

PSYCHODRAMA AND HAPPENING

GILBERT TARRAB, PH.D.

University of Montreal, Canada

This is a translation of chapter seven of a work by Dr. Gilbert Tarrab entitled "LE THEATRE DU NOUVEAU LANGAGE" (volume II), published in 1974 by the Cercle du Livre de France at Montréal, Québec.

Dr. Gilbert Tarrab, born August 28, 1940, is a professor at the School of Social Service at the University of Montréal. Among his published works are:

Le Happening: analyse psychosociologique

Revue d'Histoire du Théâtre, CNRS, Paris, 1968-I, 102 pages.

Ionesco à cœur ouvert

Cercle du Livre de France, Montréal, 1970, 102 pages.

Le Théâtre du Nouveau Langage (2 volumes)

Cercle du Livre de France, Montréal, 1973 and 1974, 620 pages.

Mythes et symboles en dynamique de groupe, forward by Jacques Ardoino

Bordas, Paris and Aquila, Montréal, 1971, 220 pages.

Initiation à la pratique du test de Rorschach

University of Montréal Press, 1970, 275 pages.

PSYCHODRAMA AND HAPPENING

"To perform a theatrical work with a therapeutic goal is not psychodrama, it is teatrotherapy. Psychodrama also differs from *comedia dell'arte*, in which actors improvise on a given theme. In psychodrama, the protagonist *lives his life on the stage* (Moreno, in "Psychodrama I," p. 13, writes "living out his life on the stage") in a sort of *commedia dell'arte* with therapy as its goal." (A. A. Schützenberger: "Précis de Psychodrame" p. 181-182.)

It would be useful, we feel, to examine the links between the psychodrama and the happening, as well as essential differences between the two. On this subject, we must here express our lively astonishment at the lines written by Schützenberger in her "Précis de Psychodrame," whose only merit, it seems to us, is to illustrate current prejudices or "pre-notions" (Durkheim) cultivated by certain psychosociologists (and some of their readers, in turn) towards the happening.

After having recognized that these "improvisational sessions, with a mixture of types, actions, songs, gestures, movements, approach (. . .) improvisational sessions (sic) and artistic creation," she writes: "this technique, vulgarized by non-psychotherapists and non-educators, is becoming widespread in American and European artistic circles under the name of "Happening," which cannot

be without an element of danger, thus has nothing to do with the psychodrama" (op. cit. p. 123).

As for us, we shall attempt, on the contrary, to demonstrate exactly where the psychodrama and the happening are related, and what differentiates them.

Psychodrama is, first and foremost, a method and, as Zerka T. Moreno says, a "philosophy" (1) whose aim is to cure the ill (usually neurotics) through dramatic and bodily expression, employing techniques which enable them to "objectify" on the stage a system of deteriorated interpersonal relationships, and to make an *active* attempt to enter into new relationships (according to Moreno).

A. Schützenberger describes the psychodramatic phenomenon thus: "In psychodrama, a situation, past, present or even future, is lived out in a group, not by talking about it (as in psychotherapy or in psychoanalysis) but by *improvised action*, in a sort of *commedia dell'arte* (2) applying to a real life situation. The hero (or protagonist) expresses his true feelings and stages the situation, with the help of all characters essential to the action, who will respond to him. These "auxiliary egos" react spontaneously, based not only on what the protagonist has said about the situation and about the person whose role they are playing, but mainly on the *reactions* or sentiments provoked in them by the principal actor, or following directions given by the "psychodramatist" in charge of the session" (op. cit. p. 14).

"We may define the psychodrama as a search for truth, one's own and that of others, by a group of human beings who *freely* discuss their problems and place them into a common pool.

They then act out their problems, putting them into question, and seeing them put into question. In so doing, they place themselves at a distance from their situation and from their involvement in it" (op. cit., p. 30).

Let us immediately distinguish Morenian psychodrama (of which A. Schützenberger has just spoken) from analytic psychodrama (Diatkine, Lebovici, Anzieu): we shall examine in turn these two kinds of psychodrama, but very briefly, as they are of interest only insofar as we can relate them to the different forms of happening.

According to Moreno, who, like Freud, is a physician, but whose theories or "systems" are quite dissimilar, the psychodramatic situation (3) consists of five elements:

1. *The stage* (or the scene of action, circular in form)
2. *The patient* (who must be "himself on the stage") ("Fondements de la sociométrie" p. 35).
3. *The director* (stage-manager, therapist and analyst, or as A. Schützenberger calls him, the "psychodramaturge")
4. *The auxiliary egos* (whose role is to "represent the real or imaginary persons" (op. cit., p. 36) of the drama lived by the patient.

5. *The audience* (who "see themselves, so to speak, as one of the collective syndromes represented on the stage," op. cit., p. 37)

The psychodrama is, in the final analysis, an experience "lived in a group, by the group, and for the group," as stated by A. Schützenberger (op. cit., p. 33). And "the psychodrama succeeds when it establishes and unifies a group in a common emotion, arising from a direct or natural impetus" (p. 37).

It is important to examine at this point the notion of "role" which Moreno requires his patients to enact on the stage. They are never asked "to play a role" (a character, as in the theatre). They are required to maintain "their" own role on the stage in order to achieve "associations of behavior," and not, as is current in classical psychoanalysis, "associations of ideas."

"The role appears even before the emergence of the self. It is not roles which emerge from the self, but the self which may emerge from roles . . . In the world of childhood, *speaking roles* do not emerge until well after the appearance and effective operation of psychosomatic roles, such as the role of "eater," of "sleeper" and of "walker," writes Moreno (op. cit., p 29).

We now reiterate, in a sense, what we have previously written concerning the theatre of new language (3a). In the same way that the spoken word in the theatre is not the only language possible, there can exist a form of communication beyond or beneath speech, which is more *authentic* than speech, and which is an intelligible interchange of "psychosomatic roles." The phenomenon of "tele" is this: for Moreno, the "tele" is a feeling projected outside, the simplest unit of feeling (non-decomposable) transmitted from one individual to another. A number of "teles" (or units of feeling) will produce a "complex of feelings" and it is this complex which causes one person to be attracted by another. We obtain the "tele-relation," which Moreno contrasts with the psychoanalytical concept of "transfer," based upon the projection of feeling, rather than upon the attraction or repulsion of X to Y. The transfer, Moreno feels, is merely a psychopathological excrescence of the "tele-relation" (cf. "Psychodrama I," p. 229).

We will not enter further into the Morenian analysis of the phenomena of "tele," of "tele-relation," and of their connection with psychoanalytical transfer. Nor will we discuss Moreno's theories, as this is not our object. We remind the reader once again that we wish only to provide a broad outline of Morenian psychodrama and analytic psychodrama, as these matters are of interest to us only insofar as they relate to the phenomenon of the "happening." In addition, we shall limit ourselves to a simple schematic account of representative psychodramatic techniques.

In the happening, unlike in traditional theatres (which are "artificial environments where *finished* works are preserved," as Anzieu writes in "Le psychodrame analytique chez l'enfant," (p. 5) the purpose is to re-enact on the

stage a human (or inter-human) event which actually happened. The psychodrama is a situation lived dramatically, an "encounter" (4), here and now, in a common place, of different individuals having certain personal (and real) problems to resolve.

In this collectively lived psychodramatic situation, there is *participation*, in the situation being acted out, of all the elements of psychodrama: the patient, the stage-manager (or psychodramaturge), the auxiliary egos, and the audience. In short, we have here a well-defined structural totality, with regard to whose terms it is the networks of relations which are of primary importance. Thus, the relations of "patient-analyst" (in a psychodrama, "the transfer has no neurotic manifestations, but is due to certain realities incarnate in and represented by other persons," writes Moreno in "Psychodrama I," p. 229), the relations of "auxiliary ego-patient," "patient-audience," are always *first* with regard to isolated entities: Patient, Audience, Auxiliary Egos (4). Speaking of spontaneity, Moreno states: "It is spontaneity which incites man to react in a more or less satisfactory manner to a more or less novel situation" (op. cit. p 18). And further on: "Spontaneity may be defined as the response adequate to a new situation, or as a new response to an old situation" (p. 181).

As in the happening, the accent is placed in particular, with Moreno, on the essential role of spontaneity which "functions only at the instant in which it bursts forth" (p 19), in permitting us "to reveal emotions in a nascent state" (p 182).

We are not far from Bergson and his "elan vital" (life force) (5), the creative thought which transcends the material and explains the world. Like Bergson, Moreno expresses himself through imagery: the intellect is aware of itself, but fails lamentably to understand the living, vital processes. The only solution is in a knowledge "from within," manifested in Moreno by spontaneity, expressed on the stage by the embodiment of what Bergson called "l'elan vital," which is precisely the bursting forth of the fluidity and the dynamism of the inner life. Thus, the Bergsonian intuition, which is beyond the understanding of the intellect (cutting up, analyzing), is found to be curiously joined to the creative spontaneity posited by Moreno. And through this joining, with Bergson as the hinge, we re-discover almost point for point the theories of Lebel on "creative participation" in the happening. happening.

At the Second International Congress of Psychodrama (Barcelona, August 29-September 3, 1966) we undertook to question Moreno verbally. He accorded us a very long interview (6), and we take the liberty of reproducing here a short extract therefrom, concerning the links between psychodrama and happening (7). Moreno affirmed to us that it was he who, in 1923, invented the happening, which was not yet called "happening," but "impromptu." At about this time, in fact, he published a magazine "L'impromptu magazine,"

the happening being for him an "impromptu." It is that which is done here and now by a certain number of persons.

"Life must be lived as a series of happenings. By itself, the happening is a superficial "courant de vie," as is the "impromptu." The impromptu originally meant the *immediate*. The happening is therefore a theatre of immediacy, of the immediate life. Thus, the happening may be extremely interesting, or utterly without interest, according to what is occurring here and now. For example, the urge to kill is a happening, because it is a phenomenon *experienced* here and now (immediacy of the phenomenon) by the assassin. The psychodrama is something else: it is a *method* and *techniques*.

I have tried to create a scientific model based on the flow of life itself. Thus, you and me, what are we doing, here and now? We are seated, you are taking notes, I am speaking, it is "life." We are living, here and now, a situation which is unique and original, because it is ours. When your work is published, it will be interesting, perhaps, but it will be a "preserved culture," WITHOUT LIFE. And I am against "preserved culture" to the extent that I am FOR LIFE, for ACTION LIVED, always here and now. In a psychodrama, I construct a situation to be lived here and now between the patient, the audience and myself. In classical psychoanalysis all is centered on the "couch" and the mere words which are spoken around it; I feel that the couch is not LIFE, nor are the words which are spoken on it. Life must be LIVED, not spoken. The psychodrama is lived reality. I must also add that the psychodrama, contrary to popular belief, did not begin as therapy, but as happening: this was in the Viennese period from 1921 to 1925. It began then, as a purely "artistic" form, it was "the theatre of spontaneity." Therapy came later."

Moreno, of course, was first a director of theatre in Vienna, then poet, sociologist, writer. In 1924 he published, in the catalogue "Internazionale Kunstaussstellung" an article on the "Theatre of the Happening," as well as studies of Stanislavski, Léger, Marinetti, etc. Even now, his wife is experimenting in her Beacon Institute (in the U.S.) with a non-therapeutic form of psychodrama which he called "Aesthetic Catharsis." As a result, he must have been approximating the experiments undertaken by Lebel and his acolytes. And Moreno claims that it is he who originated the international movement of the contemporary happening. We will not discuss this rather hasty claim. Whether this social phenomenon was originated by Moreno, by Lebel, or by the Americans (Kaprow, Oldenburg, etc.) is unimportant to us.

For us, the essential is to apprehend the objectively observable FACT that artists in different fields, as well as renowned therapists, today lean very seriously towards this movement as a means of revealing meaningful symptoms characteristic of our civilization.

It seems to us very important to note that for Moreno, the psychodrama was at first a happening, or an "impromptu" (the theatre of immediate action, lived here and now). Is today's happening becoming a form of therapeutic art? We think not, although the question is a valid one.

Moreno continues thus: "Then years before Heidegger, I introduced the concept of the "encounter" in social psychology, a concept which explains the phenomenon of reciprocity, arising from the confrontation between two people here and now. As a matter of fact, as early as 1914, Moreno published, in German, "Invitation to an Encounter," subsequently translated into English. And in 1922 he produced a monograph on the "philosophy of hic and nunc."

We then asked Moreno if he did not believe that the happening could be very useful to actors, whose profession consists precisely in playing roles, by opening to them a dynamic new field, a new dimension, thus providing a new perception of the world and of their role in this world.

"It is true," he replied, "that the central concept in social psychology is one that is borrowed from the theatre. This is the concept of "role," which is an anglicism, as "role" in English means the part played by an actor in the theatre (8).

An individual may fulfill different roles in society without becoming neurotic. Most actors, however, suffer from histrionic neurosis (9): an actor, in order to play all the roles offered to him, must usually prostitute his psyche; he must place himself inside the skin of someone else. These different roles erode his inner psyche, his individuality. He is now Romeo, now Macbeth, now Othello. This is dangerous for his personal identity. Psychologically, he is a professional prostitute. Histrionic neurosis is a sort of penalty he must pay in order to enable himself to be so many people at the same time. I am convinced that the psychodrama is still the best treatment for these actors, in that it permits them to regain their own identities, unified at last, and to become themselves again. For a professional actor, playing himself on the psychodramatic stage is not always easy, because in psychodrama the patient does not submit to his life, he imitates it. Freudian catharsis exists in a shadow-land: the catharsis of psychodrama is bathed in light, for it is above all *theatrical* and therefore a true purification. This, to me, is what makes it so different from the happening, which remains an "impromptu," an episode from the "immediate life," which may be interesting as art, but is inadequate for treating and curing the ill, particularly actors suffering from histrionic neurosis. I have, however, observed that it is actors who engage most in happenings when what they really need is a good psychodramatic cure. I remind you here of what Diderot wrote in the "Paradox du Comédien" (The Actor's Paradox): Extreme sensitivity makes mediocre actors; the absolute lack of sensitivity makes sublime actors." The result is that sublime actors—or

those who believe themselves to be so—are precisely those who totally lack sensitivity, because they are dispersed, scattered into all the roles they must play. I believe it is psychodramatic therapy and not the happening (which aggravates their histrionic neurosis) which will help them to recover *their own* sensibility. Because the man in the psychodrama is homo-faber, the man of flesh and blood, he who is born, suffers, dies, eats, drinks, sleeps, the man whom we see and hear, the brother. There is an ontological difference between theatre and psychodrama, this is well-known. It is true that life is a theatre, but if it were ONLY a theatre, there would be no hope. Life is more than a theatre, or it would be tragic. The theatre, is merely a “representation” of life, and life, bursting with spontaneity, is more than a representation.

However, and this a fundamental fact, the happening remains a “representation” (even if the participants take an active part, even if they are at the same time judges and judged), while the psychodrama is above all a *real* event which “reproduces” itself before the eyes of audience and analyst, with their participation in the drama being lived by the patient.

On the subject of the Phenomenon of “representation,” we refer the reader to Michel Foucault’s very pertinent analysis in the opening pages of “Les mots et les choses” (cf. chapter I, p. 19-31): “Les suivants”), which recalls to us Samuel Beckett’s “Film,” which analyses a similar phenomenon in pictures. In his pages, Foucault describes, in the style of Robbe-Grillet, a painting by Velázquez, where the artist is depicted in his studio, “painting two personages contemplated by the Infanta Margarita, surrounded by duennas, attendants, courtiers and dwarfs . . . It is sufficient to add that the two personages who serve as models to the painter are not visible, at least not directly; but they can be seen in a mirror; that there is no doubt that they are King Philip IV and his wife Mariana (p. 25). Further on: “This helical shell offers the complete cycle of the *representation*: the glance, the palette, and the brush, the *empty canvas* (these are the material instruments of the representation), the paintings, the reflections, the real man (the finished representation, but as if freed from its *illusory* or real *contents* which are juxtaposed thereon); then the representation comes undone; we see only the frames and this light which bathes the paintings from without, but which these must in return reconstitute in their own image as though it came from elsewhere, passing through the dark wood of their frames” (p. 27).

This “spectacle-in-a-glance” constitutes the essence of all representation: “What is this spectacle, who are these faces, reflected first in the pupils of the infanta, then of the courtiers and of the painter, and finally in the distant clarity of the mirror? But the question at once doubles itself: the face reflected in the mirror is also the one that contemplates it; that which all the personages in the painting look upon is also the personages in whose eyes they are offered as a scene for contemplation. The painting as a whole looks

upon a scene for which it is in its turn a scene. Pure reciprocity manifested in the mirror which looks upon and is looked into, and whose two facets are revealed at each angle from which the painting is viewed: at the left the canvas turned around, producing from the outside view *pure spectacle*; at the right the dog stretched out, the only element in the painting which neither glances nor moves, because it is there only as *an object to be looked at*" (p. 29).

Finally: "Perhaps, in this painting, as in all representations which are, so to speak, the essential made manifest, the utter invisibility of what we see is one with the invisibility of he who sees, despite mirrors, reflections, imitations, portraits. All around the scene are disposed the *signs* and the *successive forms* of the representation; but the dual relationship of the representation to its model and to its sovereign, to its author as well as to the one to whom it is offered, this relationship is necessarily disrupted (. . .) Perhaps there is, in Velázquez' painting, something akin to the representation of the classical representation, and the new definition of space which it introduces. It seeks in effect *to represent space in all its elements*, with its images, the glances to which it is offered, the faces which it renders visible, the gestures which give it birth" (p. 31).

Free of the chains of its relationship, "the representation can manifest itself as *pure representation*" (p. 31).

This fundamental text on the phenomenon of the "representation" recalls the theatrical representations to which Jean Genet invites us, with their "wheels of being and appearance, of the imaginary and of reality" (Sartre: "Saint Genet, comédien et martyr") which are the characters in his plays. We have already spoken of the theatre of Genet (9a), where all is "a game of mirrors," of lookers and looked upon, of examiners and examinees, where each representation is divided into two, making of itself a representation within a representation (and in a much more accomplished manner than in Pirandello). This is also what Foucault conveys to us in describing the Velázquez painting. In both cases we have "pure representation," but with Genet, there is this in addition: the representations which we attend (participate in) are ritual ceremonies of a sacred nature. We know that, for Genet, the ceremonial of the mass *represents* the "supreme modern drama," the true mythology of our age, with its own peculiar rites and system of symbolism: the perfect "representation."

And it is precisely "pure representation" of which the phenomenon of the "happening" consists, insofar as its objective is to express a "mythical thought." Nevertheless, "the ceremony conducted by the shaman unfolds according to a scheme which underlies a complete ritual, the unfolding of this ceremony is in strict adherence to a dogma, to a cosmogonic theory; the artist who enacts a happening, on the contrary, seeks his cosmogony in *ACTION*."

certainly conditioned by the collective subconscious which is its motivating force, but we can say that the equation man/world is an open-ended one, to which each happening brings a new and evolutionary solution (. . .) Seized by and in the happening in its raw state, *pre-verbal*, the thought is free and undistilled. "Seeking itself, it creates itself" (Lebel, "Le happening," p. 35).

This creation is achieved collectively, in and through a "spectacle," which we present to ourselves. Relations to the "classical stage" and to the "classical auditorium" have shifted, we are now undoubtedly more the "onlooker," and if we are "looked at," we are privileged to "look at" in our turn. The happening remains a "spectacle," however, a purely artistic spectacle, which expresses a "mythical thought." It is also the manifestation of a collective sacramentalization, and its ultimate objective is pure research into "new" modes of expression, the creation of a "new theatrical language." None of this changes its essential nature as "spectacle" or "representation." Jean Duvignaud stresses the ceremonial aspect of all theatrical phenomena from the opening pages of his monumental work "Sociologie du théâtre." He writes:

"The lights go up, the actors appear, the play begins. A creation of many, it is the result of a playwright's will, of the style of a director, of the interpretations of actors, and of the participation of the public. But it is above all a *ceremony* (. . .) . . . A religious service, in a mosque or in a synagogue, a celebration (. . .) are ceremonies where men *play a role* according to a scenario" (p. 7). And further on, he writes: "In the theatre, the ceremony assumes the same aspect (. . .) the participants have put on the costumes of their roles and act now according to the symbolic idea of the characters which they play, now according to a script which is imposed upon them" (p. 9).

The psychodramatic situation, however, is NOT a "spectacle," as in the traditional theatre, nor as in the happening. It is not a "representation" in the sense understood by Foucault, Genet, or Lebel. It is not a "creemony," as described by Duvignaud. As Diatkine and Gillibert write: "the strength of the psychodrama lies in associating through the "figure"—which is more than movement or the mere passage of time—the moment lived to the "presentification" by gesture, attitude, the dynamic organization of the body's "relations" (the relation of the corporal to the world). But if the psychodrama is a visible "spectacle" (specular) (10), it is intended to be visible only to the patient. His is the only glance, at once blind and clairvoyant. This visibility, developed for the patient, is visible to him only, and no one other than the patient can be affected by it. The drama of the patient can be affected by it. The drama of the patient is a *spectacle*, but one which can be fully experienced by him only. For this reason, it is not "art," it is not demonstrable as such. It cannot be exposed to the "other" eye, to another perception—that of the public—

without coming undone, destroying itself. In the dissolution of its function and its structure, it becomes intolerable (in "Psychodrame et théâtre," *Esprit*, No 5, May 1965, p. 941).

These lines, for our purpose, add a new meaning to the concept of "spectacle" and "representation": if there is spectacle in psychodrama, it can only be FOR the patient, and it is not, in any event, ART.

As a result, the psychodrama is psychotherapy (II), and that only. Its sole "function" is to heal the sick, or at the very least, to facilitate a more harmonious unfolding of inter-personal relations (sensitization to the Group Dynamic) (12) deficient in certain individuals. The psychodrama does not offer a "re-presentation," it reproduces an everyday reality experienced by the patient, who plays his own role on the stage for strictly therapeutic ends. Patients do not have to get into the skin of another person (as do actors in the theatre, who are usually victims of "histrionic neurosis," according to Moreno), nor learn a written text by heart: they enact THEIR OWN drama, a situation which they have actually experienced (or which they would like to experience in the future, or which they are currently experiencing). However, not all psychodramatic techniques consist only in a personal or collective presentation of the patient's problems. Certainly, the technique known as the "soliloquy" (where the patient performs a monologue in a low voice, improvising according to the reactions aroused by the partner with whom he plays) is the one most in use, but it is not the only one. A. Schützenberger, in her work already cited, mentions sixty classic techniques of psychodrama, but we will not discuss these in detail (cf. pp. 111-155 of the work cited).

We will limit ourselves to the three most important:

1.—The technique known as "role-reversal," in which the patient takes the place of the Other. This enables him to observe his own attitude from the outside and to put himself in the place of other people;

2.—The technique known as "mirror," in which the auxiliary ego plays on the stage the role normally assumed by the patient himself;

3.—The technique known as "double," in which the auxiliary ego takes the patient's place in the action, but at the same time as the patient, in such a manner that the latter can better define his own reaction:

"The role of the double is at the same time to actualize and to bring into the consciousness of the protagonist (the patient) sub-conscious feelings, and to help the psychodramatist to lead the protagonist along a certain path which seems to him to be beneficial. The double strives to *identify* with the principal protagonist and to express his feelings ("Précis de Psychodrame," p. 121).

Genet used these techniques (especially "role-reversal," but at the core of a spectacle constructed, written and conceived in advance) for the purpose of stressing the inter-relational and situational aspect of all human behavior. The He re-invents the world by coming into contact with it (...). His action is

roles are inverted (particularly in "The Blacks," "The Maids," "The Balcony") and at the same time their true "function" is made clear. But we should remember that Genet was in no way concerned with group psychotherapy; his principal interest was in the specifically "representational" aspect of theatre, and his aim was to convey its "sense of ceremony." Speaking of Genet's "The Screens," Kustow observes that "in many ways," (the author) achieves the qualities of Artaud's vision—violence, contrasts, illogicality, sense of ceremony—and we find that "The Screens" exercises our theatrical imagination to the limit. ("Sur les traces d'Artaud," in *Esprit*, No. 5, May 1965, p. 961).

We should also mention the study group in *institutional* psychotherapy led by Dr. Francois Tosquelles (13) (with Roger Gentis and Yves Racine), at the Hospital of Saint Alban (Lozère). Dr. Tosquelles is attempting to apply what may be called "structural analysis" to the situation of the institution-integrated patient (14). Thus, in Dr. Tosquelles' "improvised" psychodrama, the patient (and this is true especially of the schizophrenic) must be "placed again" into a parental structure, in which the MEANING of the relation between the terms "father," "mother," and "child" must appear perfectly clear to him, and brought to the surface of his consciousness. The example most often cited: the nurse represents the mother image, the doctor the father image. But in order to avoid any misinterpretation of the meaning of their *role* in the structure, any malfunction, a structural analysis of the hospital's modus operandi must first be made. The patient may then be placed in precise "social structures" in which he can see himself in relation to the other elements, or terms, of the structure. Hence the extreme importance of a structural analysis of the hospital's inner workings.

In this psychodrama the attempt is always to "bring back" all the relations which may occur between the protagonist and the auxiliary ego (or protagonist/physician) to the social level, and thence to the "symbolic positions" occupied at *the interior of the institution* by the patient (protagonist) and the psychodramatist (or the auxiliary ego, who may well be another patient, or even the nurse). We see by this that ONLY the meanings of individuals are modified (at the interior of the institution's structure) and, ultimately, their behavior.

On the other hand, Dr. Tosquelles and his team are attempting to analyze the "role of objects" in social relations (15). They have succeeded in attaching to these objects a meaning other than symbolic, a meaning clearly "imaginary." This suggests that *certain objects* can convey meaning (as a "new language") in irrational exchanges which cannot be effected verbally (verbalization is a barrier to true communication).

In conclusion, from the perspective of the "happening": certain objects "say" more, and thus "mean" more, than the language of words. Certain objects allow an exchange (at the level of the imagination) between individuals

that is much more fruitful than any that could occur through the language of words. This is a "language of non-symbolic objects."

We may sum up by saying that, for Dr. Tosquelles, the institution can be (and must be) considered as a tool, a therapeutic *instrument*. The patient, however, must not be left to congeal within a rigidly monolithic structure. His behavior can only be modified (for his recovery) to the extent that the "meaning" of the relations which the patient has entered into with authority (father, physician, institution, hospital) is itself modified. In order for this authority to appear no longer to the patients as bullying or "alienating," we must, says Dr. Tosquelles, destroy the image of "a rigid monolithic structure, in which human relations cannot occur," and replace it with an infinitely more flexible structure, which will permit the patients to progress towards recovery, not in a hospital seen as a prison, but in a hospital in which they can "feel at home."

If certain psychodramatic techniques are borrowed directly from the theatre (if there is similarity of certain structural arrangements, quite apart from any "meaning"), they do not on this account have the same "functions" (16), they have an altogether different "goal" than plastic research or the exploration of a collective unconscious (in the Jungian sense) or an archetypal one, as in certain happenings. When we ask the patient to improvise in psychodrama, this technique has nothing in common with the improvisation of participants in a happening (except perhaps, in its effects, as far as the happening is concerned, because although the intent of the authors of the happening is in no way "therapeutic," certain "happeners"—neurotics—may emerge, if not cured, at least comforted).

Lebel is well aware of this: "The principle of integration of stage and audience, the primacy of artistic creation over rational scrutiny, the importance accorded to the environment and to the ambiance—these distinguish the happening from the theatre, as well as from the psychodrama, as defined by Moreno. If the hallucinatory raw material is the same, it is not a question of reducing it into WORDS or into ARGUMENTS, but of transmuting it into IMMEDIATE VISIBLE LANGUAGE. Theatre and Psychodrama do not share the same field of action, and the happening is somewhere else again" ("Le happening," p. 62).

During the course of a recent interview which we had with Lebel, he further clarified his thought on this subject: "The happening questions the "cultural fact" itself. It is a plastic art, a visual art. The psychodrama has its therapeutic preoccupations, which we do not share."

We then asked him: "In your personal experience, can the happening not have a "therapeutic effect" on certain participants?" Lebel replied: "The happening has therapeutic effects insofar as all artistic experience may have such effects, because art seeks to express anguish. But from the beginning, and

above all, the happening seeks the maximum intensification of human sensibility. It is an experience of one's "limits," it is the free play of instincts, it is the festivity of which the theatre has lost the sense, and it is also an instrument of lasting social change."

It is significant that even in the pedagogical domain, this new audiovisual language has given rise to so much research. To mention only one study, Antoine Vallet speaks of the "pedagogy of total language"(17): "the language of *pictures* and *sounds*," he says, "burst forth with special brilliance towards the end of the 19th century, and its spread was aided by the unlimited possibilities of modern technique to the point where it rivalled *the language of words*, or at least appeared to. Whatever happened, it is obvious that modern techniques of image and of sound, assimilating the traditional means of expression—words—gave birth to a NEW LANGUAGE." (p. 36. Our underlining).

Thus, the three systems of signs: pictures, sounds, and words, overlap to form a new method of "speaking," of expressing, of communicating one with the other (and therefore, of "thinking"). For A. Vallet, the three systems of signs are not opposed, but complementary (as far as the new pedagogical method is concerned) and each system of signs "offers possibilities which the others do not possess" (p. 36). And he adds: "It is easy to see that, in certain cases, words are irreplaceable, just as in other cases, music only will do. Words have a clearness of outline, a precision, which makes them a tool for conceptual thought; pictures have a power of *suggestion* and of concrete *representation* which cannot be matched by words" (p. 36-37).

Is the new theatre (and its outer limit, the happening) not becoming more and more a language of pictures, *suggesting* ideas by lighting, the arrangement of objects, the new relationship of the spectator to the "spectacle" (which is no longer merely *presented*, inasmuch as the spectators participate actively in the spectacle in order to PLAY it together, in a group, with the author and the actors, and inasmuch as the spectacle has today become a collective affair). In other words, does the theatre of the new language (thus, the happening) not constitute an element of one of today's social phenomena, the "civilization of the picture"? (18).

We can now see more clearly the essential difference between the happening and the psychodrama.

1. The first is a "social art" (but an ART, above all, or a more or less balanced blend of different artistic modes of expression), even though in reality it eludes all attempts at definition (19). Nevertheless, it remains a "spectacle," whether it is a matter of a ceremony or of a representation (even though there is a relative identity between the "subject" of the spectacle and the "object" of the spectacle: the spectators themselves make this identity in staging the spectacle). And, as Lebel writes, "Contemporary art has long been

groping to rediscover the *magical function* once naturally assigned to it, in order to at last renew its techniques and effectively participate in the transformation of the world" (op. cit., p. 64).

2. The psychodrama is a therapy, whose immediate function is not to change the world, but to heal the sick, to improve their relations with those around them. And this is done *in an institution* (cf. Dr. Tosquelles), one which reflects the norms and laws (and prohibitions) of the industrial and bureaucratic civilization of the outside world. In other words, the function of psychodrama is to improve communication, when it is not a matter of simply making communication "possible," within a society which has itself been reconstructed. From this comes a first contradiction, at the inner core of psychodrama, but we will not attempt to analyze this contradiction.

This fundamental difference between happening and psychodrama overlies a functional opposition. The goal of the happening is to upset the existing social order, and to do this, it begins by upsetting the perceptive (and emotional) apparatus of the participants. The happening is above all, the destructurezation of the world (all must be seen anew) and hence: *disadaptation*. It is an art of social protest, it is against all stability, all mental conformity with the established order, no matter what guise this may assume. It is perpetual struggle, it is the essence of negation, and no gain, no discovery (plastic, esthetic, etc.) can be permanent. Ceaselessly transcending, it fails to integrate into itself, to assimilate what it transcends, it fails to establish a solid foundation from which to launch a new flight, to gain fresh impetus (20). It starts always from nothing, *ex nihilo*: its experiences are unique, original, and do not repeat themselves. In other words, it does not integrate that which it transcends, it does not retain any antecedent acquisition. It is always new, or, to put it better: it is a birth continually renewed, a "nascent state" (Moreno's expression)—always in a nascent state, and never once and for all *born*.

On this subject, Allan Kaprow writes in "Art News" (May 1961): "Unlike the art of the past, happenings have no structured beginning, middle, or end. Their form is open and fluid, nothing in particular is sought and consequently nothing is gained except the certainty of a certain number of occurrences, events to which we are more than ordinarily attentive. It exists only once (or only a few times), it disappears forever and others replace it."

What Lucien Goldmann calls "compartmentalized structururations" scarcely apply here. All is swept away at a stroke after each happening: it is necessary to begin again at zero, to get a fresh start, to "see" things anew. If we had absolutely to pronounce upon the state of the happening (as we are frequently asked "how is it with the theatre in France today?"), we would say that it is in a permanent state of disequilibrium, and has been so from its official beginning (in Japan) until today. But we must also add that inasmuch as its *raison d'être*, its essence, consists precisely in a perpetual *birth* (21),

then disharmony is its destiny, malfunction its lot. The happening is the "exploding theatre" par excellence. With this distinction, that it strives always to explode, that it asserts itself as explosive, that it assumes the guise of a continual explosion. At this point, the psychodrama and the currently accepted meaning of the term "theatre" (that is, the theatre which is not a happening) come together. While the self-conducting happening is perpetually against order, permanently revolutionary, psychodrama and theatre have in common the characteristic of establishing an order: "Like the theatre, the psychodrama is enacted in one place (. . .) even though it is not cut up into acts or scenes, the psychodrama respects the *temporal order*. The scansion of sequences is controlled by the director. Groups of sequences make up sessions, true units of time in the psychodramatic unfolding" (Diatkine and Gillibert, op. cit. p. 940).

Strictly speaking, we could say that the semi-institutionalized happening (and this is true even more of the fully-institutionalized happening) also respect a certain "order," imposed by the "structurants," but this is not true of the self-conducting happening, which respects none.

This does not mean, however, that it goes against the current, as there is no pre-determined "current," or in a counter-direction, because there is as yet no "direction" for its progress. This means that the self-conducting happening follows its own road, one which has not been previously laid out by anyone (or by a social norm from any well-defined SYSTEM).

Here we see the fundamental opposition to the psychodrama, whose function is precisely to *adjust* and to *adapt* the patient to the surrounding world (22). In Aristotelian catharsis, the spectators of a tragedy are made to feel intimately the passions represented by the actors, and are thus liberated, as if "purged" of their own. In the psychodrama also, the actors (and no longer the spectators), playing their own role on the stage (without a prepared scenario), "purge" themselves of the symptoms of their illness.

"In view of the fact that the fundamental drama of the murder of the father has been brought to the stage by both Sophocles and Shakespeare, we must ask ourselves whether the theatre does not have a certain *cathartic function*," write Diatkine and Gillibert (op. cit., p. 936). They add, however: "Seeing Hamlet, Oedipus Rex or Don Juan performed does not solve anyone's problems, but such spectacles provoke in each one of us an emotional modification which cannot be doubted" (p. 936).

Until now, we have dealt with "Morenian" psychodrama. It is time to say a few words on analytic psychodrama (of Diatkine, Lebovici, Anzieu, etc. . . .) which embraces the early theories of Freud and Breuer on the "cathartic method" (23). As for Moreno, in opposition to the French School of psychodrama, it is in "acting-out" (24)—the exteriorization in ACTS on the stage—that the patient will be cured. In "Fondements de la sociométrie" (p. 316), he

writes: "The old psychoanalytical couch has been appropriated for the benefit of the theatre of the spontaneous."

But Diatkine and Gillibert reply thus: "It should surprise no one that the mere playing of roles and elaboration of dramatic situations determined by unconscious phantasms is not sufficient to effect a cure. We must investigate the *nature* of these situations and of what the patient can grasp therefrom. Scenes played by the ill provide very meaningful material for therapists, but are often totally incomprehensible to the patient. How can we use these productions to allow the subject's ego to mobilize itself against, and to overcome, the defensive positions ranged against it?" (op. cit., p. 938-939).

We stated earlier that the essential function of psychodrama was one of adjustment and adaptation. We must, however, qualify this affirmation somewhat.

As G. Lapassade observes, "spontaneity is not simply energy, or will-to-live. It is also *adjustment*: it reveals itself in the ability of the new-born, who comes into the world without any model for behavior, to react to new situations, lacking an inborn savoir-faire (. . .) But while Freud saw a danger in this original deficiency, which is the basis of neurosis, Moreno sees, on the contrary, a *chance* for the species: human life will then be inventive, *creative*. Whence his formula: "the clearest manifestation of creativity is the child" ("Les fondements de la sociométrie," p. 16) ("L'entrée dans la vie," p. 98). But Lapassade adds: "After describing this behavior from the biological notion of adaptation or adjustment (25), today's psychologists, influenced essentially by Goldstein, have adopted the position of insisting upon the realization of man's *possibilities*, his creative capacities. For Goldstein, in effect, (cf. "La structure de l'organisme"), the organism which is merely adjusted is a sick organism: It is, for example, the organism of aphasiacs who, forced by their pathological deficiency to live in a "structured" milieu, limit their *range of possibilities*, avoid situations demanding inventiveness and improvisation and *adapt to a sheltered world*, without problems. The well man, on the contrary, can cope with a much more complex world, can adjust to it, *but can also modify it*." (op. cit., p. 98-99). And further on: "The goal of the psychodramatist no longer appears to be only to facilitate choices, to develop them, but to facilitate change, to have life accepted as an experience of change" (p. 106).

"The psychodramatist undertakes to liberate the adult by causing him to rediscover his *spontaneity* and his *creativity*, which are from birth the true characteristics of human infancy. In short, for Moreno, to learn to live is to learn to be born" (p. 108).

We can now understand why Marc'O affirmed that his institutionalized happenings were appreciated and "felt" (the term "understood" is avoided, as this suggests the use of the intellect, which has no place in a happening) most

of all by a public consisting of child-participants. Their spontaneity and creativity are given free rein in his first type of happening, solicited "through the nerves and through the senses" (Artaud). Without social obligations of any kind, children are thus capable of spontaneity and of creativity.

Let us conclude by observing that it is true that, upon analysis, the happening and the psychodrama are seen to be fundamentally opposed in their functions, in that the former has essentially artistic preoccupations while the latter's concerns are exclusively therapeutic, aiming at the adjustment of the patient to his social environment, as well as his adaptation to the predetermined role defining the culture in which he finds himself. However, and to the extent that, as Lapassade writes, "on the psychodramatic stage, man lives, far from the gods, his solitude and the complications of his relations with others" (op. cit., p. 111), it remains possible to find a common denominator for these two phenomena. For, while it is true that the psychodramatist is a stranger to all artistic pretensions, it is no less true that both happening and psychodrama (insofar as the latter's motto is "to be normal is to be normative," as Canguilhem writes (26), which is to say that the healthy man's task no longer consists merely in adjusting to a world which has become excessively complex, but also to CHANGE it) are fundamentally concerned with changing prevailing conditions. The happening would transform the world (using its own methods), while the psychodrama claims not only to adapt patients to the socio-cultural norm in which they live, but also proposes that, by a dialectic process, man can modify his relations with the world by modifying the latter and by modifying himself.

They also have in common the fact that the psychodramatic phenomenon, like the happening, aims:

1. to awaken the child in the adult (psychodrama).
2. to awaken the archetypes buried in the collective unconscious of humanity (happening).
3. to rediscover "spontaneity" (or a state of clairvoyance) through the "cultural preserves" of which Moreno spoke.
4. to free men from their chains (whether psychopathological in nature, socio-cultural or socio-economic) by helping them to regain the creativity which was theirs at birth, and which they have developed, with greater or lesser success, throughout their childhood (27).

We have decided that, in order not to burden this work unnecessarily, we will not enter into great detail concerning the differences between Morenian and analytical psychodrama (28). It seems to us useful, however, to cite one of the essential differences between these two kinds of psychodrama. Although, in the main, the dramatic techniques are similar in both cases, "for Moreno TO ACT is, for the patient, a great forward step. In classical analysis, on the other hand, acting-out or acting-in is considered as a sign of resistance,

indicative of regression" (in "Bilan de dix ans de thérapeutique par le psychodrame chez l'enfant et chez l'adolescent," by Lebovici, Diatkine and Kes-temberg, p. 91).

As we have previously stated, Moreno sacrifices transference analysis in the psychodrama, while analytical psychodrama incorporates it into its corpus of analyses.

"It is thus that, in addition to the transfer, we have been able to study in the same movement the dramatic expression of defense mechanisms. The general course of the treatment is, naturally, modified" (Lebovici et al., op. cit., p. 65).

As for spontaneity, they believe it is achieved when the "actors" are natural, when they have succeeded in forgetting that they are acting. The psychodramatists are "non-directive," contrary to Morenian procedure (Moreno is willingly "directive," preparing the patient before the session, afterwards commenting to the patient thereon, etc.). In the same manner, the technique called "role-reversal" (of which we have already spoken), or that called "double," is here never *imposed* on the patient. He is always free to use them whenever he feels the need. We should point out that this is also the technique employed by Lily Herbert in her "T-groups": "role-playing" or "role-reversal" are never imposed by the "leader," they are left to the initiative of the members of the group.

In short, it is syncretism of these techniques which accounts for the symbolic efficacy of analytical psychodrama.

As D. Anzieu and Testemale-Monod write: "The psychodramatist enters into the dramatic action to get it started and to bend it, not to submit to it. He plays the game, but without allowing their game to be imposed upon him by those whose re-adaptation is in his charge" ("Le psychodrame," p. 73).

This is a clear statement that the unique function of psychodrama is, like classical Freudian analysis, to "re-adapt" the patient: psychodramatists "in-flect" the dramatic action in one sense or another, according to the needs of the situation. They are not against analysis *during the unfolding* of the psychodrama, quite the contrary. Consequently, the observations and comparisons which we made earlier apply much more to Morenian psychodrama, in its relations with the semi-institutionalized happening. For in Morenian psychodrama, it is the "cure by words" which is criticized above all, in favor of the "cure by action" (even though Moreno never confined his techniques to the latter type of "cure") just as in the happening (even though the "cure" is never spoken of here).

"Moreno is sensitive to the spectacle (29), to seething emotions. Order is unknown, he will not take the time to respect it, the time necessary to understand it. If the secrets do not reveal themselves of their own volition, he knows how to FORCE them to do so. If emotions do not externalize

themselves, he will heat them white-hot until they explode. We sense that his technique consists in rendering the subject no longer capable of resisting . . ." writes Anzieu (op. cit., p. 72).

This observation could be applied in every particular to the semi-institutionalized happening. We have seen how the spectator feels "drained" (nerves shattered, resistance nil) when emerging from the temple where the ceremony of the "happening" has been celebrated. It will be understood, then, why we advanced the hypothesis that this type of happening belongs more (structurally)—the "cure" set aside—to Morenian psychodrama than to analytical psychodrama. For we have seen that a semi-institutionalized happening does not stop "on the way" to "make a point" (or to interpret that which has just transpired), it unreels itself, it is, it happens, it takes place, and that is all. Its ultimate goal is to create imbalance, to destroy the perceptual apparatus. Interpretation, if there is any, is made at home, alone (or in small groups).

In our opinion, it is the last type of happening, the most rarely practiced, the self-conducted happening, which is associated with the analytical psychodrama, to the extent that the latter is an ever-reiterated interpretation of the dramatic situation (of that which occurs "here and now") which is the rule of the "game": all new relations which are established between the analytical team (the "staff") and the patients are neither entirely symbolic, nor entirely real. But they are really *lived*, and consequently, must always be interpreted along with the unfolding of the psychodramatic situation and the relations which it generates between the "stage" (the patients) and the "auditorium" (the analysts and their aides).

In these conditions, the self-conducted happening, in its constant concern with stopping the "game" to "make a point" and to "interpret" (30), approaches, structurally, analytical psychodrama—leaving aside the "cure." "The game, like language, is the product of the pulsations and of what clinical psychoanalysis calls the mechanisms of the self; herein lies its great therapeutic value" (Lebovici et al., op. cit., p. 69).

For these psychodramatists, the dramatic situation created on the stage must be analyzed systematically, resulting in a restructuring of the fragmented personality of the patient. All psychodrama does not consist merely in Morenian "acting-out," therefore, since this alone cannot effect a cure. The "catharsis of integration" of which Moreno speaks does not seem to satisfy French writers: they feel that true psychotherapy can be achieved only by adding analytical interpretation, during and after the session, to the "acting-out" which Moreno claims can enable the patient "to find himself, to reorganize himself, to gather together the elements which have been scattered by insidious forces, and to integrate them." ("Fondements de la sociométrie," p. 38). The self-conducted happening would also add interpretation to "acting-

out," but with the notable difference that everyone involved is at the same time participant and analyst—there are no specializing analysts. There are no privileged individuals, no one "runs the show," no one has the "status" of psychodramatist, of monitor, of psychoanalyst, or even of leading actor. All participants in a self-conducted happening instantly become psychoanalysts (or psychodramatists) and all possess, from the beginning, the same inalienable status.

Before ending this chapter, and by way of conclusion, we quote a few extracts from the study made by Diatkine and Gillibert on the relation between the psychodrama and the theatre. This study does not concern itself with the problem which we have discussed: the relation of the psychodrama to that very special form of the theatre of new language which is the happening. It does, however, provide the interest of a general discussion of an area heretofore largely ignored.

The authors begin by asking:—"What then is this special language which the psychodrama uses and which can, with *words only*, make clear to the patient what could only be imparted by entering into the aberrations of what Freud called, justifiably, "wild analysis"? Can the study of this means of communication shed some light on our understanding of the theatre?" (op. cit., p. 932).

Recalling the importance of the audience to Moreno (in his theatre at Beacon, in the U.S., there was a "public" which observed the progress of the psychodrama and reacted to this so-called "spectacle"), the authors air their own views on this subject: "In analytical psychodrama, the distinction between actors and spectators is more subtle. Each plays both an active and a passive role in the drama. There is neither script nor author, patients and therapists improvise, but the actors are simultaneously author and public" (p. 932).

If we ignore the typically psychodramatic distinction between "patients" and therapists," we are left only with participants seeking to create in common a new theatrical language, a fresh outlook on the "spectacle" (and here it is a "spectacle"), and to establish new relations with what was in traditional theatre a "scene." We find ourselves, then, right at the center of the happening, if not fully self-conducted, at least semi-institutionalized (31).

Elsewhere, the authors observe: "The therapists are immediately plunged into a milieu as yet unknown to them: that of the "imago" and of the subject's unconscious phantasms" (p. 933).

For in the happening, everyone is mingled in the same spectacle, in the same "theatricality" created here and now by each of the participants, who are neither patients (at least their beginning "status" is not such) nor professional analysts (the same applies); it is not a question of exploring the unconscious phantasms of each participant, or of externalizing their neurosis

on the stage in order to cure it, but uniquely to encourage in the group the explosion of a primal spontaneity and creativity, the expression of forgotten archetypes, buried in the collective unconscious of man. The happening is, ultimately, a collective exorcism, bringing to the surface, through certain artistic procedures, that which industrial civilization (where reification is the law) and the socio-cultural "plus-value" has pushed deep into man's unconscious. The happening is thus a "recovery" operation.

As for the relations between analytical psychodrama and the self-conducted happening, Diatkine and Gillibert, without once mentioning the word "happening," suggest them to us in the following lines: the psychodrama is a theatre without art, "the fruit of a continuous creation of the patient and the therapist. No one knows what the next reply or gesture will be. This spontaneous reaction acted out in a play gives the psychodrama its authenticity. The patient and the therapist may choose not to say or to do what the others expect of them. This is essentially opposed to the dramatic presentation (32), where speech and gesture are rigidly controlled (. . .) The same words, the same gestures lose their meaning in any other context (. . .) The psychodramatic unfolding is fully meaningful only to those who live the very special adventure which is a psychotherapeutic cure. It is as a function of a *global unfolding* that what is spoken and acted out becomes meaningful (. . .) A chance spectator would not understand why it is remarkable that the patient should speak certain words or move away from or approach this or that person. He would see only awkward movements and stammering (. . .) In the psychodrama, there is an intimate dialogue where each participant ends by understanding, from the slightest word or gesture, what the other wishes to convey. The content of this dialogue (33) is not communicable to outsiders—psychodrama is not an art form" (pp. 934-935).

One would suppose that these lines were written about the self-conducted happening, but with this important difference: the happening is not a therapy. And, while it is not communicable to the casual onlooker, being a phenomenon which demands the total participation (spontaneous and creative at once) of all concerned, it nevertheless remains, above all, an ART: an art which runs counter to the currently accepted idea of the artistic phenomenon, a counter-art, in the sense in which Ionesco wrote his "anti-plays" in the 1950's as a rightful protest against the "plays" of that era.

Ionesco's anti-plays are today the classical plays of the theatre of the new language. It may well come to pass that the counter-art of the happening will become the new theatrical language of tomorrow.

Diatkine and Gillibert observe that the world of the theatre could gain a whole new approach to its art from the psychodrama, not by merely attending psychodramas, *but by re-immersing itself into that primitive zone of the relation of the phantasmic to the corporal*" (op. cit., p. 942).

Is this not precisely what the happening attempts to accomplish? Is this not wherein lie its researches, still experimental, it is true, but paving the way for the theatre of the future?

This "theatre of shadow and substance," of which Diatkine and Gillibert speak, "where the participation of all its members is total, where the group dissolves when one of its members no longer feels the need to participate, to take part," this "theatre without performances (at least in principle) where only the dramatic unfolding of a new language takes place" (op. cit., p. 942), is it not this of which the happening is the forerunner?

NOTES

1. Cf. the transcription of her lecture of August 20, 1966 at the second International Congress of Psychodrama (Barcelona).
2. The relations between psychodrama and commedia dell'arte, which form the origin of the happening, are here made evident, from the point of view of "construction" (this note is our own).
3. Moreno reminds us that the word "drama" is transposed literally from the Greek, which means ACTION or ACCOMPLISHMENT (in "Fondements de la Sociométrie" p. 35. This book is the French translation of "Who Shall Survive?", Beacon House Inc., N.Y., 1953). And "psychodrama" (from the Greek) breaks down into psycho (the soul) and drama (action, accomplishment).
- 3a. *Le théâtre du nouveau langage*, by Gilbert Tarrab, 2 volumes, le Cercle du Livre de France, Montréal, 1973-74, 620 pages.
4. The "encounter" means, for Moreno, that "two people are not only TOGETHER, but equally and above all they LIVE within each other, each apprehending the other's feelings with all his being" (cf. the interview accorded to us by Moreno in August 1966, published in *le Bulletin de Psychologie*, Paris, December 1966, 254 XX, 5, pp. 273-275. Cf. also page 2 of his speech "Fonctions des universells; temps, espace, Réalité et cosmos" (Barcelona).
5. Cf. "Les deux sources de la morale et de la religion" by Bergson.
6. Cf. the complete account of this interview appearing in "Le Bulletin de Psychologie," Paris, December 1966, 254, XX, 5, pp. 275-275 in particular.
7. We revert here to Moreno's OWN TERMS which he used during the course of the interview.
8. Cf. on this subject "La notion de rôle en psychologie sociale," by A. M. Rocheblave-Spenlé (PUF, Paris, 1962).
9. From "hystrión": bad actor. Such well-known actors as John Barrymore, John Garfield, Peter Lorre, Franchot Tone, Joan Crawford, John Garfield, et al. . . . were treated psychodramatically by Moreno.
- 9a. See our "Le théâtre du nouveau langage," Volume I.
10. Specular: a visual hallucination, in which the subject sees his own image as in a mirror.
11. "Although it is widely used in pedagogy and in human relations training, the psychodrama is ESSENTIALLY a therapeutic instrument." (A. Schützenberger: "Précis de psychodrame" p. 13. Underlining is the author's.) Elsewhere: "The psychodrama is always at the same time therapeutic and pedagogical, but the accent may be placed on profound therapy or on pedagogy." (op. cit. p. 32).
12. Cf. on this subject the studies of P. H. Maucois and R. Bassoul on empathy in "Empathies et connaissance d'autrui." Cf. also our work "Mythes et symboles en dynamique de groupe," Bordas, Paris and Aquila, Montréal, 1971, 220 pages.
13. The psychiatrists working with Dr. Tosquelles are part of the "Getepsy."

14. Cf. his intervention at the Second International Congress of Psychodrama (Barcelona). We base ourselves also on a personal communication which he made to us.
us.
15. We here rejoin certain themes pertinent to the happening.
16. "The theatre is not a therapeutic, but a celebration accompanied by a state of joy hardly to be replaced. To see "l'Avare" performed has never made anyone less avaricious. But it can satisfy those who find the egoism of their parents insupportable and help them to feel less alone" (Diatkine and Gillibert, "Psychodrame et Théâtre" p. 936).
17. Cf. his article: "Du ciné-club à la pédagogie du langage total," appearing in the magazine "Etudes" (July-August 1966), pp. 31-45.
18. From the title of Michel FARIN'S article: "L'emprise des images: civilisation de l'image?" (in "Etudes," July-August 1966, pp. 5-17).
19. We certainly cannot subscribe, under the conditions imposed of admitting that the happening is also an art of the avant-garde, to these lines written by B. DORT in 1956 in "Théâtre populaire": "The true function of the avant-garde (...) is a therapeutic one. Whether emptying the stage or revealing the crowded condition of the stage, it detaches the spectator therefrom. It disrupts the *organic unity* of stage and hall which was the source of the certainty and of the common values of an older world. It restores the spectacle to its condition of SOMETHING SEEN, of something to be looked at" ("L'avant-garde en suspens," in "Théâtre Populaire," No. 18, May 1956, p. 47). Now, we have seen that the true "function" of the happening (in the structuro-functional sense) cannot be therapeutic. And furthermore, if it is true that this function "restores the *spectacle* to its condition of something seen," the fact remains that those who watch the spectacle are at the same time, and in the same movement, *seen* by others; in other words, the spectacle is "something to see," it is true, but it is the spectator-participants who are at once subjects and objects of their own regard. Therefore, far from "disrupting the organic unity of stage and hall" (Dort), the function of the happening consists precisely in involving the spectator IN the spectacle, in placing the hall in the stage and the stage in the hall, in such a way that the spectator is himself his own "spectacle," at the same time being a spectacle for others, because in the final analysis, the happening is a *collectively* improvised spectacle.
20. We know that Hegel's "Aufhebung" is defined as a transcendence which is never *suppression* of the previous state, but a fulfillment, a flowering, encompassing the integration of that which is at once transcended and conserved. This "dialectic" process of development has no relation to the happening. Art (and the happening is an *art*) as H. Marcuse so aptly observes, "survives only where it denies itself, where it saves its substance in denying its traditional form, and thereby denying reconciliation; where it becomes surrealist and atonal" (*Eros and Civilization*, p. 132). But also: "The dual function of art is at the same time to oppose and to reconcile, to denounce and to acquit, to allow to burst forth what is repressed and to repress it again, in a purified form." (op. cit., p. 132).
21. We can say that, like man, the happening is essentially *incompleteness* cf. G. Lapassade: "L'entrée dans la vie. Essai sur *l'inachèvement de l'homme*," Ed. de Minuit, Paris).
22. In the psychodrama, there is being introduced progressively "a new organization, thanks to which the subject seems to be brought out of his *chaos*, to free himself from his shackles, to recover his energy, frittered away in useless pursuits. Owing to the action of the various personages introduced into his intimate drama, the complex puzzle of his identifications begins to resolve itself." (Diatkine and Gillibert, op. cit., p. 940).
23. Catharsis, from the Greek: "Katharos," pure. A. Schützenberger defines it thus: "It is a relief after a state of extreme tension, a seething, an emotional peak accompanied by a breakdown of resistance, a thawing of sentiments, an expulsion of dross resulting in a liberation from the past and a modification, from which point a

- reconstruction is possible, with abreaction, and a threshold is crossed (. . .) The catharsis is thus a total or partial relaxation (. . .) Moreno distinguishes the catharsis of abreaction from the catharsis of integration (total catharsis from partial catharsis), the *psychic catharsis* of the actor in the spontaneous personal drama of psychodrama (even more than that of the participants in the audience) from *mental catharsis*: the individual, placed on the road to a "total life," frees himself from and purges himself of a cultural or mental syndrome" (op. cit., p. 184-186. Underlining is the author's).
24. Acting-out: a procedure whereby the transfer expresses itself *outside* the therapeutic situation, according to the analytical school of psychodrama.
 25. We here point out to the reader the fact that Lapassade does not differentiate between the phenomena of adaptation and adjustment. Now, we know that from the psycho-sociological point of view, adjustment is the process by which a behavior or an attitude transforms itself in order to conform more closely to the requirements of the social order, whether it is a matter of seeking a partner, or of the more or less implicit requirements of an institution, or even of the rules of an organization. In other words, it is the transition from an unrestricted behavior to a behavior which becomes more and more restricted, and this is one of the goals towards which the psychodrama is moving. Whereas adaptation is the behavior of an individual or of a group who have succeeded in overcoming or in significantly reducing the tensions inherent in a given situation. Whence: adjustment is the degree of precision to which individuals have progressed in adapting themselves to the pre-determined roles which define a culture.
 26. Cited by Lapassade, p. 99. Cf. "Essai sur quelques problèmes concernant le normal et le pathologique," by C. CANGUILHEM.
 27. Anzieu observes, in "Le psychodrame analytique chez l'enfant": "All has transpired as though Moreno had undertaken to re-invent the notion of the unconscious using the term 'spontaneity' " (p. 23).
 28. Analytical psychodrama, as we know, is applied in particular to child and adolescent therapy.
 29. We have seen previously that in a psychodrama, of whatever type, there cannot be any question of a "spectacle."
 30. We have stated that these interpretive sessions occur *in general* after the conclusion of the happening, but it frequently takes place "right in the middle" of a happening. It is well to remember that there are no rules here, that we are searching, experimenting. This is in contrast to analytical hermeneutics, where certain rules must be strictly observed.
 31. In all which follows, we shall deal only with the last two types of happening.
 32. We should add "classical," since the authors do not have in mind here the phenomenon "happening." There is a valid opposition between psychodrama and happening, but this opposition is *functional* only (psychodrama and happening having different AIMS), the procedures used in each case being largely similar (but not seeking the same *goal*).
 33. Even if this dialogue is entirely mimed, as in certain self-conducted happenings; for the dialogue of gestures is, precisely, one of the elements of the new language of the theatre.