

Finding the Courage through psychodrama

From Socrates to Moreno, to a Psychodramatic Experiment Group in HAGAP

Vassilis Vassiliadis

2015

Contents

Preface	3
Acknowledgments.....	4
Introduction	5
The notion of courage.....	9
Moreno and Courage.....	18
Psychodrama Theory	23
Sociometry	24
Creativity and Spontaneity	25
The warming-up	28
Role Reverse	30
Mirroring.....	33
Surplus Reality.....	34
An example of Courage in the Group	35
Jenny’s story.....	35
Warm-Up	36
Enactment.....	37
Sharing.....	40
Discussion	42
Conclusion	45
Bibliography	46

Preface

This paper is written in the context of the completion of the prerequisites for the certification as a psychodramatist. It represents an important part of the work conducted in an experiential group with extensive supervision in the Hellenic Association of Group Analysis and Psychotherapy (HAGAP) setting. This knowledge and understanding has been reached through hundreds of hours of experience, quest, studying, and questioning.

The paper examines in which ways psychodrama can help people find and/or reveal the courage they have inside them so as to face the conscious or unconscious emotional difficulties, aiming to move forward in their lives.

I chose this subject as I saw it happening inside the psychodrama group I was conducting and I felt I had to write about it. Perhaps, it is the only way to express my gratitude to my teachers, my classmates, the co-conductor and the members of the group for the unique chance they have given me to find in my turn the courage I need to become a psychodramatist.

The group was formed when the second level of our training was beginning, as we had the obligation of the practical training coordinating a psychodrama group for 160 hours.

I remember quite vividly the agitation I was feeling those days, asking myself “Can you make it?” Spontaneously, being of such character, my answer would be “yes”. The question that followed was “What do you need to make it?” and then the answer would be “Courage”.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to all those who have stood alongside me throughout this learning journey. Particularly, I wish to acknowledge the following for their unique contributions to my work:

- My fellow trainees, peers and the organization of HAGAP who have supported my work towards becoming a psychodramatist through these many years.
- My trainers Horatiu Albini, Georgios Haniotis and Julia Hardy. Their energy fuelled my passion for psychodrama.
- Roberto de Inocencio and Arsalus Kayir for their supervision. Their valuable insights and encouragement have helped me to achieve the desired results.
- The members of the group I have worked with, for the courage and vulnerability during the encounters. Their names and details have been changed in this thesis to protect their anonymity.
- The founder of HAGAP, Vassilis Menoutis. He inspired and triggered me through his exquisite knowledge, mentoring, supervision, and personality. He constantly supported the psychodrama zone, offering me and my peers, an excellent professional environment to be a psychodramatist and a capable therapist.
- My therapist for inviting me to join psychodrama and his support during the whole journey. He believed in me from the very first time and patiently accompanied me in my learning. He enabled me to appreciate personal development as the most valuable lifelong adventure.
- My wife Erska, for her love, practical support and encouragement. She believed in me and unfailingly supported through all my training. During the period of becoming a psychodramatist, she brought to life our daughters, Katerina & Anastasia. Thanks to them, my spontaneity and creativity emerged, motivating me for further involvement.

Introduction

The context for this search is a two-year duration, experiential psychodrama group. The group started in December 2011 having 6 members, 2 conductors and constituted the practical training for the educational program of the two coordinators. The group took place in the premises of HAGAP and under its organization. The conductors were the writer and P.

The first meeting took place on the 1st December of 2011 and we completed in December of 2013. The meeting had a weekly frequency and more precisely every Thursday from 19:30 till 21:30. In total we had 92 sessions of 2-hour duration.

As conductors we had decided to conduct alternately the session without this being binding to us and surpassing the group dynamics. When one conducted the other had the role of the co-conductor supporting the conductor. The co-conductor could express himself whenever he/she wanted and sometimes participated in group exercises and activities.

The group started with 6 members and two conductors and was completed with 4 members and the two conductors. The members joined the group having received references from people inside or outside the group and HAGAP organization. Most of them knew nothing about psychodrama and experience -self-awareness groups. Every member before joining the group had an individual session with the conductors for acquaintance, information concerning the process and exploring the need of the interested person. Totally, we met 10 members from whom 6 came in the first founding group meeting. For privacy reasons I have changed the persons' names. The 6 founding members were Athena, Thanos, Nikos, Mina, Christina, and Katerina.

Totally during the two-years course 13 participated for a period of time in the group:

- 4 stable members that joined from the start or at an interval and completed:

- Jason, 36, Doctor
- Manos, 30, private employee
- Danae, 29, freelancer
- Jenny, 26, nurse
- 3 members realized a steady course for a few months but didn't complete:
 - Lia, 32, private employee
 - Sofia, 22, student
 - Christos, 30, military officer
- 5 members had a course in the group without staying:
 - Georgia, 34, private employee
 - Niki, 28, private employee
 - Mary, 25, private employee
 - Mariza, 50, civil servant
 - Kelly, 38, lawyer
- One member, T., passed away during the group course, 52, private employee.

Our goal as conductors was to conduct our practical training creating an environment of security and care for all the members and to reach a point of enjoyment of the whole process as a loving process. With great emotion I can say that we have succeeded thanks to the relationship we developed between us as conductors and thanks to the care we received from our trainers, supervisors, psychodrama zone and Hagap in total.

The content of every session stemmed from the need and the reflections of the members and through the psychodrama process we tried to help them realize emotions and situations always with the necessary care, in regard to the limits and the strengths of each member of an experience-self-awareness group.

The experience of conducting was for me one of the most important experiences in my life. The feelings I had during the group course were

many and rich. Joy, sadness, enthusiasm, disappointment, love, hatred, envy, empty and full.

In any case, at the moment when the members unfolded a light crease in some dark part of themselves and an unconscious element of their life became conscious, my feelings were joy, concern, and emotion. These feelings were the outcome of the courage that the protagonists found so as to see, touch, smell, hear, taste, these dark and difficult parts of themselves. It was the outcome of the courage the members found to learn, to know each other, to relate, to help and be helped from other members.

The courage of the conductors to become conductors while being students, experiencing thus one more coming of age in their lives. The courage I found as conductor to stay on stage so as to conduct a psychodrama group. During my coordination there were many times I needed courage to carry out. The courage to care for the members of the group, courage for the creation of a space with safety for the members, courage to help members face what they fear or ignore, courage to deal with cases of members that reminded your personal issues, courage so as to coexist with the contradictions, the uniqueness of each member, courage to be there for the members and your colleague.

I remember namely when I first conducted a protagonist psychodrama, how much courage I needed to handle my fears and my anxiety. In the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and so on coordination things became easier. As if the practical exercise brought the necessary courage on surface. Thus at the end of the two-year of the group, I may say that I finally have the courage to become a psychodramatist!

As co-conductor, I enjoyed the process of observation of the psychodrama. It helped me conceive different perspectives about the techniques and methods. I remember that I needed less courage to cope with the role of the co-conductor than that of the conductor. Despite the fact that I was feeling the same responsibility, care and interest for the group, I needed less courage since I wasn't the one directing the happening. I always tried to

be in contact with the group dynamics, to trust my colleague as conductor and always be ready to offer whenever it was needed.

With P. we arranged most of the times to meet for a while before the group and to sit a little afterwards discussing the group dynamics, pending matters and information about the group and the members. Moreover we also discussed our relationship and how we felt about each other. Even when there was something between us, we left it aside and agreed to deal with it outside the group setting. All our energy and care was focused on the group. I would also like to express my gratitude to P. for the way we cooperated and for the relationship we built during these two years.

The notion of courage

The notion of courage exists since ancient times.

In the Ancient Greek language, “tharos” (courage in Greek language) was called “tharsos”. The initial meaning was “having courage”, but the differentiation of the subjects thar- and thra-in the attic speech led also to the differentiation of their meaning. So the words with thar- had a distinction of merit (“have courage, boldness, bravery), whereas with thra- had a bad meaning (“have audacity”). This differentiation still exists in the New Hellenic (tharros, tharsos). The word, ”tharsos” doesn’t have an exact equivalent in another indo-european language [*Vostantzoglou, 1962*].

Before Socrates time, two notions appear concerning Courage. The “military” notion of courage, which was strictly determined as the virtue of the noble warrior. Distinguished examples of such warriors we find in the Trojan War. Achilles, Diomedes, and Hector had the virtue of the brave warrior, rushed in battle first of all, ready to fight heroically giving the example to their army. [*MacIntyre, 1966, 05-14*].

Then as the Hellenic society and the policy of hostilities changed, courage was for the first time recognized based on the will the citizen-warrior has to stand and fight in an arrangement of phalanx. The essence of this courage had its origins in the honor and decency. It is the “courage of the citizen” as Herodotus described, under which Hellenes fought for their freedom having the fear of law, in contradiction to the Persians who fought for their masters and having the fear of whip.

A less characteristic but yet traditional thinking of Ancient Greeks about courage include the notion of endurance with the exemplary case of Ulysses. In the writings of the Lyric times and of Homer, the Courage of endurance and the will for resistance is directed not only towards the exterior enemies but also to the inner passions and the calamities in general. Courage in that case is not a special virtue of the warrior, but a matter of an “enduring heart” and will [*Schmid, 1985, 113*].

During the 5th century, at the days of rationalistic movement a new notion emerged about courage in Athens, which was much different from the two Hellenic ideals that we already mentioned. It concerns a human who is sufficiently instructed, so that in the domain of his specialty to be less vulnerable and more capable to control his fear, knowing which situations are really dangerous or not, and what to do to avoid harm and take advantage of any chances that might occur. Thus, with the appropriate training and experience a person can become brave, acquiring prudence and expertness.

Socrates agrees with the traditional view, that courage includes the mastering of fear and passions using the power of mind or will, though he insists that there is something more, the mental guidance or wisdom so as to reach the virtue of courage.

Socrates gives the question about what is the role of thought in relation to courage and through the dialogue with Lachis¹, strengthens the view that the vigor or the self-control that is not guided by mentality or wisdom is not courage. Further on, in the dialogue he focuses in the cognitive dimension of courage in which he defines as “the science of excellent and brave” “*he ton deinon kai tharaleon episteme*”, “the knowlegde of where to fear and where to dare”. This dimension comes from Socrates himself and concerns himself [Zacharopoulos, 1990, 22-58].

The man who possesses the “technique of wisdom” knows the realistic data of a situation and with the appropriate actions knows how to lead the facts to his benefit, avoiding damages.

¹ The *Laches* is a dialogue about the virtue of courage. Two distinguished generals, Nicias and Laches take turns attempting to define the nature of courage while Socrates mediates and responds. Socrates has defeated each of the arguments by the generals and proven to them that they cannot say what the nature of courage is because they do not know it. Despite the fact that Socrates, Nicias, and Laches are all conspicuous examples of courageous men, since not one of the men succeeds in defining courage, they have no real knowledge of it. In the end, Socrates instructs that the whole company go back to school again and that he will also do so himself.

Two things distinguish from the Socratic notion of moral knowledge or the “technique of wisdom” as the keystone of courage:

The first has to do with the moral authoritarianism of the Socratic view and the very close relationship that has to exist between the maintenance of clarity of values, and the ideal of individual integrity. Socrates presents himself as a man oriented to the autonomous choice of ideals. These ideals define his moral limits, which he cannot surpass, whatever his personal cost would be, and determine the direction he has to follow so as to maintain his self-esteem. The mentality plays the most important role, because it examines daily in a practical base the “what is worth of fear” or “what is worth of daring”, and that’s why he values not only the importance of an action, but also the situation in which the feelings of honor and decency are found. The conclusions of Socrates were:

- That we must care and fear not only about the things that might harm our soul like injustice, the lack of measure, the moral recklessness, but also that we must care and dare for things that are good for our soul like justice, legality, and the search of truth through philosophy.
- That we shouldn’t be preoccupied a lot about the non-morals and the evils (sufferings).

More precisely, Socrates saw his life through a double perspective where on the one hand there is the absolute human indifference for the good or the evil of death, but at the same time life contains the absolute moral calling. It is this presence of absolute moral perspective that demands deeds of self-sacrifice, to the point that someone may choose to die than to be morally dishonored.

For this reason it is also important for the brave man, according to the Socratic notion, to reexamine and to reconfirm his values: he must know exactly where he is so as not to abandon his moral ego and must, also, reconfirm that his values are right, so that his perspective about morality and integrity in life are not failed [Schmid, 1985, 114-116].

The second trait concerns the attitude of a man that has awareness about time and the accidental. The brave man knows well the technique of wisdom, weighs his actions predicting the damages and the benefits, and acts in a way to maximize his prosperity. Ideally, his prediction and his skills would obliterate the role of the accidental. There are times that Socrates seemed to speak like this, as if he estimated his actions so as to win a greater happiness. But, in a more profound analysis, Socrates' view approaches much more the tragic perspective where human beings are unable to predict the outcome events, good or bad ones.

This means that as far as the Socratic brave man is concerned, his choices and principles based on which he acts, are totally in his hands. His fear is focused on whether he has understood or not, what is right in his case, or more concisely what is the meaning of good, in life is in general. From the moment, though that he follows his beliefs, he is absolutely certain and prepared to accept the consequences.

The mission of the brave according to Socrates is not to gain the honor and be a winner, but to maintain the position he has given to himself. If he succeeds in this, then he has won, independently if realistically he is defeated.

Socrates' thinking about courage, except from the ability of confronting difficulties, sets off also the dimension of protection and respect of self as the totality of soul and body. The specific approach reminds very much the aim of the psychotherapeutic process. [Schmid, 1985, 117-122]

To my great surprise through the research about courage, I realized that in the modern times we live in, courage has the dimension of early Ancient Greek history having "forgotten" the Socratic dimension of "wisdom".

For example, today when we hear that a fireman dives into fire to save someone, but he himself doesn't manage to survive, leaving 2 young children behind, is this courage? When someone dedicates his life to the care of someone abandoning himself completely, is this courage? When

someone renounces his love so as not to distress his parents or the local society, is this courage? [Phillips, 2004, 265-308]

According to the Socratic notion, of course it is not courage, since it doesn't have the technique of wisdom to protect or not to harm himself. But, according to the modern definition of courage, the protagonists of the above cases could be called courageous or even heroes.

This is the exact point I aim at highlighting with my thesis. How a small group of people with every day stories like the above, managed to find the real courage, the courage to care for themselves by stopping to serve morals and values of other people and to move forward in their lives.

Nowadays, courage is defined as the ability that allows a person to face difficulties, danger, pain etc. without fear. This is the most ordinary interpretation of the definition of the word Courage in a series of Greek and English dictionaries that I looked it up. More specific:

Tharos [lack of fear] - fearlessness, intrepidity, mettle, boldness, power of the soul, mental strength, vigor, sturdiness, fortitude, spirit, bravery [Vostantzoglou, 1962]

Tharos - Mental strength that characterizes the disregard of danger, the absence of fear in facing danger and generally a difficult situation. 2. Intimacy due to a close relationship. [Dictionary of the common Neo Hellenic Language, Aristotle University, Thessaloniki, 1998)

In the English language the word "Tharros" is interpreted as "Courage" having the following definitions:

Courage = Being brave when in a dangerous situation. [Collin, P.H., English Dictionary for Students, Independent Publishing Group, 2002]

Courage = the quality of mind or spirit that enables a person to face difficulty, danger, pain, etc., without fear;

Courage = the ability to control your fear in a dangerous or difficult situation. [Advanced Learner's Dictionary, Cambridge University Press, 2005]

Looking for the etymology of the English word "courage", I discovered with great interest that it comes from the latin word "Cor", which means "heart" [Online Etymology Dictionary, 10/10/2014] and as characteristically Brene Brown² mentions *"the initial definition was to say your story of who you are with all your heart. And so these people had, very simply, the courage to be imperfect. They had the compassion to be noble to themselves first of all and then to others, because, as it is proven, we cannot sympathize others if we can't behave to ourselves with politeness. The other thing they had in common was this. They fully embraced frailty. They believed that what made them vulnerable made them beautiful. They didn't say that frailty is comfortable, but neither unbearable. They just said it is necessary. They spoke about the eagerness to say "I love you" first, the eagerness to do something without having guarantees. They are willing to invest in a relationship that might work or not. They believed that this was fundamental."* [Brown, 2010, 7-31].

Therefore with joy we see contemporary researchers as Dr. Brene Brown, to seek the Socratic perception of courage.

At this point it is worth noticing that in Greek Language, the English word "Courage" is translated as "Kouragio" which means:

Kouragio = bravery, gallantry, fearlessness, manliness [Vostantzoglou, 1962]

Kouragio = the mental strength with which someone faces the difficult situations. [Dictionary of the common Neo Hellenic Language, 1998]

Kouragio = brave confrontation of difficult situations [Major Hellenic Dictionary, 1997]

² Brené Brown is a research professor at the University of Houston Graduate College of Social Work. She has spent the past ten years studying vulnerability, courage, authenticity, and shame.

Summarizing in the new Hellenic language “tharos” and “kouragio” means to dare confronting a difficult and/or dangerous situation, recognizing the fears without though having them as an obstacle. In my paper I will use the word “Tharos”.

Taking into consideration all the above we would say with certainty that courage is a multidimensional virtue. According to the bibliography of the psychologists Seligman and Peterson, courage includes four basic sub-categories- bravery, persistence, sincerity, and zeal [Seligman and Peterson, 2004, 197]

Though Seligman and Peterson come from the field of positive psychology for which I have many questionings from the few I have studied about, I will use for this specific paper the classification they make for courage linking it with the Socratic view and what happened in the psychodrama group. More specifically the four dimensions of courage according to Seligman and Peterson are:

1. **Bravery** - It is related with courage and is defined as the ability to support what is right in difficult situations. Bravery can take a natural-physical form, to act bravely despite the possible physical harm that you might suffer, and the form of morality to act in a way that strengthens what you believe as good , despite the social disapproval and the possible reactions of others.
2. The **persistence** - falls in the wider dimension of courage, because it includes the continuation of a course or a goal, even if an obstacle or a failure has preceded. In other words, don't give up at hard times!
3. The **sincerity** belongs to courage because it includes something more than just saying the truth. Sincerity can be equivalent to integrity and includes the ability to tell the truth to yourself and to people in all kinds of conditions whatsoever. There are many cases in the lives

of all of us, when in order to be sincere and true a great endurance is demanded so as to overcome the fear of disapproval.

4. The **vitality** (enthusiasm, vigor): To face life with enthusiasm and vigor. To be in motion seeking constantly for solutions to the problems and answers to the questionings that arise in our life [Seligman and Peterson, 2004, 213-273].

In these four dimensions I would add a fifth dimension inspired from the Socratic view of Courage:

5. The **technique of wisdom** in which, the brave man knows the realistic data of a situation and with the appropriate actions knows how to direct them towards the events to his benefit, avoiding harm.

In this paper I will try to link psychodrama with courage and how these five dimensions of courage emerged inside the group, as with certainty I mention that psychodrama helped the members, the coordinators and the group as a whole, to find the courage to progress.

But where do we need courage? In which daily circumstances?

- To say what we believe and what we feel without caring what others might say
- To go against the family and social stereotypes that suppress us and hold us back
- To move ahead despite our fears
- To create something new
- So as not to be afraid to face the dark sides of ourselves
- To build up relationships
- To accept the different
- To fail
- To accept our weaknesses
- To farewell a given situation despite the usage and the comfort it offers us

- To progress without harming others
- To look at things through ourselves even if this entails pain.
- To dare to change the scenario of our life

We all experience every day all the above and many more daily cases of mental courage. In our group we had the chance to work them through as psychodrama creates a safe context to be able to let ourselves and face our self in any possible case of dealing with fear or a difficult situation.

In that way the group through the psychodramatic process, working in different levels as members, coordinators and as an entirety-group managed to find the courage to deal with situations as the above.

Moreno and Courage

In the previous chapter we saw the Socratic notion of courage, which in essence, describes the courage that Socrates himself had. I believe that Socrates was not only one of the most important philosophers of Antiquity, but he was also the braver. I have the same belief for Moreno as well. He was not only an important scientist that offered a lot in the field of mental health of the individual and society, but also a very brave person.

The relationship of Moreno with courage starts very early on a ship of unknown identity somewhere in the open sea of the Black Sea. The ship crossed Vosporos with destination Konstanza in Romania. It is the 18 of May 1889 at the dawn of the Holy Saturday and Paulina Ionescu of Jewish origin, wife of Levy Moreno, brings to life a young boy on board. Nobody knew whether the ship was Greek, Turkish, Romanian, or Spanish. This ship's anonymity led to the anonymity and the non-naturalization of the young boy. No one knows whether he is Greek, Turk, Romanian, or Spanish since the birth certificate was never issued. A citizen of the world has just been born. A sailor that would travel from one ocean to the other, from one country to the next with the name Jacob Levy Moreno [Moreno, 1985, 14f].

And so begins the life of young Moreno. With Courage, as the necessary symbol of survival. Growing up, Moreno developed the virtue of courage as a basic virtue to progress in his life.

One Sunday the parents of the now 4 year old Jacob, visited some friends and the young boy stayed at home alone to play with the neighbor's children. In the house's cellar he says to the other children: "Let's play God and angels", "Who will be God?" prompted the question. "I will play God and you will be the angels", answered Jacob. The other children agreed. "But we have to create heaven at first" said one of the children. They took chairs, placed them on the big table which was in the center of the cellar and started building the different levels of paradise, the one after the other by tying a few chairs together in one level and then by

placing one more row of tied chairs on top, till they reached the ceiling. Then with the help of other children, Jacob climbed on the chair of the upper level where he was hardly able to sit. The other children walked around the table using their hands as wings and started singing. The taller children held together the mountain of chairs that they had built. One of the children asked Moreno suddenly: "Why you don't fly?" And Jacob stretched his hands and tried to fly. A little later he landed on the ground with his right hand broken... [Moreno, 1946, 2].

One story from Moreno's childhood that reveals his relationship with courage. A courage that reflects to the courage of a warrior in the pre-Socratic times, since as a young child he dared impulsively without having the necessary wisdom to protect himself.

Moreno from a young age had many influences from various "heroes". One of those was Socrates who constituted a big "hero" for Moreno [Karp, Holmes, Tauvon, 2002, 43]. Socrates as the father of existential philosophy dedicated his whole life speaking with common Athenian citizens aiming at discovering the real self. He had the courage or the "madness" for many, to defy dialogue with the Athenian citizens. In a similar way Moreno developed the most psychodrama theories by discussing and observing many different groups of people.

At completely different times than those of Athens of the 5th century B.C. the adolescent Jacob Levy Moreno started his searches in the Vienna parks speaking and observing children. He wore a green coat and seated on the trunk of a tree he used to say stories to the younger children that used to gather at the Augarten park to play. The children were impatient to hear the next story by Moreno. He never told them the same story twice and he often asked children to create their own stories or to change the given ones.

He observed children playing for hours and was impressed by the sense of freedom, their ability to imagine and to solve their conflicts instantly. It was in that way, that he started forming his idea about how important is spontaneity and its relationship with creativity. He watched how children

got into action and how they switched roles between them. As he told stories and played with them, he was impressed by the lack of obstacles in their spontaneity.

Somewhere at this point he named the readiness of the children for action “warm-up” and started forming the basic philosophy upon which psychodrama was based. (Cannon of creativity-spontaneity, creativity, warm-up). Later on he supported that he himself was an instigator of a revolution among children, a revolution against the social stereotypes and the class discrimination, a revolution for spontaneity and creativity. What he observed was that as children grew up, they become less spontaneous and creative, more anxious and cautious. He wanted to teach them how to preserve their spontaneity and their creativity, against society’s effort to put them in a mould. It is as if he wanted to teach them how to preserve their courage.

Though the children were enthusiastic and impatient on when this peculiar person with the green coat would appear, their parents together with the park’s visitors began to feel discomfort and to see him as something unusual and peculiar, and thus dangerous for their children. “My most important beginning was nevertheless in the gardens of Vienna...” he would say afterwards [Nolte, 2014, 13-14].

At this point we meet the dimension of the wisdom of courage that Socrates mentioned, as Moreno realized that if he continued to speak in the park with the young children as the mysterious man with the green coat, he would harm himself and his beliefs.

We can say with certainty that Moreno was an admirer and an exponent of the Socratic courage. He was found repeatedly in difficult situations and managed through his wisdom and faith to open constantly new paths, creating and expanding the psychodramatic notion and thereafter sociodrama, sociometry, and sociomedicine.

One “acknowledgement” of Moreno about his courage, is made in the famous meeting with Freud. In his autobiography he describes the one and

only meeting he had with him on 1912. It was in a Freud's speech that while he was finishing, he nodded to Moreno so that he approaches him and asked him: "What are you doing?" Moreno replied "Well Mr. Freud, I start from where you stop. You meet people in the artificial environment of your office. I meet people in the street or in their house, in their natural environment. You analyze their dreams. I give them the **courage** to dream again. You analyze them and sort them out. I let them act out their conflicting roles and help them put the pieces together again" [Holmes, Karp, Watson, 1994, 11].

This meeting was never confirmed by Freud. The basic dispute of Moreno with the psychoanalytic theory lies on the negative disposition of psychoanalysis about human and the tendency to relate childhood with calamity and the idea that pain and evil dominate in the universe. Also psychoanalysis allows analysis and excludes action. As a result Moreno inverted many of Freud's ideas like the couch with the stage and the passive role of the therapist to the active role of the coordinator.

Moreno, like Socrates had the courage to doubt important personalities and theories of his time. His doubt though, didn't express denial and refusal. His doubt was a way for further quest aiming at progress.

The life of Moreno is a course full of moments of courage. Indicative is his idea to meet God, his meetings with a group of prostitutes in Am Spittelberg, his interventions in Mitterndorf with the repatriated refugees of the 1st world war from where the basic idea of sociometry emerged, the quest for a new king of Austria which is mentioned as the official birth of psychodrama, the creation of the improvisation theatre Stegreiftheater Austria and Impromptu in United States, his emigration to the United States and of course thousands of cases of psychodrama meetings on stage [Nolte, 2014, 14-52].

Summarizing his personality, Moreno had the courage to strive a lot in his life with his own invincible narcissistic fantasies. The projection of his mother's desires that her child was the new messiah, provisioned his feeling of omnipotence. His identification with Jesus was an important issue for all his life and especially during his youth. He tried to accomplish his mother's fantasy, with periods of deep despair as inevitably he would fail. On the other hand his father's absence in combination with his idealization in Moreno's eyes became the conviction that Moreno was the father himself. This culminated in the gradual adoption of his father's full name. At times he would play God or was God. A man, a personality that offered humanity precious tools for a better life, for a better world!

It is May 1974 in the west coast of the Atlantic, Moreno with Zerka are ready to blow out the 85 candles as his birthday approaches. Suddenly though, he feels an intense discomfort, a burning...the doctor comes. The diagnosis is heart attack. They ask him to be transferred to hospital for medical technical care. Moreno looks at Zerka affectionately and denies politely, he is faithful to his desire to experience undisturbed even his own death, which he considered as a natural continuation of life. 14 May 1974, 4 days before his 85th birthday Jacob Levy Moreno took the protagonist role he always wanted in his life. Probably better: he went to meet the one who has been the leading role of his life, God.

Like this, the life of a brave man was completed, a man who aimed for a better world. A life full of interchanges and discoveries through his own problems, the problems of the society, of humans and of the individual. A life that created and left us all a great heritage. Psychodrama, Sociometry, Sociodrama and Sociatry, notions interrelated with life and the action of Jacob Levy Moreno.

Courageous Socrates expanded the notion of courage through his dialectics. Courageous Moreno created psychodrama, a space where each person can find his lost courage for a better life...

Psychodrama Theory

P.F. Kellermann , defines psychodrama as *“a psychotherapeutic method in which the participants are encouraged to continue and complete their actions through the dramatization, the role playing, and the dramatic representation of the self.”* [Kellermann, 1992, 18-44]

The verb “encouraged” confirms my conviction that psychodrama constitutes a “place” so that the individual finds the courage that is well hidden or that he/she ignores its existence. This is succeeded through a method and a process that Moreno formed over time.

And Kellermann continues:

“A verbal and non-verbal communication is used. Acting a series of scenes, representing, for memories or particular events of the past, incomplete cases, inner dramas, fantasies, dreams, preparations for future dangerous situations or unrehearsed expressions of the mental situation on the here and now. These scenes are either situations of the real life or externalizations of inner mental processes. If it is demanded, the members may assume other roles or give other roles to lifeless objects. Many techniques are used, as the exchange of roles, doubling, mirroring, monologue, etc. The phases of warm-up usually follow the enactment, the closure and the sharing” [Kellermann, 1992, 18-44].

Psychodrama is also known for the intense emotional excitement that is experienced by many protagonists and members who participate in it. Moreno believed that to describe events and experiences, as happens in many forms of psychotherapies, may evoke intense feelings that are related to these events, to make all the body reenact these moments, as happens in psychodrama, and is very effective for emotional stimulation. The techniques of enactment allow very much the greater expression of the emerging feelings. For Freud the enactment is a resistance in therapy. For Moreno the enactment of desires and feelings in a controlled environment is the definition of psychotherapy [Nolte, 2014,179].

The theory of psychodrama was developed over time through the publication of articles of Moreno about psychodrama in journals, his books and books relating to psychodrama which were published by others mainly his students. Here we encounter another common characteristic of Moreno and Socrates as they both didn't leave clear and structured texts about their work.

I herewith present the theories of Moreno that are focal in my paper about courage.

Sociometry

The word sociometry comes from the latin word "socius" which means social and also by the latin word "metrum", which means metric. Based on the etymology of the word, sociometry is a means of measurement of the human relationships. The measurement of relationships is useful not only for the evaluation of behaviors inside groups, but also for the interventions in groups aiming to the positive change and the determination of the extent of change.

For a group, sociometry may constitute a powerful tool for the elimination of conflicts and the improvement of communication among the members, because it allows the group to see itself objectively and to analyze its own dynamics and correlations. It is a methodology for the localization of the energy carrier of the interpersonal relations of group. It imprints its pattern on how the individuals are connected to each other when they act as a group towards a specific goal or aim.

Sociometry is based on the fact that people make choices in their interpersonal relations. Each time that people get together, they make their choices. Where to sit or stand? Choices about who is friendly and who is not, who is the focus of the group, who is rejected, who is isolated.

As Moreno says, "the choices of humans and the choices of things constitute a critical fact for all the relationships. It is indifferent whether the motives

are known to the person who makes the choice or not. It is indifferent whether the choices are inarticulate or very expressive, rational or irrational. They don't demand any specific reasoning for as long as they are spontaneous and real for the person choosing them." (Moreno, 1953, p. 720).

Moreno developed the notion of sociometry to study people and their interpersonal relationships, the relation they have between them, the sub-groups they form and the basis on which people are attracted or reject each other. This dimension has a particular importance working on subjects that demand courage, as when someone is afraid to face a difficulty, specially emotional and unconscious, then except for fear they may feel shame, loneliness or more difficult feelings, resulting in him/her being isolated and feeling lonely. As a consequence, it is important inside the group to create mutual relationships with other equal members and to participate and/or belong in groups or sub-groups. Otherwise, they would have difficulty finding the spirit to work on a difficult issue against their fears, finding the courage they have inside them.

In psychodrama, as a group method, sociometry is developed between members, encouraging the cohesion between them so that the isolated persons start feeling they are not alone through the identifications that are made while applying the sociometric exercises.

During the two years, the members of the experience group developed mutual relationships as they started seeing the other people's cases similar to them. As the group was working, they gradually developed roles in their relations with other members of the group, as they supported, challenged and helped each other. This cohesion was built gradually through the expression of each one's issues inside the group especially in the stage of warm-up and enactment. [Nolte, 2014, 155-158]

Creativity and Spontaneity

The theory of spontaneity and creativity is the corner stone for psychodrama. Moreno believed that through the participation in

psychodrama the spontaneity of the groups and the members is considerably increased. More specifically, he created psychodrama in order to help the participants to live their life more spontaneously.

Spontaneity is an unsustainable energy that functions in the here and now and gives life a sense of integrity and vitality. It is the energy that emerges when we warm-up to express ourselves in roles or reactions to people and situations. It is the energy, which motivates the individual to react sufficiently in a situation that he /she hasn't experienced before or to facilitate the individual's capacity to react in a new way in a familiar situation.

Spontaneity may constitute the most essential element to work with courage as many times an individual may not have access to his/her spontaneity because there is a blocking or he/she is trapped in a negative conception that defines his choices and feels encircled. On the contrary a person that may have access to his/her spontaneity has more choices for the same problem than an encircled person and trusts his/her ability to make the right decisions in life. [Nolte, 2014, 69-85]

Spontaneity is a prerequisite for creativity as it helps to eliminate anxiety and acts as a catalyst of that substance.

In a new situation an individual may show:

1. No reaction
2. An old reaction
3. A new reaction
4. A sufficient new reaction which demands a sense of synchronization, suitability and autonomy [Karp, Holmes, Tavon, 2002, 61-62]

If we make a collation with the notion of courage, we come up with the following finding in the corresponding question, "what choices do people have when they encounter a difficult and/or dangerous situation"?

1. **No reaction.** This choice suggests timidity and domination of the self by fear. The result is usually harmful for the self and is an obvious lack of courage.
2. **An old reaction.** A very usual choice that arises from being encircled by a perspective. Many times while we know that the outcome is harmful for ourselves, we continue to react at exactly the same way, in a similar familiar situation. There is an intense blocking of spontaneity that doesn't allow us to react differently.
3. **A new reaction.** Here we have something new given that we may distinguish that the source of energy is spontaneity and not impulsion which would rather lead us to worse outcomes.
4. **A sufficient new reaction** which demands a sense of timing, suitability and autonomy. Here based on the Socratic notion of Courage, the individual's fear is focused on whether he/she has understood or not, what is right in each case, or what the meaning of right in life in total is. From the moment he/she follows his/her beliefs, he/she is absolutely certain and prepared to accept the consequences and fear is reduced remarkably unlocking the spontaneity, giving its place to courage. But additionally to the capacity to face the difficulty and/or the danger, the individual must protect and respect one's self as an entirety of soul and body. It is important to repeat that the mission of the brave according to Socrates was not to gain the honor and win, but to hold the place he has given to himself. If he/she succeeds in this, then he/she has won, irrespectively whether realistically he is defeated.

Moreno dissociates spontaneity to impulsion. He considers that impulse doesn't entail any kind of creativity and on the contrary may be described metaphorically as if someone is going from bad to worst. A person may have creative ideas, but without spontaneity these ideas are impossible to achieve.

The idea of the conscious development of spontaneity may seem paradoxical, since very often it is difficult for someone to tell spontaneity from impulse. But psychodrama functions primarily in the level of learning to be spontaneous and creative so that the members of the group would react in a more sufficient way at a particular moment in their life. This may be achieved by placing continuously the members of the group in situations that demand a reaction and by giving them the opportunity to try a variety of alternative solutions with the therapist's and the group's help. [Karp, Holmes, Tavon, 2002].

As Socrates believed that a person can be trained in the virtue of courage, so did Moreno believe that the spontaneity of a person could be encouraged and be developed through the exercise and the training and psychodrama is the appropriate place for this training and exercise.

The unlocking of the blocked spontaneity of the individual, is the first step to find the courage through a psychodramatic activity. The access to spontaneity preconditions a process of gradual warm-up.

The warming-up

The warm-up is an aspect of the theory of spontaneity and creativity. "The process of warm-up in each case is the functional expression of spontaneity that operates in all levels of human relationships" (Moreno JL 1993: 14) As a consequence we are always in a process of warm-up for a role that either arises from an inner or an external stimulus. In a sense, we can say that all the techniques that Moreno developed, as doubling, the mirroring, the inversion of roles, the empty chair, the redundant reality, etc., could be described as interventions that help individuals to warm-up at the greater extent so as to express their truth in a psychodramatic meeting.

The warm-up constitutes a process and not just a technique. The phase of warm-up in psychodrama is used, to increase spontaneity, to encourage the trust and the cohesion inside the group as well as the emergence of a protagonist.

There are two different processes of warm-up that we should consider. The first concerns the process of warm-up of the members of the group as they come in the group meeting. Namely the thoughts and feelings that a member experiences anticipating the session, It could be unpleasant feelings and anxiety, or pleasant for other members of the group and on what he/she foresees it will happen. A member may be in great ambivalence, recognizing the positive outcomes he/she could gain from the group and at the same time to be anxious on how to participate in the psychodrama.

The second concerns the warm-up of the group that begins with the meeting of the members in the room of the group and ends with the choice of the protagonist for the psychodrama. The responsibility for the warm-up of the group is exclusively of the coordinator.

The reasons that make the process of warm-up necessary to the psychodrama are many (Karp, Holmes, Tauvon, Proofreading: Lia Zografou, 2002). In a new group, the warm up is necessary to establish a context for the group, such as its duration, the general objectives and what kind of group it is. Also to clarify its activities and to help the members clarify their demands from the group, to establish and suggest, where appropriate, rules for the acceptance of action, of spontaneity, and the dynamic expression and of course to transform the autonomous units to groups of associations.

In a therapeutic or experience group with large frequency of meetings, the warm up helps considerably in the development of cohesion of the group and in the establishment of an active base of trust between the members and the therapist, the acceptance of the cautious and shy behavior eliminating the resistances, in the beginning of a process of exchange of information between the members, till the emergence of the protagonist.

The exercises that the coordinator may use to warm up the group vary and apply in different cases. These exercises may be introductory, sociometric,

with motion, verbal and non-verbal, physical, intimacy and of course exercises for the preparation of the protagonist.

Also a very fundamental aspect is the warm up of the stage director/therapist of the group in relation to space, his feelings and the group dynamics. We would say that the better warm up of the coordinator is to be prepared for the unpredictable.

The aim of the warm up is to help the members of the group to approach the issues and the feelings they bring to the group. The process of the warm up helps the protagonist to be ready in every respect to find the courage to face his/her difficulties.

Role Reverse

The technique of role reversal may be the most recognizable technique of psychodrama. For many it constitutes the engine of psychodrama.

The value of the role reversal lies in the experience to live the role of another person and the possibility to experience ourselves through the eyes of someone else. They see themselves from the perspective of another person. It demands the ability to put ourselves aside and enter the world of someone else.

The role reversal is a technique that brings greater consciousness, the solution and the hope, and this is recognized as the most important invention of psychodrama. It is an attempt to place protagonist A in relation to the unconscious of protagonist B and B in relation to the unconscious of A. The coordinator urges A to externalize freely face to face with B's unconscious, and inversely for B, face to face, with A's unconscious. In that way, each one of them may penetrate as deep as possible to the psychism of the other. Imagine mother A and daughter B, or brother and sister. Apart from the inner resistance, under the gaze of their own Ego, they would have to outplay their interpersonal resistance expressing something that might never have been expressed in their ordinary life till that moment.

In the case of a mother and daughter, each one has at her disposal the repressions and the unconscious of the other. The role reversal gives them the possibility to bring to surface a great part of what has been accumulated during those years.

Role reversal has a number of functions. At first it gives the group information regarding the other important persons in the life of the protagonist. This knowledge, that is brought through interviews, might be based on reality, in the protagonist's beliefs or might be imaginary. As psychodrama's work is to reveal the inner world, if the reality is not satisfactory, then the convictions and the fantasy or the imagination may put new life into the inner world. Without this ascertainment the solution or restoration is impossible.

The process of verification (of the inner world) is by itself a vital element in the inversion of roles. The coordinator might interview the protagonist, when he/she inverts role, so as to verify if the perceptions of the protagonists are as described by him. The initial perceptions often change, as the protagonist reveals a deeper understanding of the other person than it seemed at first. Also, role reversal may be realized when the feelings are blocked and the scene is static. This process may be very important for someone that is not familiar with the evaluation of his /her own perceptions.

It is also an important tool, for someone to learn about relationships. Adults use it as a part of their effort to understand the world around them. Children adopt spontaneously the role reversal through playing from a very young age. In its ideal version and application the role reversal may bring consciousness and hope. It is a technique that is focused in the here and now and offers a variety of choices, playing, creativity and spontaneity. (Karp, Holmes, Tavon, Proofreading Lia Zografou, 2002).

Role reversal should not be used:

- When the action flows smoothly
- When the protagonist feels intensely that is in danger or is very terrified, as he/she faces an external or internal figure that stirs up the fear of violence or insanity(for example the figure of a liar or a sadist).
- With psychotic patients, who may react with fright or to consider the role as the reality.

It should be noted that many role reversals may be exhaustive physically and psychologically.

In the search of Courage, role reversal may be the most important technique of psychodrama. Through the role reversal a member may reach all four dimensions of courage according to Seligman and Peterson theory:

1. **Bravery** - The inversion of roles gives the possibility to the member to express something that he/she didn't have the courage to do till that moment. He/she may be liberated from a natural or physical situation with safety and act bravely strengthening what he believes is right, despite the social disapproval and the possible reactions of others.
2. **Persistence** - through the role reversal a member may draw the strength to continue the course towards his/her goal facing an obstacle or a failure that might be a person, or a situation or a feeling. With the role reversal he/she may assume the role of the obstacle or the failure and see from their perspective how to face them and move on.
3. **Sincerity** - As mentioned above, the process of verification of the inner world of the other but also of the protagonist himself, is itself a vital element in the role reversal. It gives the possibility to the member to discover the other's truth. Sincerity can be equal to integrity, and includes the ability to say the truth to yourself and to people under any circumstances. There are many cases in the life of all of us, where to be sincere and real demands a great endurance so as to overcome the fear of disapproval.
4. **Vitality (enthusiasm and energy)**: With the role reversal, mobility is automatically created in the action taking place. Not only in space, but mainly in the inner world of the protagonist who through the roles reversal moves towards an intense, emotionally, seeking of solutions to the questions and the problems he has himself brought up.

As mentioned in the chapter of "The Notion of Courage", I have added a fifth dimension inspired from the Socratic view of Courage.

5. **The technique of wisdom** in which, role reversal is a key technique to get into others shoes and uncover any existing but hidden threats, and protect the self from harm and unpleasant events.

After the protagonist creates a contract with the conductor, he/she may enact scenes in the sphere of surplus reality developing new scenarios. Through the position of the role reversal a new light is shed on the situation and him/herself and the group. He/she tries his abilities to assume new roles, to expand the range of roles he/she has, to increase the level of his/her spontaneity and to be more open and authentic [Karp, Holmes, Tavon, 2002].

Mirroring

The mirror technique helps the protagonist to see his behavior, as others show him through the representation of their own drama, encouraging him to think objectively about what he shows subjectively. The real aim is that the protagonist sees himself as looking into a mirror. [Karp, Holmes, Tavon, 2002].

The mirror technique is applied usually when the protagonist is blocked emotionally. Then the coordinator invites him to get out of the situation and choose someone, to show his/her own behavior (alter ego). This method is usually understood as a clear stimulus of the protagonist's resistance, because it represents the non-verbal communication.

When the technique of mirroring is affected in the most successful way, then the protagonist observes his/her own behavior and returns on scene, to try another reaction. The difficulty is that the protagonists often condemn their own self. Because of the guilt they have they may become so anxious so that they are unable to see or think their own behavior. Any aggravation of their shame and guilt might be counter-productive, unless if it is dealt with kindness and care, otherwise a further internal dissociation and anxiety may be brought [Karp, Holmes, Tavon, 2002].

With the technique of mirroring the protagonist may see his own behavior and find out in what way he falls short from the desirable level of his spontaneity. The protagonist may advise his/her auxiliary Ego (alter ego). This may warm him up or raise his/her adrenaline so that he wishes then to try the new role.

The technique of mirroring makes the protagonist able to see his behavior as childish. He may realize that the child inside him didn't have any support and that also he as an adult failed to develop the appropriate adult role toward him. As an adult the protagonist may then become the supporter [Sarris, 1995]

The technique of mirroring helps the protagonist to face from the balcony the difficulty that is caused by the blocking. He finds the courage to advise him through the alter ego, on how to move activating his/her spontaneity.

Surplus Reality

Surplus reality is a unique notion of psychodrama. It allows the member of the group to enact not only the scenes from real events that happened in his/her life, but also to scenes that never happened or might never happen, as Zerka Moreno said. It allows the member to express “in a way that his/her life doesn’t allow” [Nolte, 2014]

Surplus reality allows the invisible dimensions of the life of a person such as the hopes, the fears, the fantasies, the dreams, the unexpressed discontents etc, that have not fully been experienced or expressed, to be specified and dramatized.

Old and future events, that constitute a reality in the member’s imagination, may be brought on stage at present. This freedom to express oneself in a psychodrama representation gives members a deep experiential knowledge of their inner self. Moreover Zerka Moreno confirms that the deeper therapeutic change “comes from the enactment of these scenes, these interactions, these moments that can’t be and will never be in real life, for any reason” [Moreno ZT, in Moreno, Blomkvist & Rutzel 2000:18].

This is the power of the surplus reality in action.

An example of Courage in the Group

During the 2-year period, many cases of courage unfolded in the group. Jason's release from the tight embrace of his mother, Manos facing his guilt, Danae working with the loss of her father during adolescence, Christos confession for the incurable disease he had, the group work about the loss of a member, and more. I choose to present Jenny's case, as an example of how psychodrama helps to find your courage, because apart from a strong protagonist drama it also touches entrenched social stereotypes, causing strong identifications for all the members of the group. For me it is a great example of how Courage can emerge through psychodrama.

Jenny's story

Jenny joined the two-year experience psychodrama group of HAGAP at the beginning of the second year. She works as a social worker and at the same time she does her master's degree in sociology. She lives with her parents and the last six months she has a relationship with Petros and she is very in love with him. Jenny is generally a positive, smiling, and optimistic person; she looks happy and seems to have what we call a normal life.

During that meeting Jenny came to the group quite upset. As soon as she sat in circle she spoke right away, saying that she is shocked because she has discovered something very bad about Petros.

I asked her to tell us about her findings and how she felt. She told us that while she was discussing with Petros about the political situation of Greece, he admitted that he is a member of a political organization which stands for extreme political opinions. The particular organization is reprehensible from the majority of Greek society.

"I am in a state of shock" she said and she felt despair as she was very in love with Petros and the only thing she was thinking now, was that she had to break up with him and answered that the basic reason was her family.

Her family was the most precious for Jenny and traditionally for many generations they belong to the opposite ideological party. “ I don’t dare to imagine what would be the reaction of my parents if they find out that I have a relationship with an “ extreme”, she said in great tension.

At this point it is important to mention that at the particular time period the political situation in Greece was quite unstable with an important part of the society turning towards extreme political opinions and parties. The organization that Petros was supporting had entered the Greek Parliament for the first time, causing great commotion in society as a whole and everyone was discussing about it.

I asked Jenny whether she wanted to work on the subject she had brought. She answered positively, but she didn’t want to have the role of the protagonist because she felt emotionally charged and ashamed for the whole event.

Warm-Up

I asked the group to stand up and walk freely in the room. As they were walking, I told them to focus on the feelings they had that particular moment and think of cases of extremes, that exist or that they had faced in their life. I asked them as they walked, to name loudly whatever crossed their mind. They started referring to different cases such as Religion, Values, Love, Fear, Political beliefs, etc.

It was time for sociometry. I told them to think that the room is a scale from one end to the other and one by one to name cases of extremes that had crossed his/her mind. Each time that someone would mention a case, the rest would place themselves in some point inside the room’s scale depending on their feelings and their beliefs for that particular case. In most cases Jenny placed herself in the middle of the scale explaining that this expressed her way of life as well. In love, fear and values she stood

somewhere near the middle. Most members were in the middle as well. The scale concerning religion, had on the one edge the deeply religious ones and on the other edge the non-religious. Jenny placed herself a bit further the middle towards the religious people. The other members were towards the non-religious, except for Manos that was half step in front of Jenny towards the religious ones.

I asked Manos at first why he stood there. He said because he grew up in a family where they believed and still believe very much. I then asked the same question to Jenny. She answered that her family is quite religious and started referring again to the event with Petros and that she can't handle it. She was quite upset. I approached her and asked her whether it was a good moment to work on her case with the help of the group and she agreed.

In that case sociometry helped Jenny set at rest her fears and her shame that she was feeling a little earlier in the circle, as with the identifications during the group she started warming up emotionally and specially in the climax of religion, the creation of a sub-group with Manos made her feel that she wasn't alone.

Enactment

I was walking on stage having Jenny on my left. I urged her to think of a question that expressed her reflections and see whether we could find an answer.

She said: "I want to see if there is a possibility to go on with my relationship with Petros with the new facts". I asked her to choose someone from the other members to be Petros. Without delay she chose Jason. I asked her to place him in relation to herself and on how she was feeling at that moment. She placed herself on one end and Jason on the other, using the same direction of the climax from the previous sociometric exercise of the warm-up.

She changed roles with Petros and expressed his feelings about Jenny, saying that he loves her; he wants to be with her, she is very important to him and that the different political beliefs didn't mean anything to him. Then Jenny back at her place, expressed how she felt about Petros, saying she really loves him, BUT that suddenly her feelings were frozen.

She changed roles with Petros, and I asked her whether being Petros now she would like to make a small step towards Jenny. Petros answered: "Of course" and made a small step. Back at her place, Jenny was feeling better, but again quite distant and frozen. I asked her if she would like herself to make a small step towards Petros, as a response at his own step of goodwill. She tried, but she couldn't, something was holding her still. I asked her how she felt. She said fear and shame.

I asked her to bring them on stage and she chose Danae for shame and Manos for fear. At that moment I asked her to bring on stage love as well and she chose Christos. I asked her to change roles with each of the auxiliary egos, to place them on stage and give them voice.

- Fear was holding her tight from the right hand telling her: "Don't forget your family values"
- Shame was a step backwards, holding her right arm and saying: "Where are you going? Stay here. Remember what our religion is saying."
- Love was standing next to her, holding her left hand telling: "Move ahead..."

Back at her place and while she was hearing the voices and felt the touch, she started crying deeply. I asked her whether she could recognize the voices and replied:

- "Fear is my mother"
- "Shame is my grandmother, my mother's mom"
- "Love are my own values"

I asked her if she now wanted to try and make a step ahead of fear, shame and love holding her. It was very difficult and painful. She was afraid that she might lose them and that she would betray her family values and religious beliefs.

Since there were no more members to play the auxiliary egos of the mother and the grandmother of Jenny and since she didn't want to talk to them, I informed Manos that he wasn't fear any more, but the mother of Jenny and Danae that she was no longer shame, but Jenny's grandmother. Using the roles reversal again, Jenny had a dialogue with her mother and where she told her: "I don't betray my family values. I just want to move ahead holding our values and to be happy. I also have my own values that I want to follow. I love you, but I am not happy if you hold me back."

Through the roles reversal with grandmother, Jenny clearly realized that religion was not her problem but her grandmother's. "Yes, I believe in God, but not in your way. If you decided to devote your life and happiness to God and to Mother of God, that doesn't mean I would do the same."

Back in her position she tried to move towards Petros, but the holding she had was still strong enough to hold her back. Then I asked her whether she wanted to bring on stage her alter ego and watch the scene herself from outside. She answered positively and on the scene came the co-conductor P., since there wasn't any other member available.

Jenny watched the enactment from the balcony. She expressed her anger towards her mother and her grandmother loudly. I asked her whether she could advise Jenny what to do. She shouted at her: "Follow your heart. Leave your mother behind and make a step ahead." She returned to her position in the scene and followed the instructions of her alter ego. Jenny made a step forward and cried. She felt great relief and emotion. I urged her to tell the story to her mother based on how she felt at that moment and reverse roles. She turned to her mother and said: "I want to feel free; I want to move ahead following my own values, that part of them is based on yours, but they aren't exactly the same. I thank you for everything, I will

always love you and care for you, but now I want to follow what my heart tells me, and I want you to accept me as I am.” I asked her what she was feeling and answered great relief, as if she had discharged a huge burden.”

I then asked her to talk to Petros. Having him opposite to her she told him: “I love you very much and I am willing to make a step towards you, but I want you to be the way I loved you. I want you to make clear to me what you are doing in this organization, your deeper beliefs and your worries.” She reversed roles with Petros and answered that he feels exactly the same and that he would do everything not to lose her. In the middle of their distant, Jenny and Petros embraced each other warmly for 2-3 minutes. I asked her if she felt ready to complete and return back in circle. She nodded positively.

Sharing

Jenny was very relieved and moved.

Jason as Petros said he felt very strong from Jenny’s behavior and that he felt ready even to leave behind the political party for Jenny’s favor. He felt great love and pride for the way Jenny faced the situation.

Danae as fear felt powerful and settled from where he was in relation to Jenny. As Jenny’s mother, she felt very sad and angry in the beginning of the scene, but at the end she felt proud for Jenny.

Manos as shame, felt quite well and that he had Jenny in hand. As grandmother, said she didn’t understand why Jenny was trying to leave, but at the end she felt somewhat relieved about Jenny.

Christos as Love, felt strong and brave.

This story reflected events from their life to all members and how hard is to find the courage to make this step ahead towards their own wishes, as they are afraid that they would betray their parents and their values.

Jenny felt moved and she said: “I didn’t imagine that I had the courage to do this. I think I know now what to do and this is worth fighting for! Thank you very much” and she asked to hug the entire group.

A year later, Jenny is very happy with Petros, they live together and have a healthy relationship. Jenny’s mother is really happy having a quite balanced relationship with Petros.

After the inversion of roles, Jenny could penetrate better in the problem. She managed to understand herself better and see what is really hers and what not. She was given the opportunity to understand better Petros and to feel him. The same for her mother and grandmother. She could get out of the deadlock of her mother and grandmother without abandoning her relationship with Petros. Instead of staying in her mother’s and grandmother’s holding and deprive from her personal life the joy and the love, she found the courage-that as love was holding her from the left hand, the heart’s side- to move ahead.

The acting helped her see the possibility of continuation of her relationship with Petros and a new start for the relationship with her mother.

Discussion

When the group started, it was obvious that Jenny was already warmed-up and she was ready to work. She had an intense inner conflict between her love feelings for Peter and the social and family stereotypes which condemned his political beliefs. This upset the whole group, as the issue touched all group members, some more than the others.

The reason I proceed to the warming up, even though Jenny seemed she was already warmed up, was that she felt extremely embarrassed due to the social stereotypes, and this feeling blocked her spontaneity.

Warm up increased group members' spontaneity gradually. As I watched Jenny, I observed that her spontaneity increased when, thanks to sociometry, she started making identifications with other group members. These identifications made her feel that she was not alone in shame and internal conflict anymore. As she felt secure, she decided to work as a protagonist without any pressure.

When I brought Peter on the scene and placed him opposite her, conflict inside her started culminating and caused her intense agitation. With role exchanging technique, she began to empathizing Peter and realized that he is the same person she was in love with and not someone else who has the characteristics of the ideology that the particular political organization represents. Jenny as Peter, through role reversal, could easily make a step of goodwill towards her, projecting his intention to fight for their relationship.

At this point, I could see that Jenny began to realize that the "problem" was not at the opposite side as she originally thought, but rather inside her. This also confirmed, when I asked her to make a step forward, but she could not move. Her spontaneity was blocked because of her fixed stereotypical view, and this froze her on the scene. Then I decided to bring to the scene the auxiliary egos of shame, fear and love, to help Jenny understand what holds her back. The role exchanging technique came to reinforce the process.

From this position, fear expressed a strong intransigence which leave no place for discussion with Jenny. The same was expressed from the position of shame but with less dynamism.

Jenny easily recognized the voices of fear and shame, as her mother's and grandmother's respectively.

Although Jenny began to experience a different reality through the enactment, she was still immobilised, and her mother's and grandmother's drawing did not allow her to follow her heart and make the next step towards Peter.

So, I thought of bringing on stage an auxiliary ego - alter ego, so that Jenny can watch the scene from the balcony. My intention was to help her get out from the blocking situation. Now, she could observe her situation and behaviour, and she expressed intense feelings of unhappiness, rage and anger. This burst acted as a purifying and this helped to activate her spontaneity. From the balcony, she advised Jenny what to do.

When she entered the scene again, she was able to make the step towards Peter. Role exchanging made the internalized patterns of mother and grandmother more conciliatory. It also solved the impasse situation and allowed a sincere and productive dialogue between them. So she found the courage to come in contact with her love feelings and make a step forward. She felt great relief by realizing she was not obliged to choose one end or the other, but she could continue feeling love with Peter and at the same time have a good relationship with her mother and grandmother.

Before closing the enactment, I used the surplus reality technique, to help Jenny experience a situation that reality didn't allow her to experience until then. Peter's hug gave Jenny hope and courage. When Jenny watched herself through the other roles' eyes, she managed to gain a different view and a better self-awareness which help her learn how to manage similar situations with courage, without harming herself.

All group members had the opportunity to "see" themselves in the place of blocked Jenny during feedback. They received a strong stimulus to dare inside the group content and to find the courage to face their own difficulties.

At the meeting's closing, I felt very touched and proud for the work that was done from Jenny and the other group members.

Conclusion

In this study I have explored how psychodrama is effective in finding the courage to face difficulties in our life and move on. I have presented an illustration of working with a protagonist in a specific case.

The psychodramatic process has assisted the protagonist to realize, articulate and face the truth inside her.

Jenny's engagement with the process enabled her to avoid an inner splitting, a very painful and captivating process. With psychodrama she managed to find the courage to act in a novel way. In other words, finding courage means that we can have more options for the same problem. In the initial stage, Jenny had to decide between her love and stereotypes. There was no other option than this dilemma. One way or another, she should sacrifice a part of her. This is a disjunctive process. Through psychodrama and courage a disjunctive or even worse a deadlocked situation can be turned into a conjunctive solution allowing the protagonist to create or recreate the events and the relationships of his life.

Courage has a therapeutic aspect, and psychodrama is the appropriate place to find it and work for a better life.

“Let him that would the world, first move himself”

Socrates, (470C - 399BC)

“I give people the courage to dream again. I let them act out their conflicting roles and help them put the pieces together again”

J.L. Moreno (1889 – 1974)

Bibliography

Blatner, Adam, *Foundations of psychodrama*, Fourth Edition, Springer Publishing Company Inc., NY, 2000

Brown, Brene, "*The Gifts of Imperfection*", Hazelden Publishing, Minnesota, 2010

Collin, P.H., *English Dictionary for Students*, Independent Publishing Group, 2002

Dictionary of the common Neo Hellenic Language, Aristotle University, Thessaloniki, 1998

Holmes Paul, Karp Marcia, Watson Michael, *Psychodrama Since Moreno*, Routledge, 1994

Karp Marcia, Holmes Paul, Bradshaw Tavon Kate, *The Handbook of Psychodrama*, Routledge, Athens, 2002

Kellermann, Peter Felix, *Focus on Psychodrama: The therapeutic aspects of psychodrama*, London: Jessica Kingsley, 1992

MacIntyre, Alasdair, *A Short History of Ethics*, MacMillan, NY, 1966

Major Hellenic Dictionary, Tegopoulos - Fytrakis, Athens, 1997

Moreno Jacob Levi, *Psychodrama* Volume 1, New York: Beacon House, 1946

Moreno, J.L., *Who Shall Survive?*, Beacon, NY, 1953

Moreno, J.L., *The Autobiography of J.L. Moreno*, Moreno Archives, Harvard University, Boston, 1985

Nolte John, *The Philosophy, Theory and Methods of J. L. Moreno, the Man Who Tried to Become God*, Routledge, New York - London, 2014

Online Etymology Dictionary, Douglas Harper, www.etymonline.com, 10/10/2014

Phillips Christopher, "*Six Questions of Socrates: A Modern-Day Journey of Discovery through World Philosophy*", W.W. Norton & Company, 2004, (265-308)

Sarris, Neoklis, *An Introduction to Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama*, Dania Publishing, Athens, 1985

Seligman M. and Peterson C., *“Character Strengths and Virtues: A Handbook and Classification”*, American Psychological Association / Oxford University Press, Washington, 2004

Schmid W. T., *“The Socratic Conception of Courage”*, In *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, University of Illinois Press, 2, 1985

Varnalis, Costas, *“True Apology of Socrates”*, Kedros Publishing, 1991

Vostantzoglou, Theologos, *Anti-lexicon or nominal of the new-hellenic language*, Vostantzoglou, Athens, 1962

Zacharopoulos, I., *“Plato: Laches, Menon, Parmenidis”*, In *Ancient Authors Library*, Dedalos Publishing, 1990