredients. In psychodrama it is an essential part of the warming up process either encouraged by the director or spontaneous. Stepping up from the chair is the normal first step when beginning a psychodrama. The muscular activity involved triggers thoughts, memories and feelings. Unrestrained breathing and a good sense of grounding should also be encouraged. The body is involved in both conscious and, which is still more important, unconscious communication. Watching the body of the protagonist or using a ‘physical double’ gives the director important clues often revealing subconscious parts of his ongoing process. Maximization of movements, as well as focusing on specific areas
through touch, strengthen the warm up. The bodily components of emotions, body sensations and symptoms can be concretised and put on stage as roles. Finally movement is a necessary feature of catharsis and action insight.

Discussing the use of the body in psychotherapy necessarily involves the question about sexual abuse. How much protection is attained through the rigorous rules of psychoanalysis? Is there a greater danger of sexual seduction in methods that involve touch and body contact? It is a sad fact that reports about sexual abuse are not uncommon and are reported to happen regardless of technical approach. In the early development of psychotherapy the consciousness about the devastating effects of sexual exploitation was poor. Many early pioneers did not respect the sexual integrity of their clients. To date there is no indication that clients in types of psychotherapy that involve bodily action and touch, for instance psychodrama, are more exposed to abuse . . . Probably the group situation offers a certain protection compared to the secluded individual therapy room. But the only guarantee is a consciousness about ethical standards and a sufficient professional training of therapists, regardless of method.

Theories about developmental psychology

Freud’s and Moreno’s developmental theories were both formulated before the time of systematic child observations and were based on speculations and reports from adults.

Freud’s psychosexual theories are based on how the drives manifest themselves in different body organs during development and how psychic disturbances are characterised by the phase when they started. Freud also made the distinction between ‘primary process’ representing the early magic thinking of the pre-school child and ‘secondary process’ representing the realistic mature thinking of the older child and the adult. Among others Eric H. Eriksson and Margaret Mahler have extended Freud’s developmental theories.

Moreno has written about five different stages in the child development representing the bases for role development:

1. The stage of the matrix of identity: the stage of the all-identity or mother/baby unit. Moreno described the mother as the baby’s natural double.
2. The stage of the double: the infant focuses on the stranger part of himself or ‘mother’. The baby is mothers natural double.
3. The stage of the mirror: the infant focuses on the stranger part of himself, which is lifted out, and all the other parts, including himself are omitted.
4. The stage of role reversal: the infant places himself actively in the other part and acts its role.
5. The stage of reversal of identity: the infant acts in the role of the other towards someone else, who in turn acts his role. It is only after completion of this stage that he has capacity to assume his own identity fully. (Bradshaw Tavon, 1998, p. 40)

Although speculative I have quoted these stages as an interesting example of Moreno’s thinking about child development and its relation to roles.
Researchers in child development in present time use observations and a lot of technical devices to support their theories. One of them, Daniel Stern, has sketched significant revisions compared to earlier beliefs. He puts the focus on the interpersonal development. The interplay between child and mother, described in Stern’s books, is very much in accordance with the ideas about development of roles and counter-roles and thus of great interest to psychodramatists.

Object relations theory and other approaches derived from classical psychoanalysis

Freud had the ambition to create a coherent and integrated theory. His followers have gone on developing his theories, in some cases accomplishing major modifications as for instance the school of object relation theory, whose views gradually have obtained increased acceptance. It developed in Great Britain initiated by Melanie Klein and her followers such as W.R.D. Fairbairn, Donald Winnicott, Harry Guntrip and John Bowlby. In USA Otto Kernberg is one of its advocates. They rejected Freud’s ideas about the child’s body as the primary drive target and saw the libido as primarily object seeking, to find someone (usually the mother) for survival. Fairbairn has summarized his theoretical views:

1. An ego is present from birth.
2. Libido is a function of the ego.
3. There is no death instinct; and aggression is a reaction to frustration or deprivation.
4. Since libido is a function of the ego and aggression is a reaction to frustration or deprivation, there is no such thing as the id.
5. The ego, and therefore libido, is fundamentally object-seeking.
6. The earliest and original form of anxiety, as experienced by the child, is separation-anxiety.
7. Internalization of the object is a defensive measure originally adopted by the child to deal with his original object (the mother and her breast) in so far as it is unsatisfying . . . (Fairbairn, 1963, p. 224)

The object relations theory is mainly interpersonal and avoids the mysterious and demonic features of the id involved in the old theory and like Moreno one presupposes ‘the other’. The description of how the small child internalizes the important objects of his environment is not very different from the ideas about development of roles. In both cases they result from interaction and become ‘gestalts’. The difference is between the emphasis on the inner world and the more behavioural aspects the roles describe but the may well represent two sides of the same phenomena. One might regard the inner objects as psychodramatic roles more or less appropriate for the adjustment of the adult and accordingly use psychodrama techniques to analyse their efficiency and effect desirable modifications. Paul Holmes, British psychodramatist and object-relations oriented psychoanalyst, (to whom I have referred earlier) elegantly presents in his book, The Inner World Outside his own way of practising psychodrama, where he uses his psychoanalytic knowledge as a map.
Also the American ‘neo-Freudian’ psychoanalysts Fromm, Horney, Sullivan, etc., criticized the drive theory from different bases and emphasized the importance of the interpersonal relations. Kohut developed what he called ‘self psychology’ arguing the importance of the therapeutic relationship as a healing factor to repair the patient’s emotional deficits. They all represent a certain move to come closer to psychodramatic views.

Other psychoanalysts have made their own modifications of Freud’s theories, some of them deviating enough to stop calling themselves psychoanalysts. Freud’s colleagues Jung and Adler diverged very early. Reich developed body-oriented views and was politically radical. He was excluded. Perls, being dissatisfied with poor results in his psychoanalytic practice, developed Gestalt therapy, which shares existential and phenomenological views with psychodrama and has borrowed from the method. Casriel found his psychoanalytic techniques unsuitable for work with drug addicts and created The New Identity Process.

Discussion

The psychoanalytic theories have been elaborated and extended in the course of a century. Since the original works of Freud, a continuous succession of articles and books have been published, covering all conceivable aspects from developmental theory to technical advice for the therapist. Psychoanalytic theory is doubtless the most elaborated and widespread clinical theory about human behaviour, about human pathology and its treatment. It has also exerted a great influence on cultural areas and despite the resistance and controversy it originally provoked it has become part of popular thinking and its terminology has infiltrated popular writing. That does not imply that the theory is perfect or even generally accepted. It has been severely attacked by biologically oriented scientists, behaviourists, system theorists, etc. Moreno definitely belonged to the critics:

The psychoanalytic system has in common with other analytic systems which followed in its steps, the tendency to associate the origins of life with calamity. The key concept of the Freudian system is the libido, but Freud instead of associating sex with spontaneity associated it with anxiety, insecurity, abreaction, frustrations and substitution. His system shows strong inclinations towards the negative . . . It was not the sexual actor and his warm up towards orgasm, it was not sexual intercourse and the interaction of two in its positive unfoldment, but rather the miscarriage of sex, its deviations and displacements, its pathology rather than its normality, to which he gave attention. (Moreno, 1967, in Holmes, 1992, p. 10)

Thus while natural scientists have criticized psychoanalysis to lack sufficient scientific standards, Moreno and other humanistic psychotherapists have attacked the preoccupation with pathology and the adherence to a medical model. Psychoanalysis like most established doctrines also has run the risk of rigidity and dogmatism. At the present time the threat against the intrinsic human values in psychoanalysis comes from both biological and economical fundamentalism (Luhrmann, 2000).
The success of psychoanalysis has also been attributed to Freud’s excellence in writing. The clarity, the personal touch and the way he expresses new ideas seemingly in a dialogue with the reader is unequalled among psychoanalytic writers. Many subsequent psychoanalysts unfortunately have acquired an obscure and complicated style hard to penetrate.

Moreno as much as Freud wanted his philosophy and his (psychodramatic) methods to influence the whole world. He offered his services to politicians in crucial conflicts, for example to help Kennedy and Khrushchev to reverse roles at the time of the Cuba conflict. And you may remember the citation, which is the first sentence of Who Shall Survive? ‘A truly therapeutic procedure cannot have less an objective than the whole of mankind.’ He compared his ideas with Marxism, Psychoanalysis and the religions and offered them as an alternative:

Early in the twentieth century, during my youth, two philosophies of human relations were particularly popular. One was the philosophy that everything in the universe is all placed in the single individual, in the individual psyche. This was particularly emphasised by Sigmund Freud, who thought that the group was epiphenomena. For Freud, everything was ‘epi’, only the individual counted. The other philosophy was that of Karl Marx. For Marx, everything ended with the social man, or more specifically, the socio-economic. It was as if that were all there was to the world. Very early in my career I came to the position that there is another area, a larger world beyond the psychodynamics and sociodynamics of human society—cosmodynamics. Man is a cosmic man, not only a social man or an individual man. (Moreno, 1987, p. 10)

In fact many of his ideas have had a profound impact. Group psychotherapy has developed and spread over the world, sociometry and many of the techniques he invented have diffused outside psychodrama, psychodrama itself has developed in many countries but has not attained attention comparable to that dedicated to psychoanalysis. It may be attributed to the difficult and controversial parts of Moreno’s personality as well as the difficulties in understanding his writing. Moreno was actually a revolutionary man. By encouraging people to actively engage in life and in creating their future, his ideas may pose a threat to those in power:

Behind the screen of telling fairy tales to children I was trying to plant the seeds of a diminutive creative revolution . . . Children were my models whenever I tried to envision a new order of things or to create a new form. When I entered a family, school, a church, a parliament building, or any other social institution, I rebelled. I knew how distorted our institutions had become and I had a new model ready to replace the old: the model of spontaneity and creativity learned from being close to children. (Moreno Autobiography, 1985, in Marineau, 1989, p. 40)

The practice and the ideas of psychodrama have been met with resistance not at least in Sweden because of its divergence from both the academic and the general culture of the people. The same may be true for many western countries. It seems that the two continents where psychodrama is most accepted are South America and Australia.
As an optimist one could maintain that Moreno is still too much ahead of his time to be generally accepted. A more pessimistic view would be that development moves away from Moreno’s ideas toward individualism, materialism, and the cultural conserves offered in abundance by mass media and information technology.

**Final personal words**

When I first met psychodrama and began my training, my clinical thinking was most influenced by general psychiatric and psychoanalytic theories. They still have an impact, however they are perceived with critical distance. Though essential they did not help me enough to become a good enough psychodrama director. On the contrary, the flow of thoughts they produced stopped my spontaneity and creativity from developing. I got anxious about going wrong—and I often went wrong. I needed to grasp the ideas of warm up, spontaneity and creativity to understand what happens in a group session from start to finish and to guide protagonists and auxiliaries to work more efficiently. Without a sufficient warm up of the director as well as the group there will be no spontaneous acting and no adequate or new responses. Practically speaking it meant developing and trusting my intuition and paying attention to facilitating authentic encounters between the protagonist and other persons and also between the protagonist and less conscious parts of himself. The concept of the creative potential of every individual prepares the ground for a healthy therapeutic optimism. It fosters a trust that group participants have the capacity to break repetitive patterns and attain new perspectives, granted their spontaneity becomes available.

The theory of roles widened my understanding of human interaction within and outside therapy. It seems logical to consider roles as mental gestalts, emerging or disappearing in the moment according to the figure-ground principle. Setting the goals for therapy—still a rather neglected practice—is facilitated by considering necessary changes of the role repertoire. The sudden dramatic changes in behaviour that may occur after overwhelming experiences, religious conversion and sometimes in therapies are most easily explained as being caused by the emergence of a new role (not necessarily a very healthy one). The same seems true for temporary behavioural changes in extreme situations. On the psychodrama stage, roles and counter-roles can be explored and new roles can be developed and trained. Role reversal allows the protagonist a new perspective of looking at himself through the eyes of someone else. The whole range of possibilities which the stage invites (see above) are the director’s resource in the production of the psychodrama.

Moreno must be credited for pointing out the potential of the group and the potential healing influence of the authentic encounter. As mentioned above, in psychodrama groups encounters are encouraged and facilitated. Already during his work with the prostitutes in Vienna, Moreno saw that every group-member had the possibility of being the therapeutic agent of any other group-member. In the emphasis of an authentic encounter the idea of the transparent group leader is included. This notion has liberated me from a therapeutic straitjacket, which never suited my personality but hindered my own spontaneity and limited my potential as a positive role-model for the group members.
Thus Morenian theory has widened my theoretical views and encouraged me to develop the role of the director in a more appropriate way. My experience as a co-leader of clinical weekly psychodrama groups has been encouraging and has strengthened my conviction that psychodrama is an effective form of psychotherapy with a wide application. I agree with the European and South American clinical tradition that psychoanalytic wisdom may enrich and facilitate the psychodramatic praxis despite a number of contradictory views. Kellermann puts it this way:

... Although Moreno's theories are useful to explain many clinical situations, they fail to provide a sufficiently uniform and comprehensive theoretical structure for psychodrama therapy. (Kellermann, 1992, p. 34)

Continuous theoretical and experimental work is needed to supplement Moreno's concepts. In practice continuous training and support of new trainees must be encouraged. If psychodrama is to thrive the training institutes must bear this responsibility. There has been diversity of opinion among psychodramatists about their position in relation to established forms of psychotherapy and to the University faculties. There remains the difficult task of gaining recognition from these established institutions without losing the revolutionary essence of psychodrama.
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