

## PSYCHODRAMA, SOCIODRAMA AND SPONTANEITY TRAINING

If we should merely have succeeded in adjusting each individual to every possible group within the fold of the given institution, this would still not be a guarantee for an adjustment later in the community at large. The perplexing problem of a community like Hudson is the necessity of returning its population, after a period of training, from a given environment to a more complex environment. Theoretically we could imagine a solution in the idea of conditioning the individual through placing him successively into many environments to learn through trial and error. These environments, however, may not always be available; or, again, incorrigible habits may develop. Yet, in want of a manifold of natural environments we can resort to the creating of *experimental* environments, and in want of a manifold of living roles we can resort to fictitious roles which are brought as close as possible to the living ones. To accomplish this aim we have developed techniques for “training social spontaneity.”

The problem can be looked at also from another angle: the more similar the set-up of a closed community to that of the community outside the more it will be a reality test. Therefore, the better defined the social reality, the better we will be able to define the techniques necessary to attain potential preparation for it in Hudson. But the difficulty starts right here. We have no means whereby to define with any amount of precision this reality to which the individuals return. We have been able, through the sociometric test, to obtain a good idea of the psychological reality, Hudson. For us who have made this sociometric study, Hudson is the known, the world the unknown. We have gained a criterion for measuring the success in adjustment of an individual here, but we have no criterion as yet to predict whether an adjustment to the community at large will or will not be successful—more especially since the set-up of Hudson, in which the social and work situations into which the individuals may enter are limited in number and readily definable, is so relatively simple compared to that of the community at large. If the world were of as comparatively rigid a structure as we imagine society was in the Middle Ages, then we could preview the social and vocational

situations, their number and character, for which the individuals have to be trained. But today these situations differ from country to country, often from state to state, and undergo transformation within a few years, even within the same town. It is a reality which does not remain stationary, a changing reality. The technological process destroys well accredited vocations with new inventions and develops new ones. While inconformity with the law is technically sufficient to define an act as antisocial, this is no criterion for deciding whether or not an individual has attained successful adjustment to the persons in his community.

The trend towards greater complexity and differentiation reflects not only upon the social and vocational situations but also upon the instinctual drives of man, particularly upon the sexual and parental impulses. And it is for failure to command these impulses to the advantage of the individual and the kind that the majority of the population of women's institutions are committed. The fact that they are sent to institutions is irrelevant. The problem would be the same in any case. Regardless of whether they have transgressed the law or not, these girls have in common with many others who remain unapprehended, that they develop a comparatively larger emotional expansiveness in reference to sex than to other criteria, without, at the same time, being able to direct their emotions. As the difficulties arise in relation to the other sex, the problem is one of emotional learning: how to behave towards the other sex. But for this particular problem in adjustment no therapeutic approach exists either in our institutions or other schools.

Two conclusions can be drawn, however, from the psychological reality of the community outside and the equipment required for an individual who meets these demands adequately. The first conclusion is a negative one. The lack of fixed vocations and their transitory character, the impermanence of the social situations and the constant uprising of new varieties make it unwise to take these as a criterion around which to construct a program of training. The second conclusion is based upon sociometric studies as far as they have been made to date in the community at large. Social groups have a definite organization in respect to the age levels of their members and to the criterion of the particular collective in which they participate; the position of an individual in

a group which has one kind of organization is a means by which to prognosticate the position he will attain in groups of a like or closely similar organization.

But successful adjustment to a plurality of environments requires a flexible, spontaneous personality make-up. The question then arises how such a personality make-up can be achieved and what attributes this personality requires. The objectives of our systems of education in the past have been to train man for a series of rigid social situations and for a series of rigid vocations. The roads through which the individual had to travel were given. Development or perfection could be obtained only within these dogmatic and clear-cut boundaries. Outside of these were chaos and disintegration. But within the last century a change has taken place. This change did not move from the old dogmatic situation to a new dogmatic situation, but to one of flux and uncertainty. The argument has been raised that the cause of this development is the industrial revolution and that the remedy lies in halting the progress of the machine, or, again, that the cause lies in a perversion of man's instincts and the remedy in a return to a more primitive civilization. But another point of view can be taken: that *man is resourceful enough to become more highly differentiated and more flexible in accord with a more highly differentiated and more flexible form of society which, as it appears, is in the making.*

We had observed in the case of Elsa TL that the spontaneity testing was accompanied by a by-product: the attitude of many members of her group towards her underwent a modification although no other effort had been made except the placing of the members into experimental situations to act with her. As it appeared, during these acts Elsa was stimulated to uncover aspects of her personality which she had not had an opportunity to reveal in the disciplined course of cottage life, and likewise the other members of the acting group had an opportunity to uncover towards Elsa aspects of their personalities which had remained hidden or little displayed. The suggestion arose out of these observations to supplement the routine group life through activities in experimental play situations, giving the members of the group a chance to act in a variety of functions and rôles and enabling them to release and shape their interests. Through this medium it was

possible to make each member of the group, the interrelations among the members, and the group as a whole more flexible. The conflicts of the actual family constellation and of love and business relations, etc., were lacking in this community. We introduced precisely such situations as might arise in relations of this sort in order that conduct in these situations might be improved through incorporating functions relating to them into plays. In this manner we provided a means to offset and fulfill the lacks intrinsic to a closed community.

The individuals chose the situations and the rôles in which they wanted to act, and the partners whom they wanted to act opposite them in a certain rôle, or they reversed the rôles they had in life, or they were placed in selected situations. As the acting was pure improvisation, the performance was a yardstick of how they might perform in life situations. But whereas conduct in a life situation is irrevocable, here every phase of the performance is open to correction through criticism made by the other participants, the instructor and the subject himself. Thus a technique for learning to differentiate in action behavior patterns which may have been inadequate at the start is made available to the individual and to the group. We found it advisable to construct the situations in such a manner as to resemble as closely as possible the position the individual expects to assume in the community outside. For instance, if the individual receives training in a specific vocation, she is placed in a variety of situations which might arise in this vocation.

Social life has the tendency to attach a definite rôle to a specific person so that this rôle becomes the prevailing one into which the individual is folded. Anxiety, fear, resentment, or feelings of difference and distinction are often increased by this condition and the accruing strains and tensions reflect into the group life. They can, however, be reduced through the release and training provided by skillful guidance of the individuals in the performance of play situations.

Many things which one girl would not tell another or the housemother in life she may act out in a play, and the humor of it may prevent and heal many potential grievances which might otherwise have led to actual conflict. And there is another aspect

which is the more important the more rigidly differentiated social life is. *Everybody is expected to live up to his official rôle in life—a teacher is to act as a teacher, a pupil as a pupil, and so forth. But the individual craves to embody far more rôles than those he is allowed to act out in life and even one or more varieties within the same rôle. Every individual is filled with different rôles which he wants to become active in and that are present in him in different stages of development. It is from the active pressure which these multiple individual units exert upon the manifest official rôle that a feeling of anxiety is often produced.*

The method has numerous advantages compared with training in adjustment through actual life experiences, particularly for the individual in the formative stages. First, in actual life situations an individual often has difficulty in learning from a mistake due to the earnestness of the situation. In his anxiety he may repeat such error when a similar occasion occurs, thus retarding his learning to overcome it. Second, for many individuals actual life situations encourage an emotional inertia if the performance is successful in a given rôle, and more is not demanded. Third, actual life situations, even if these develop an individual to the point of fitting perfectly into a certain rôle, they make him single-tracked and exclude from his horizon other varieties of situations and vocations. As a *developmental* technique Spontaneity Training is thus superior to life training. Through training of individuals for conduct in possibly arising situations, in a variety of rôles and functions they may have to assume towards a variety of persons in the possible rôles they may assume, the subject learns to meet life situations more adequately. The training makes him more resourceful and versatile. The possibility can be envisioned of directing man's evolution with the aid of "Stegreif" (spontaneity) techniques into avenues which differentiate and enlarge the spontaneous base of his heritage, his ability to be spontaneous, his "spontaneability." Spontaneity research has disclosed that spontaneity is not a mystic and irrational factor, but a capacity with which all men are endowed and which can be tested and trained. The problem of learning becomes one of not inducing and conserving habits but to train spontaneity, to train and develop man to the habit of spontaneity. These considerations have led me to the development of a "spontaneity theory of learning."

A series of life situations calling for the embodiment of specific states and rôles is constructed. This series is not arbitrary but organized upon the basis of the findings of the sociometric and Spontaneity Tests in relation to the specific individual under training. Each of the situation-patterns is constructed through several phases ranging from the simplest possible form of a given situation-pattern through the more complex forms to the most highly differentiated, all carefully graduated according to the requirements of the subject. Hence *the subject is trained through acting in the simplest of rôles in any specific situation-pattern through several degrees of differentiation of the same situation-pattern until he can command the pattern adequately*. As in life the individual must perform in many situation-patterns, Spontaneity Training must also include not only many varieties of any single situation-pattern but many different situation-patterns.

An example of how such training is graduated to develop and sustain a specific attitude in a given rôle in several varieties of the same situation-pattern is as follows: For instance, in the first stage the subject produces the attitude of sympathy towards another individual. In the second stage he has to produce the same attitude in a rôle in which he has to command a certain function, for instance, the rôle of a salesperson in a dress shop and in relation to certain things, dresses. In the next stage, the subject has to produce the same attitude in the same rôle as above but in a situation selected by the instructor, as selling dresses to a business-like and ready customer. In a later stage, the task is further differentiated. The subject produces the same attitude and in the same rôle but the instructor selects a customer who is to act resentful and argumentative. The task of the subject is to sustain the cheerful, sympathetic attitude in the face of such resistance. The differentiation of this pattern can be further elaborated in accord with the ability and progress of the subject.

In some phases of the training in which the situation, his own rôle and the partners are selected by the subject, the position of the instructor is that of a critical observer. But in the process of graduated training the part of the instructor becomes more active. One of the most important problems is then *how to get the subject started*. The instructor may have arrived at certain conclusions

in respect to what kind of roles the subject is deficient in and what kind of persons he needs to adjust to. He constructs situations in which the subject is to act in a certain rôle opposite one or more persons. In the instructor's mind the pattern of this situation, the details of arrangement, and particularly the rôle the subject should act, gain a definite, clear form. The instructor is thus himself warmed up to the state and rôle he realizes needs to be embodied by the subject. In this condition the instructor discloses to the subject the rôle to be acted by him. This procedure wherein the instructor transfers to the subject the rôle and the possible form it may take is called the *Act of Warming Up*. The value of the training depends partly upon the impression which the act makes on the subject and upon the clarity of the thought which formulated the rôle. The Act of Warming Up itself has only the significance of providing a "starter." The rest of the procedure remains the production of the subject and co-actors.

Another important phase of the training is an analysis *immediately* following the action. This may reveal that an act was successfully but too hastily embodied, perhaps because the subject was too anxious to succeed, warming up too early, jerking while in the state and jumping into higher levels. Such a spontaneity state can be called "overheated". It may reveal the inability of the subject to produce a state demanded of him and can therefore be called "rudimentary". Or it may reveal the inability of the subject to stop, to *finish* the act, that is, to finish it in accord with the demands of the situation. It may reveal the anxiety of the subject to be in the lead all the time, unwilling or unable to collaborate with a partner in a given situation-pattern. Again, it may reveal the inability of the subject to coordinate his bodily movements of arms, legs, etc., to his verbal expressions and to the bodily and verbal expressions of his partners. Or it may reveal the lack of factual information in respect to the matters which are brought to expression in the course of the situations acted. These and other analytic findings may have a bearing upon the next situation and rôle to be selected for the subject, and are also an indication of the progress he has made in the training.

## SPONTANEITY THEORY OF LEARNING

As the training of spontaneity states and not the learning of contents is the objective, the attempt is made to loosen the fixed associations between states and contents as they have become established in the course of education by traditional method. Emphasis upon contents results in the split of the individual into an *act* personality and a *content* personality. We found it a valuable hypothesis to assume that two different memory centers develop, an *act center* and a *content center* which exist in general as separate structures without connection. A content is received in a dull, untuned state, an act in a highly heated state; our hypothesis is that they trace different paths in the nervous system. They are not received at the same moment. In consequence they do not recur simultaneously, filling one moment, uniting the entire personality with one action, but at different times, separated from each other. The material learned does not reach the act-center of personality. A shut-in memory develops and prevents the integration of the factual knowledge into the active personality of the individual. The knowledge remains undigested, unabsorbed by the personality and hinders its full influence upon his activity and judgment. But in actual life situations the supreme desideratum is exactly this facility of integration.

There is another problem arising in the course of mental growth which has to be considered. An individual may begin any specific activity with improvisation. But the more often improvisations around that complex are produced, the more the tendency develops in the individual to pick out from past efforts the best actions, gestures, thoughts and phrases, in other words, to improvise less and less and to develop more and more a safe and organized anchorage. He is then able to forsake improvisation entirely in relation to this specific complex and to rely upon the censured and recensored product of his improvisations, that is, upon a "content". Spontaneous production was merely a starting form of the process which in the end turned into a finished product, a content which later became *sacred* through repetition. The effort at spontaneity is no longer necessary; it becomes rudimentary and dies out. Therefore, the objective of a spontaneity theory of learning is to develop and sustain a spontaneous and flexible per-



sonality make-up. A technique of Spontaneity Training as described has to come to the rescue to offset the resignation and inertia of the individual.

It has been observed that when soldiers return from war in a foreign land they can be divided into two groups: in one group are those men who have gone far towards mastering the foreign language and in the other are those who have remained almost entirely in ignorance of it. I have made the observation on a small sample that this fact has little to do with the intelligence of the men. While a man of superior intelligence returns ignorant of the language a less intelligent man may have attained a remarkable command of it. The freshness and originality of his speech is frequently surprising. Inquiry has revealed that these men have gone through some intensive emotional experience, for instance, falling in love. It appeared that it is not the emotional experience itself but certain processes accompanying it which account for the greater facility of this group over the former in acquiring the language.

Every one of us realizes the relative availability and presentness of various facets of his knowledge. The question remains why certain knowledge is immediately at hand and other knowledge which we have struggled equally hard or harder to attain is always slipping away when most needed? There are several theories which have tried to explain this process, the one is the theory of conditioning, the other the theory of repression. But there is one hypothesis which has been neglected, that is that among other factors, learning is affected by the rising and falling of the spontaneous states in the learner.

In order to illustrate our hypothesis we may refer again to the learning of a foreign language in the case of our group of soldiers. Some men, ignorant of the new language, tried to learn it in a popularly accepted way, that is, by using a text book, memorizing words and phrases and trying to retain characteristic idioms of speech. In other words, their learning took place when they were poorly warmed up, in states of low spontaneity. However, when they were deeply involved in a life situation, in a highly heated state and had to deliver some of the phrases they had learned, their memories did not function adequately in the sudden need of the

moment. According to spontaneity hypothesis it is assumed that learning connected with highly warmed up states establishes special associations. Contents of learning which enter the mind connected with highly warmed up states recur more easily with the recurrence of similarly warmed up states. On the other hand, contents of learning which enter the mind associated with untuned, unemotional cold states tend to recur with these and not with highly warmed up states. We assume that also between these states special or close associations exist. The man who failed to use the foreign language well had to deliver it while functioning as an actor; at the time when he acquired it, however, he was in the behavior of a more or less passive recipient, interpersonally uninvolved. He did not have the emotional experience of the man who learned it in an interpersonal situation and who was therefore able to apply it more effectively to other interpersonal situations. The latter had learned to speak it in an exciting way, therefore his conversation, when required, however faulty, was keyed to an emotional pitch. Interpersonal situations as love relations are, as a matter of course, accompanied by intensively heated states. Every word and phrase exchanged in these states remain associated with them. The contents enter the mind when the subject is in the behavior of acting. Later, when he is anxious to use them in emotional situations again, they recur spontaneously, connected with the present acts. Since he began by receiving contents in a spontaneous activity, he could finish by delivering them as a spontaneous expression. This way of learning not only increases his knowledge but shapes and gives more unity to his personality; his learning becomes essentially connected and integrated with his acts, not apart from them.

#### THE OPERATION

Spontaneous operation refers to the actions taken by the learner in the moment of learning. If the moment is not completely encountered and lived some residua of the spontaneity in action may result and block the learner's progress. These residua may be caused by numerous stimuli, for instance some stresses in the course of doing, and remain undigested in the learner. It is from the residua of spontaneous action that what is often called

frustration of the learner results. The learner can deal with his residua in three ways: first, he can let the residua passively mount up until they make his immediate living unsteady and unbearable, *i.e.*, he becomes mentally ill; second, he can use them as cliché materials for the building of mental stereotypes and cultural conserves. These two ways have been practiced almost to the exclusion of any other way; lastly he can stick to spontaneity, try to resolve the residua by de-conserving and go on actively and systematically by training it. This is the type of operation to which the spontaneity theory of learning has been dedicated.

Experiments of spontaneity testing and training adequately set up are few. Our hypotheses in this area are largely based on clinical observations. But enough has been done to set other investigators to studying the problem.

To the spontaneity theorist the difference between association and field theory of learning appears secondary. The association theory analyzes behavior into elements and tries to discover laws governing the combination of these elements. The field theory contends, in contrast, that the parts have no significance except in terms of the total configuration. The two theories have in common that a) they feel safest in experiments with animals, b) they try to explain the dynamics of the highest forms of human productivity with reference to the simple hypotheses formulated on the basis of animal experimentation, without reference to spontaneity and creativity.

The field theorists have discovered one dimension of learning, the visual or perceptual restructuring of the problem, but they have neglected to study the dynamic factors which cause these restructuring tendencies to *emerge*. The association theorists have discovered another dimension of learning, the laws of associative strength, as the frequencies of response and the latency of reaction time of response. Both contributions can be integrated into the spontaneity theory of learning, the one having focussed on the structure, the other on the functions of the mind. The spontaneity theorist places both phenomena into a larger matrix, the action matrix dealing with a higher grade organism, the actor *in situ*.

## METHODS OF LEARNING

The acts taken by the learner are influenced not only by the moment *in situ* but by events which have taken place in the past or by goals which are set for the future. According to emphasis several theories of learning have developed: associational learning (of the behavioristic or the gestalt type), goal learning, and in our own time spontaneity learning. An illustration as to what goal determination does to the learner is "goose step" learning, the model taken from military schools. The learner rehearses, he is meticulously drilled as to how to behave in special situations because it is assumed that he will be more accurate in handling a specific situation the better he has rehearsed it; he is made to learn like an actor memorizing his rôle. The result may be a great precision in solving that task but a minimum of spontaneity for anything else which might occur unexpectedly. If a new situation takes place for which the student-soldier has no spontaneity experience to fall upon, he'll be blinded and blocked by the very clichés he has learned to master. He might have been prepared for *all* potential situations instead of for a few specific ones but this would amount to changing the philosophy and technique of learning. We would have to train the spontaneity of the soldier instead of his precise execution of this or that situation. It has been said especially of the Australian, but also of American soldiers, that they have shown to be, during the last war, less exact and prompt than the German soldier, but more individualistic and more spontaneous. This can easily become a drawback and may lead to disorganized behavior if not considered in a larger frame of reference. *The objective of learning may, for instance, not be the precision in a specific number of tasks, but the spontaneity of the total organism of the soldier and the spontaneous coordination of interaction between all the members of a platoon.* The objective should then be to make the organism of the soldier able to act adequately and quickly on the spur of the moment; to preserve and increase his plasticity becomes more important than to train his precision within a narrow range. It may very well be that the greater spontaneity and resourcefulness of the American and Australian soldier was a contributory factor towards winning the war, wresting victory from the Germans against bad odds, as the Germans had in the beginning the

superiority of weapons and vastly better disciplined armies.

The transfer effect from the learning of one thing to the learning of another should be the more difficult the less developed the plasticity between the different loci of learning is. The task of the spontaneity learner is therefore to prepare himself for easy transfer and, at the same time, learn how to integrate it with disciplined action; how to meet the proper balance between the two extremes, how much to sacrifice of the one or the other depends upon the individual case. There are several methods by which one can learn to mobilize easy transfer, for instance, the improvisation of senseless, manufactured words and phrases in the treatment of stutterers. Such an exercise is an exercise in spontaneous production. It has a different purpose than the memory test of nonsense syllables and should not be confused with it. It is a method in "deconserving" the learner's mind, gradual removal of clichés and training his spontaneity. One area of application is stuttering. It moves the stutterer from the semantic to the presemantic level of speech; now that feelings and gestures are associated with senseless words the stuttering vanishes. At a later stage the moment may come when it is possible for the stutterer to retransfer the spontaneous balance attained by nonsense speech to the semantic level. This chaotic, spontaneous, freely emerging language I have called "*basic language*" as it has some similarity to the baby languages of the infant.

The goose step learner is often instructed to overlearn, to know his piece better than necessary, as a safety device against slipping or stage fright. "Under learning" may be an equally important device for the spontaneous learner. The overlearner wants a cultural conserve to stick, the underlearner wants his spontaneity to thrive.

#### THE VEHICLE—THE STAGE OF SPONTANEITY VERSUS THE PSYCHOANALYTIC COUCH

The vehicle in which learning takes place symbolizes the kind of learning which is contemplated. An illustration is the psychoanalytic couch. The patient has to lie down passively in a horizontal position. If he wants to be in a more elevated position he has to stretch the legs of the couch and raise the mattress. If he wants to be in a lower position he has to take the legs off and if he wants

to move from one position to the other he has to transform the couch into one with several layers. If he wants to stand on his feet safely he needs a couch with a hard, perhaps wooden surface and if he wants to move around freely, expansively and into all directions, he needs wide spaces, an extensive field of action. When he is through with these manipulations a new vehicle has been born, the old couch has changed into a theatre of spontaneity. And something else is added; when he was on the couch, if his mother or wife was on his mind, he talked about them; that is all the couch permitted. But on this new vehicle they can appear and act on the stage, presenting their own part and the whole world can sit before them in the audience.

The vehicle for army exercises is the "open" field. It is a vehicle similar to the stage, farthest removed from the couch, as anything might happen in it and anything might have to be acted out on it. The events are not determined by a single individual, a talking soldier on a couch; spontaneity in a triple sense, individual, social and actional are the desiderata for an army in movement. But this open field can be deteriorated by forms of exercise which misuse the opportunities of that field. Their symbol is the goose step. The goose step would not require the wide open spaces in which to operate. A vehicle like a railway track would be sufficient for its fulfillment. The railway track does to the open field what the couch does to the stage. From the point of view of mobility the railroad track is like a physical frustration of the open field of action, the couch the frustration of the therapeutic stage and psychoanalysis a frustrated psychodrama.

#### AUTONOMY OF THE LEARNER

Learning is an all inclusive process of which educational learning is only one phase. It must include learning in life itself from infancy up to old age, for sub-human as well as human organisms. It must include social and cultural learning as it occurs within the framework of social and cultural institutions. It must include therapeutic learning as on the couch or on the psychodrama stage. Once we have formulated such a broad view of the learning process we can go a step further and evaluate all these various learning instruments as to what they accomplish for the autonomy, the spontaneity and the creativity of the learners themselves.

One can measure the educational or therapeutic value of an instrument by the degree to which it stimulates the autonomy of individuals or groups. The degree of autonomy, for instance, which psychoanalysis permits a subject to attain is limited to the verbal dimension. Non-directive counseling may be given a still lower rating than psychoanalysis because by itself it does not increase the spontaneity of the therapeutic learner; on the other hand it is so designed that it decreases the spontaneity of the counselor. The degrees to which the subject warms up to an experience and expression of himself and others is a measure of the autonomy of the self. It is useful to study the degree, the range and intensity of warming up which individuals attain in the course of various operations of learning. We can talk about instruments which encourage only a minimum of involvement and autonomy, and of instruments which encourage a maximum of involvement and autonomy. Some instruments encourage the individual only to warm up to perceptions, others only to fantasies, others to a free association of words, illustrations are the Rorschach, the TAT and the Word Association tests. A large number of not yet existent instruments can be envisioned which would mobilize and sustain in a controlled fashion larger and larger areas of personality until a level of warming up is reached by which the actor *in situ* is completely taken in and released. Such instruments enabling high degrees of autonomy are psychodrama and sociodrama.

#### CATHARSIS OF INTEGRATION AND THE AIM OF LEARNING

One of the contributions of spontaneity research was to recognize the various phases and degrees of spontaneity as one continuous process, the reduction and loss of spontaneity, impulsive abreactions and the pathological excesses as well as adequate and disciplined spontaneity, productive and creative spontaneity. Another contribution was to recognize that spontaneity does not operate in a vacuum but in relation to already structured phenomena, cultural and social conserves. "Spontaneity is a function of organization."\*

---

\* This apt phrase has been coined by Professor Wellman J. Warner during an address at a meeting of the American Society of Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama, May, 1951.

The unification of all types of learning by the principle of spontaneity is the dream of many educators. It will gradually take place in proportion to the invention and practice of methods which demonstrate its usefulness. We are more and more becoming aware that in operation the educator cannot be neatly separated from the parent, the counselor, the therapist, the friend and partner. In turn, the pupil cannot be neatly separated from the son, the learner, the counselee or the patient. The dynamic inter-relatedness of all types of learning brings to the fore a concept which was relegated up to now to a specialty, to psychotherapy only, that of mental catharsis. Mental catharsis is here defined as a process which accompanies every type of learning, not only a finding of resolution from conflict, but also of realisation of self, not only release and relief but also equilibrium and peace. It is not a catharsis of abreaction but a *catharsis of integration*. To use Shakespeare's Hamlet as an illustration—if we imagine that the Hamlet on the stage is the real Prince Hamlet and *not* an actor—there are from the critical experience of his father's appearance to the entrance of Fortinbras, besides numerous abreactions, a long chain of role takings and interactions, dialogical sequences and pauses, moments of meditation and decision, the total sum of which aims at an integration of Hamlet with his co-actors and the spectators of the drama into a community experience.

Within a universe which is dominated by cultural conserves and social stereotypes the comparatively freer and more spontaneous unit is the single individual. But the isolated personal spontaneities of two billion individuals, however worthy, do not produce a spontaneity of the masses. Therefore, it is imperative that the spontaneity of the masses of people is systematically developed by means of special procedures. As we have learned from sociometric and spontaneity research, with the increase of the number of individuals and the interaction between them, a *decrease* of their own spontaneity and the spontaneity of the group takes place. They make each other unfree and unspontaneous. The larger the population of mankind becomes, therefore, in a conserve-dominated world order, the more unfree the individual becomes and the more unfree become the small groups within the total population. The crowd and mob psychological studies of LeBon, Tarde and others were in themselves correct. They found



that the crowds and mobs are impulsive, automatic and uncontrolled, given to primitive emotions, reducing the individual participants to a lower level of initiative, freedom and spontaneity. What they did not realize is that what are called crowds, mobs and so forth are all already pathological, distorted group structures for which our world order itself is responsible. LeBon and Tarde described what the structure of crowds and mobs are in *our* type of society, but not what they could be if the optimal social structure of spontaneous-creative human relations were mobilized. If we should decide to develop a spontaneous-creative universe to replace the one in which we live—and in which spontaneity is arbitrary and incidental—the spontaneity of one individual will stimulate the spontaneity of the other and the quantitative result will be the opposite of what we have at present. The spontaneity of the group will increase with its size and with the number of interactions of its members. In our present world order the spontaneity quotient of the total of mankind is practically inert as for instance the League of Nations and the United Nations Organization have illustrated.

The spontaneity of mankind in such a future world order will multiply in direct proportion to the number of its groups and the numbers of interactions between them. It will be so enormous that the power of man, the exercise of his collective energy will surpass everything we have ever dreamed.