

Change: what is at stake?*

NORBERT APTER

65 rue de Lausanne, 1202 Genève, Switzerland

Abstract *The author presents here the elements of a deeply non-linear process: the process of changing. Norbert Apter bases his reflection on his professional practice and describes the moments through which, as he has observed, his clients go: awareness, ambivalence and ambiguity, intention, action, integration. He also underlines, with details, the aspects of internal and external negotiations as well as the equilibriums that are put into question through the process of changing. He comes to the point where he perceives that the necessary and sufficient conditions that Carl Rogers suggests may not be the only useful ones. They might well be efficiently combined with the postulates of J.L. Moreno's psychodrama.*

“Important is not what’s been made of man,
but what he makes of what has been made of him.”

(Jean-Paul Sartre, Saint Genêt, actor and martyr)

Foreword

The difficulty in describing the stakes involved in a process of change lies in both the complexity and the sheer number of potential factors present. These factors are specific to each individual and to each process. Nevertheless, it seems clear that change is a process, if not a process composed of many other different processes! ‘However the processes themselves are exposed to the change’ (Bateson, 1972, p. 257). Hence the absurdity that would be a linear representation of a reflection on the processes of change. Consequently, even if I have chosen a linear description of the process to make it simpler to understand, it is essential to always keep in mind the non-linear nature of the process of change itself. This is in order to avoid an extreme over-simplification which would not give justice to the ‘complex tissue or events, in which all sorts of alternating liaisons overlap, combine and thus determine the texture of the whole’ (Heisenberg, quoted by Lapaw, 1988, p. 19)

It seems therefore essential that the professional remain conscious and clear as to the stakes of the processes of change; whatever frame of reference he or she uses. Hence, my purpose is to point out some of the stakes of change (which, unfortunately, are sometimes reduced to a mere process of ‘letting-go’) and to present them as I have experienced them in my professional practice.

In this way, I hope to mirror, as closely as possible, my understanding of the human

*Paper presented at the XIIIth IAGP Congress: ‘Annihilation, Re-creation and Survival’, London, August 1998.

This article was published in french in the “Brennpunkt 77/1998” of the SPCP (Swiss Society for Person-Centred Approach and Psychotherapy).

experience as expressed by many different patients/clients and, in so doing, to contribute to broadening our outlook on change and giving a new impetus to our thinking on this subject.

CHANGING

Equilibriums and changes

Life, at its best, is a flowing, changing process in which nothing is fixed. (Rogers, 1967, p. 27)

All life is a quest and change. One moment follows another and, even if it seems similar, will never be identical—be it only for the fact that we have experienced the previous instant.

We learn about ourselves from our emotions, our thoughts, our responses, our actions, our reactions and our choices....We discover ourselves through going on with our life. Such evolutionary changes come from the innate potential of all living beings to adjust to the new present. But this potential, although innate, often arises difficulties.

Equilibriums and continua. Everyone of us has established a specific combination of the numerous dimensions of our lives. In this way we have built different equilibriums which form our present. Even those we call imbalanced are equilibriums: they might be satisfying, unsatisfying, acceptable, unacceptable, pleasant, painful, to be maintained or to be changed—they are still equilibriums. This is the inherent tendency for homeostasis and equilibration.

In my observation, an equilibrium is the fruit of several continua. A continuum, as I see it, has its specificities and, in the case of the process of change, essentially:

- Implies a large range of intermediate possibilities between our two personal extremes whether perceived or imagined.
- These intermediate possibilities can be 'unknown', 'forgotten', minimized or disqualified by the patient/client.

An individual will all along either contemplate or try out many different adjustments of these possibilities in the search for the right choice, for the 'appropriate' position. As Kierkegaard said: 'We are most human at the point of choosing'. And this, I would say, even more so since, at the moment of choosing:

- Frequently, the new wished-for equilibrium is not situated simply half way between the two extremes of the continuum, in the balanced centre of it, although this particular area has been intensely imagined, magnified, despised, desired, feared, adored, abhorred, searched for and avoided.
- A desired position of balance on a continuum varies, also according to the position of existing balances on other continua...all being in constant evolution.

The taking into account, even briefly, of our continua, our questioning and our 'pulling-apart', becomes more unavoidable in order to reach a resolution through a new position of equilibrium. The sorting out, choices and therefore negotiation (internal and external) begin.

A definition of change. Beyond the simplified vision of 'change = letting go', which less and less professionals seem to have faith in. I have arrived at defining change in the following way:

Change (of equilibrium) could be called an 'ex-change', for it is equivalent to a *series of processes of negotiation—internal and external*—the main characteristics of which are more or less the following:

- *the reassessment of several equilibriums* which have been internalized.
- *Taking into account* the past, present and our anticipation of the future.
- *The intention to reactualize our equilibriums* in an acceptable or even more so, in a satisfactory manner.
- *The active desire to keep* what we appreciate *within* ourselves.
- *The letting go* of that which we no longer want within ourselves.
- *The putting into place* that which seems to suit us.

This is indeed a process of exchange of equilibriums where the objective is a readjustment to reality. Carl Rogers (1980, p. 42) said, and it is complementary and compatible with the point being made here, that the objective was to face the current problem and future ones in a better adapted manner.

Negotiation

Since I am defining change in terms of 'process of negotiation', it might be important to clarify some of the ingredients of the latter (Bellenger, 1990; Launay, 1990).

Characteristics. Regardless of whether it is internal or external, negotiation seems to have the following characteristics:

- at least two part(ie)s are present (later I will emphasize the role of their 'advocates').
- These part(ie)s were, are or will be in conflict (of wishes, needs, behaviours...).
- They search for some common ground through a hopefully constructive dialogue.
- Their dynamics are complex and diverse: listening, expressions, dialogue, confrontations, co-operation, 'blockages', reconciliation, momentary (and limited?) relapses of conflict, (non)constructive discussions, (dis)agreements...
- These dynamics between the part(ie)s present can be more or less activated. They may or may not be synchronized or conscious. They are, however, inter-related and influence this non-linear process.
- Violence might appear to be momentarily excluded.
- Intransigence is pushed aside in favour of more leverage (taking stakes, needs, limits and goals more or less into account).
- The more negotiation is chosen, and welcomed by the part(ie)s present, the more the desire to reach an acceptable or satisfactory agreement will prevail.
- In order for a constructive feeling to remain dominant, much attention must be paid to the negotiation climate.

All these dimensions of the process of negotiation seem to be part and parcel of the process(es) of change—be it internal or external. All the more so since it is a process of exchange of which the facts, the needs, desires and the margins of manoeuvre are not always clearly defined.

Being aware of a (recurrent) problem

It begins with looking for new ways to react to stimuli in our life (which might not necessarily be experienced as new) while remaining true to who we are. Indeed, before even desiring change, we have to recognize the presence (and often the reappearance and repetition of) an internal and/or external reality liable to be questioned: the 'problem'.

A problem. Of course everyone has their own definition, which is more or less clear, of what a problem is. Here is the one I am using:

Question(s) that we ask ourselves or that is/are put to us which involve(s) ambivalence or an internal/external conflict that is subjectively experienced.

Awareness. The simple fact of recognising that a problem exists often implies a process of change in gestation. This negotiation with reality can bring the person to a situation of 'awareness': that which Jung called 'enlightenment' or 'illumination'; but not in the mystical sense of the word, rather in the sense of 'evidence'; that some would call the 'trigger', the 'tilt' or 'flash' and which Rogers (1974, pp. 176–177) notably called 'insight'. This encounter with the 'obvious', identified and recognized as such, contains in itself a formidable potential for transformation. It is discontinuous. It is often difficult to clearly put into words. It does not contain the shadow of a judgement and is, *par excellence*, the welcoming of the openness to what is. It appears to connect parts of the person which, until then, had been perceived separately and can now form a coherent whole with a meaning and a direction. Hence its importance.

To take this 'risk of evidence' is the first process of change of all the 'active' processes of change. It is also certainly a key, recurrent element of it.

THE PROCESS OF CHANGE

Readjusting some equilibriums

Whatever prior homeostasis or equilibration exist (Ausloos, 1980; van Bertalanffy, 1974), the process of exchange will induce some modifications of them. *Certain equilibriums will recurrently be put into question.*

I am presenting here questionings that all my patients/clients systematically face in their processes. (More strongly, less strongly, it depends on the theme(s), the timing and the specificity of the person.)

Altruism vs Egoism. I can live for others, through others, in forgetting myself, in negating myself, in sacrificing myself, ...even if I have to help myself to achieve this with a belief: a self-destructive concept of generosity. I can also choose to live only for myself without any regards to others—their wishes, desires, needs and boundaries. What is my right position? Hillel summarizes this dilemma in the following way: 'If I don't take care of myself, who will take care of me? If I am not here for myself, then who will be? And if I am here only for me, what am I?'

Conservation vs Transformation. 'One now is better than two later.' Am I ready to let go, without any guarantee of benefiting from it? What do I wish to maintain? Do I have to do an inner trimming? Do I have to install new things? What can I keep in place without developing a rigidity, an inertia, without conditioning myself towards a non-change? What can I move and transform without finding myself carried away by the movement of change and without losing more than I would like? These are questions that are at the centre of any readjustment.

Image(s) vs Reality. How do I reconcile my imagination and reality? Am I disguising or distorting my identity? How can I be faithful to my various dimensions? How do I readjust the image I have of life and of myself, of that which I give, that which others have and the reality of what life is and of who I am? Such questions bring the person to such (im)penetrable mysteries as: What is Life? Who am I?

Isolation vs Fusion. Here is the central theme of contact: What type of contact to have? What is it that I desire and that really suits me? Isolation? Inter-dependence? Co-dependence? Fusion? What are the benefits, the losses, the risks and the hopes involved? How do I find my place in society? What are the limits of my territory? Where are others' boundaries? All the questions of 'I and Thou' so well described by Martin Buber (1969) are posed here.

Split vs 'Monolithism'. I can be in a position where I feel 'I am made of one block' and search for some coherence, against wind and tide, beyond the nuances, inner contradictions, *tergiversations*, I also realise that I have several parts in me. (Some even speak of 'facets'.) They are not always in agreement. Should I silence them all for the sake of one? Or have 'a right hand that doesn't know what the left is doing'? Or even search for some form of agreement between them? How to feel at ease?

Rigid order vs total chaos. If chaos is necessary for all change, then so is order. The one without the other implies for me either losing my structure, overflowing my boundaries, exploding or else being fixed and rigid, sometimes to the point of sclerosis. Safe evolution lies, among others, in the frequent renewed adjustment of my dosage of these two ingredients. Yet, I can be both afraid of chaos and/or get fed up with a certain established order. How do I go about this?

Past vs Future. The relationship that I maintain with my past and with my future undeniably influences the experience of my present and thus needs to be readjusted.

Is the past used *in favour* of an improvement of my well-being in the present? Or *against* it? What do I do with it? Does it banish all hope? Where are my invisible loyalties? What unconscious patterns do I keep reproducing which annoy me? Do I have a realistic anticipation of the future? Do I even have a future? Is it rosy, fairylike or even 'magical'? Or do I picture a catastrophic scenario? Is it my future made up of expectations, frustrations (and disappointments)? In what way does this 'future' hamper my present? How do I rebalance my relationship with my past and my future in such a way so as my present doesn't suffer—or can even benefit?

Resignation vs Intention. Often I hear myself say 'Accept that which is!'. However at times acceptance transforms itself into submission and resignation and I view it as a 'minefield of my determination'. As for the desire for change, it can take on the appearance of a pressurizing wish ('I have to change at all costs!') or a rebellious one ('I will not stand for that one more time!') of which the inefficiency is troublesome. Negotiating an interior repositioning that could facilitate acceptance and desire becomes indispensable.

Total powerlessness vs Total power. I can believe myself to be totally powerless: 'I have no power over it'; 'I have no responsibility for it'; 'I am ashamed...'; 'What will people think of me'; 'I am wrong to desire'; ...etc. I can also believe that 'I should know'; 'I should be able to'; 'I will do it in a way that will please others, in such a way that they will love me'. I can even arrive at believing that 'I know and can do ANYTHING', 'I can change others, I know what they need'; 'I can get him/her to...(verb)...me'...

All this influences my freedom to see, to hear what is, my right to feel and express. This also plays a role in my taking risks and the true recognition of my power over my life and of my limits.

Life vs Death. 'To live without' this or that aspect of that which was my life associates the death of this aspect with the life that continues—e.g. I can't live with (or without) vs I must live with (or without); or I mustn't live with (or without) vs I would like to live with (or without); ...etc. Such dilemmas!! I need reowning my life without identifying myself to it. I need daring to let go. I find myself facing the prospect of bereavement and hopefully rebirth.

All during the process of change, these different equilibriums (and some others) appear, reappear, are addressed, revised, and restructured again and again.

As we will see here, their diverse advocates will be active and will influence each moment.

Times of ambivalence and ambiguity

In view of these numerous continua and equilibriums that are to be revised, there is no need to emphasize how numerous and varied the 'pulling apart' can be. All the time during the process of change, moments of ambivalence and ambiguity are present (some moments reflect more precisely the 'pulling apart' in regard to the change itself: easy vs difficult, long vs short, total vs non-existent, impossible vs magical).

Due to the various equilibriums to be modified, and the specific themes and questions of the person and the situation, the internal conflicts are and become more or less uncomfortable. Indeed, one's different inner parts have difficulty in coming to terms with each other.

The advocates. Consciously or not, there is both a desire to change and a 'no-desire' for change. In my experience, each of these parts is supported by one or more 'in-house advocates' leaning on personal beliefs and representations. Whether these advocates support or facilitate the appropriate movement desired or complicate and hinder the change, they are present and manifest themselves. These internal voices are often reinforced by external persons or elements, who we would call 'external advocates'.

Times of intimate decision, times of intention

The option On this basis it becomes essential for the person to discover, hear and listen to the advocate best suited to facilitate one's personal evolution.

- How do I teach myself to change, at my own pace and in security, one (or more) parts of that which I feel, believe, think or do?
- How can I rebalance the internal forces present and use this energy resource to move towards what truly suits me?

Little by little, the person will reown her desire to change and activate the search of her internal resources. Beyond the 'maintenance-advocates', the person will be able to give herself the right to recycle the energy commonly used for not changing. This will establish a beginning of self-confidence.

What a change!! The person will have already mobilized all the energy for changing the equilibriums present and *choosing* the possibility of a new orientation.

The intention. The word 'choice' as well as the word 'decision' usually mean for most people an intellectual, mental, mostly wilful process. This form of choice, of decision undoubtedly exists and has its own efficiency and usefulness. However, it is based on the belief in a part of our organism (the will of our brain) prevailing above all other (the rest of our brains, our psyche, our physical body...). This advocate often claims absolute control and believes itself to be omnipotent. Lowen emphasizes that the effort of will is not enough to effect change: only to be ready, and to have the desire and the capacity of changing may produce change

(1976, p. 102). The 'intimate decision', in itself, is often described as a clear sensation, acceptable or even so, satisfactory for our being. It is similar to the result of a successful internal negotiation. It takes the form of an internal evidence. Thus an equivalent to the notion of the intimate decision is often used: 'intention' (Norcross & Goldfried, 1998). More indirectly, the idea of intention clearly reflects the tugging between advocates and the difficulties that remain in the application of the intimate decision.

Often this implies a gradual orientation of one's being towards the change, a commitment to taking care of oneself. It means understanding and going beyond the advocate concerned with the obligation to succeed. All the more so since to lay down, by choice, the foundations of peace with oneself, of self-respect, of staying true to oneself and in relation to others, can be scary...in the view of all the equilibriums to be revised.

Acting and times of actions

The action, or more precisely, the actions of change imply, whatever the stage or moment is, a re-evaluation of equilibriums and their *reactualization*—that is to say the conservation of that which we appreciate in ourselves and the letting go of that which we no longer want, the putting into place of what seems to be suitable for us and the taking into account of the past, present and our anticipation of the future.

Experienced expression. All such actions seem to have to do with 'free expression', 'experienced expression', i.e. 'intimate expression'. a letting go which connects moments, situations, memories with the sensations, emotions, beliefs (and so on) that were previously blocked.

The absence of an emotional charge almost always makes a memory inefficient (Freud & Breuer, 1956, p. 4). Moreover 'repressed affect isolates and perturbs' (Jung, 1953, p. 35). Consequently, the letting go of that which has been stored up and protected, opens up access to a renewal of contact. The 'experienced expression' silences for a while and inhibits the action of the 'impeding advocates'—the advocates of repression. Relief and liberation are then experienced. This liberation seems to happen through words, gestures and emotions. The person perceives herself in her 'emerging globality'. Now, it is the advocate in charge of the person's rights—reminding her of permissions and legitimacy—which is active. In this instant, the person utilizes all that tends to allow her to recontact the spontaneity and creativity of what Rogers (1968) called 'our organismic being'. Claude de Jonckheere (1988) describes this experience in the following way:

In this context, an intimate experience consists of a chain reaction of emotions, sensations, image associations and memories. A sort of alchemy that will colour in a particular manner our mental representations and may result in your being different later. (p. 138)

A variety of shades. This 'experienced expression' has three main features, often inter-related that create its richness and power:

(i) *Regression:* Regression permits an essential awareness: at the beginning was an inadequacy of our environment and in no way a failure on the part of the individual (Winnicott, 1969, p. 136). The 'self-accusatory' advocate is thwarted. Regression can then bring new resources to the area of the past where the problem is situated.

(ii) *Reconstruction:* It means acquiring new resources in the present which will enable one to change his look on the past. One advocate will allow reparation, another correction. The two (or maybe they are only one) are essential. The reparation promotes the sensation of healing

of wounds, and thus security. Correction facilitates the free renewal of choices anchored in reality.

(iii) *Progression*: A sense of progression is then experienced. It encourages an adjustment of 'I' to the present and to its vision of the future. The person perceives a change and its effects in the present. Maybe the 'resource-advocate' will even display all the possibilities of influencing the future.

Possible manifestations. These changes of equilibrium will aim at and, maybe, manifest in two ways:

(i) *Outwards*: by a movement towards greater autonomy and an increased hold on the reality of the present.

(ii) *Inwards*: through more pleasure in life, a simplified adjustment to the reality of life, and increased confidence in the process of life (present and future).

A new series of negotiations, internal and external, on one or more continua could be engaged. A new series of possibilities of reactualization of the self then appear, they all lead to new progression.

Times of integration

When the internal conflict is resolved, the various dissociated parts associate in a creative manner (Perls *et al.*, 1979, p. 21) to form a new balance. The different internal advocates no longer fight for power: it seems that they have reached an agreement, if only temporarily. Mobility is increased. The corrections and remoulding can be achieved more peacefully. *Actual change is integrated into present day life*. Sometimes characterized by an impression of 'feeling different', this new state of being is more in tune with present reality. As if the hold of the past on our emotions and affects had subsided or even vanished. As if we were able to use our spontaneity and creativity in our responses to current stimuli. As if new behaviours and attitudes in regards to oneself and others were possible. As if our coherence had at last taken form. As if we were in tune with our here and now. And maybe this is the case.

All these feelings connected to integration (which are difficult to describe) can, by being present, support—if needed—ulterior processes of change.

The principal security: the climate

Depending on the climate established with oneself and with others, one can encounter 'additional' difficulties: when the climate is tense, aggressive, menacing, judgmental or stigmatizing, the person may develop fears, become defensive, close oneself or become aggressive. Brian Thorne (1994, p. 53) pointed out that Carl Rogers (1902–1987) is the psychologist who undertook the most research ever made in the area of Psychotherapy, and most particularly on the theme of the climate necessary to facilitate growth and change. Rogers (1959) emphasizes the necessity and efficiency of a climate where a defensive attitude is pointless. He confirms the *sine qua non* importance of this element in a posthumous article with Ruth Sanford (Rogers & Sanford, 1989).

Tendency and climate. Indeed, according to him, human beings have a 'formative tendency', and innate tendency towards 'self-actualization'. They know and they can. Everyone has their own specific characteristics, their own evolution, their own dilemmas. They have their own questions, resources and solutions. What a person needs is a favourable climate that allows

her to search, to find, to choose and to reap the fruits of this knowledge. Rogers describes the facilitating climate as needing the following three attitudes (1968):

- *Unconditional positive regard* of the person, of what the person feels, thinks and believes without desiring to change or remodel her.
- *Empathic listening* of the person, in her globality, her world, as she perceives it and experiences it.
- *Congruence*. Authenticity, beyond roles, façades and pretensions.

These attitudes undoubtedly facilitate the security, confidence and liberty needed to discover or expose oneself. They also seem to increase the tendency of the person to take responsibility for her life as much as she can do so. They are clearly a support and reassurance (Rogers, 1986, p. 129): two essential elements of the process of change.

It seems to me indisputable that everyone, when engaged in a process of change, need to develop these three attitudes towards themselves. Either with the help of a psychotherapist or by themselves. In this way they improve their own climate of growth.

To treat oneself with a constructive climate. In my experience people who develop these attitudes in regard to themselves and to their lives, progressively get many benefits from it. Notably in connection with:

- the expression of the diverse parts present, of their advocates of their desires, needs, proposals and counter-proposals;
- openness to other positioning;
- the reshaping and restructuring of internal/external reality;
- the creation (or even the innovation) through finding out an acceptable position for the diverse elements present.

Thus they dare to become, step by step, that which they truly are and they can develop their own potential (Rogers, 1980, p. 173).

TO CONCLUDE AND TO GO ON

Reflecting on change and its processes could continue indefinitely. This presentation, due to its linearity, doesn't do full justice to the entanglements that form the essence of a process of change.

Besides, any reflection in this area needs to take into account the uniqueness of the individual. It presents the professional with specific processes that he discovers in the course of his accompaniment of the person. It is important to note that the attitude of the professional towards change in general, its modalities and its setting in particular is of major importance as it influences (willy-nilly) a person's process of change. I will not elaborate here the foundations and hypotheses of the principal theories of psychotherapy, their history, conception of the human being, their indications...(one may want to read Corsini *et al.*, 1979).

At this stage of knowledge whatever basic hypotheses chosen by a professional, we have to accept how relevant other theories are. Certain even go to the point of studying and stressing the possible complementarity or even more so: the possible integration of particular theories (Norcross & Goldfried, 1998). The aforementioned confirms and broadens the questions and affirmations where Ferenczi (1982, p. 100) underlined the necessity to adapt oneself, as regards the method, to the persons' particularities.

Conclusions

From the various observations that I have undertaken and presented here from the process of 'ex-change'—and thus from the negotiations and revision of equilibriums (both internal and external), it stands out:

1. Diverse Identifiable moments:

- Awareness
- Ambivalence
- Intention
- Action(s)
- Integration.

2. In an omnipresent manner:

- the undeniable influence of context and climate, favourable or not to the change. It colours, supports or complicates the process of change. On this theme, as we have already seen, the greatest advances have been made due to the research and contributions of Carl Rogers.
- The activity, more or less intense, of that which I have called the 'internal and external advocates'. At all times they appear and greatly influence the process. It would be very interesting to develop a series of observations and reflections on this subject. This would allow us to determine the principal, recurring advocates and the dynamics organizing them.

New hypothesis(s)

From these reflections, a number of hypotheses can emerge. As far as I am concerned, I observed the influence of climate and the activity of advocates to be omnipresent. A hypothesis that seems evident to me and which would need elaboration: to my knowledge, *two different approaches address each particularly one of these two elements and could be combined in order to facilitate change.*

- *The Client-Centered Psychotherapy* (Rogers & Sanford, 1989) creates a favourable and secure climate which facilitates the development of the person. The co-presence of unconditional acceptance, empathy and congruence in the psychotherapist weakens defensive positions while respecting and supporting the uniqueness of the person and her self-determination.
- *The Psychodrama* (Moreno) gives voice, through action, to each advocate present and facilitates their negotiation and the resolution of conflicts. The tools of psychodrama (auxiliary ego, role-reversals, mirrors and soliloquies...) provide many possibilities for each person to effect their change using spontaneity and creativity (Moreno, J.L., 1934, 1946, 1965; Marineau, R., 1989).

My professional experience confirms that the alliance between these two approaches of psychotherapy seems to have a real and lasting efficiency. More ample observations, reflections and research would undoubtedly be useful.

By studying further in depth, the question of their compatibility and complementarity, we could maybe determine to what point an integration is possible. A new (integrative) form of accompanying a change may, in this way, see the light of day.

In my view many patients/clients could benefit from it, which is the most important point.

Acknowledgement

For the English version of this text, I would like to thank Elisabeth Kock and Simon O'Dochartaigh.

References

- AUSLOOS, G. (1980). Systèmes—Homéostasie—Equilibration, essai. *1èmes Journées Internationale de Thérapie Familiale de Lyon*.
- BATESON, G. (1972). *Vers une écologie de l'esprit*. Paris: Le Seuil.
- BELLENGER, L. (1990). *Stratégies et tactiques de négociation*. Paris: ESF.
- BUBER, M. (1960). *Je et Tu*. Aubier: Le Cher.
- CORSINI, R.J. et al., (1979). *Current psychotherapies*. Itaca: F.E. Peacock Publishers.
- DE JONCKHEERE, C. (1988). Le changement du point de vue de la psychologie humaniste, in C. BESSON (Ed.) *Les théories du changement à l'oeuvre dans le travail social*. Coll. Champs professionnels. Genève: Editions I.E.S.
- FERENCZI, S. (1982). *Psychanalyse 4* (Oeuvres complètes). Paris: Payot, (pour la trad. fr.), tome IV, p. 100.
- FREUD, S. & BREUER, J. (1956). *Etude sur l'hystérie*. Paris: P.U.F.
- JUNG, C.G. (1953). *La guérison psychologique*. Genève: Librairie de l'Université.
- LAPAW, R. (1988). Problématique du changement dans notre contexte socio-culturel, in C. BESSON (Ed.) *Les théories du changement à l'oeuvre dans le travail social*. Coll. Champs professionnels. Genève: Editions I.E.S.
- LAUNAY, R. (1990). *La négociation*. Paris: ESF.
- LOWEN, A. (1976). *La Bioénergie*. Paris: Editions Tchou.
- MARINEAU, R. (1989). *J.L. Moreno et la troisième révolution psychiatrique*. Paris: Editions Métailié, p. 55.
- MORENO, J.L. (1934). *Who shall survive? A new approach to the problem of Human Interrelations*. Washington DC: Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Co.
- MORENO, J.L. (1946). *Psychodrama*, Vol. 1. Editions Beacon, Beacon House.
- MORENO, J.L. (1965). *Psychothérapie de groupe et psychodrame*. Paris: Editions P.U.F.
- NORCROSS, J.C. & GOLDFRIED, M.R. (1998). *Psychothérapie intégrative*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.
- PERLS, F. et al. (1979). *Gestalt-thérapie*. Montréal: Ed. Stanké.
- ROGERS, C. (1967). *On becoming a person*. London: Constable & Co.
- ROGERS, C. (1968). *Le développement de la personne*. Paris. Ed. Dunod.
- ROGERS, C. (1980). *La relation d'aide et la psychothérapie*. Paris: ESF.
- ROGERS, C. (1974). *La relation d'aide et la psychothérapie*, 3rd edn. Paris: Editions ESF, pp. 176-177.
- ROGERS, C. (1986). Rogers, Kohut & Erickson: a personal perspective on some similarities and differences. *Person-Centered Review*, 1.
- ROGERS, C. & SANFORD, R.C. (1989). Client-centered psychotherapy, in H.I. KAPLAN & B.J. SADOCK (Eds) *Comprehensive textbook of psychiatry*. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins.
- THORNE, B. (1994). *Comprendre Carl Rogers*. Toulouse: Editions Privat, p. 53.
- VAN BERTALANFFY, L. (1974). *General system theory and psychiatry* (1974) in S. ARIETY (ed.) *American handbook of Psychiatry*, Vol. 1, NY: Basic Books.
- WINNICOTT, D. (1969). *De la pédiatrie à la psychanalyse*. Paris: Petite bibliothèque Payot.

Résumé L'auteur présente ici les éléments d'un processus profondément non-linéaire: le processus de changement. Se basant sur son expérience professionnelle, Norbert Apter relève et décrit les moments par lesquels il a observé ses clients passer: prises de conscience, ambivalence et ambiguïté, intention, action, intégration. Il souligne aussi en les détaillant les aspects de négociations internes et externes ainsi que les équilibres remis en question par le processus de changement. Il en arrive à imaginer que les conditions nécessaires et suffisantes que Carl Rogers propose ne sont peut-être pas les seules utiles. Elles pourraient peut-être s'allier efficacement aux propositions du psychodrame de J.L. Moreno.

Zusammenfassung Der Autor stellt hier die Elemente eines zutiefst nicht-linear Prozesses dar, den Prozess der Veränderung. Norbert Apter bezieht sich auf seine berufliche Erfahrung und

beschreibt die Momente, durch die er seine Klientinnen und Klienten gehen sah: Bewusstwerdung, Ambivalenz und Zweideutigkeit, Absicht, Handlung, Integration. Er zählt die verschiedenen inneren und äusseren Umgangsweisen im einzelnen auf sowie die in einem Veränderungsprozess in Frage kommenden Gleichgewichte. Er gelangt zum Schluss, dass die notwendigen und hinreichenden Variablen nach Carl Rogers vielleicht nicht die einzig nützlichen sind. Sie könnten sich möglicherweise in wirksamer Weise mit den Postulaten des Psychodrama von J.L. Moreno verbinden.