

## **ETHICS OF PSYCHODRAMA**

*İnci Doğaner, MD, Ass. Prof of Psychiatry, TEP in PD,  
Family therapist, Dance therapist, Transgenerational  
Psychotherapist Dr. AÖPD Institute and private practice*

### **Morality versus Moral Philosophy**

Jonathan Moreno -the son of Jacob Levi Moreno and Zerka T. Moreno and the first Psychodramatic family's child- who is now a philosopher, historian and a specialist in bioethics, says that when academic philosophers use the term ethics, they refer either to the study of the morality or the study of the standards of moral conduct of a specific professional group (Moreno JD 1994). Here, in this presentation I will be more on "the study of morality", or "the philosophy of morality" in psychodrama.

What is then the "study of morality"?

Doğan Özlem, who is currently a professor of philosophy in Yeditepe University, starts his discussion on ethics by saying that there is a type of behaviour that is specific to human being; that is "action". Action, he continues, is a voluntary, wilful behaviour that depends on, arises from a principle, norm, belief or value. People living together does not exhibit only actions that results with technics in practice; but they meanwhile act on a level of "good" or "bad" "right" or wrong" regarding a caring towards others. While we give the name homo faber, homo technicus to human who with his/her practical mind organizes his/ her surrounding, dominating over nature; we can give the name homo moralis to the human who acts in moral behaviour. Morality is a group and net of believes, values, norms, taboos, restrictions and propositions which enters to and guides the life of an individual, a group, a nation, a class, a cultural group in a certain period of time. In the Picture you see Aristotle (384-322 BC) with Platon (422- 347 BC) painted by Raphael. It is painted in 1509- 1510: The School of Athens. In a detail from this Picture. Young Aristotle's finger is showing his realistic nature; while Platon's finger is symbolizing his mystical nature of the view about universe. The Ideas. Beyond what he says, Aristotle, when he wrote Nikomachean Ethics dedicated to his son, brought a systematic to the previous views on morality. This was philosophy about morality. This is grounding, classifying, evaluating, comparing basis and that is why he was the first ethician in history. Ethics is a philosophical discipline that handles the phenomena of morality; classifying, evaluating,

comparing different views about three main questions: 1) What should I choose? 2) What should I do? 3) What should I want?

### **Foundation of psychodrama (Does psychodrama has a moral philosophy?)**

I think that the psychodrama itself has a moral philosophy; a grounding which contains a body of interrelated elements. It implies an ethical grounding also regarding the “power issue” which gives us the link to the topic of this conference, “power and ethics”, and I hope this link will itself be clear through my presentation. I will only be able to pass through some parts of this body in my limited time.

Who is the first psychodramatist in the world? Is it Moreno? Who knows it? But,

You see Laurence Olivier as Hamlet in 1948 in the film which is also directed by him after he played in *As You Like It* as Orlando in 1936. “All the world is a stage. And all the men and women merely players. They have their exits and their entrances. And one man in his time plays many parts” was Shakespeare (1564- 1616) saying in *As you Like It*, (by Jacques) in 1599 (Act II, Scene VII). Let’s make another quotation from the psychodramatist Shakespeare’s protagonist Hamlet: He talks to the players: “ ...suit the action to the word, the word to the action... for anything so overdone is from the purpose of playing... was and is, to hold as it were, the mirror up to the nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image and the very age and body of time, his form and pressure.” (Hamlet, Act III, Scene II, 1600). Created probably in 1600, Hamlet, by choosing a double for himself from the theatre artists, the players and giving them orders to act his inner tragic world. This is to be mirrored to himself and to his mother, the queen and to the serpent that stung his father, the old king.

We all know Jacob Levi Moreno (1889- 1974), the founder of Psychodrama, build it as a treatment system for mental disorders. Some pieces of his creation are: role theory, role reversal, role playing, encounter, I- God, I- Thou, action, spontaneity, creativity, co-creation, cultural conserve, axiodrama, sociometry, tele, social and cultural atom, psychodrama, group psychotherapy, sociodrama, surplus reality, co-conscious, co-unconscious. As well as to him it is to us that all go beyond a treatment system. It is a philosophy of life. Moreno at least had strong believes. His beliefs and his philosophy are synonymous. A belief is a simpler form of philosophy. In his masterpiece *Who Shall Survive* he writes: “A truly therapeutic procedure cannot have less an objective than the whole mankind”. This can be said to indicate that Moreno’s techniques were developed from a philosophy that was oriented to affecting the whole human race.

In *Who Shall Survive*, he writes: "My philosophy has been misunderstood. It has been disregarded in many religious and scientific circles. This has not hindered me from continuing to develop techniques whereby my vision of the world could might be established in fact. It is curious that these techniques – sociometry, psychodrama, group psychotherapy- created to implement an underlying philosophy of life have been almost universally accepted while the underlying philosophy has been relegated to the dark corners of library shelves or entirely pushed aside (Moreno, 1934)

### **The protagonist of Jacques Lacan (1901- 1981) : Antigone (441 BC)**

French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan discusses the ethics of psychoanalysis giving a large place in his seminars to a commentary on Sophocles's *Antigone* during 1959- 1960. The original tragedy is written in 441 BC. Lacan writes about it in 3 sections, *The Splendor of Antigone*, *The articulation of play*, and *Antigone between two deaths*. It is a very rich, very deep text by Lacan, full of associations. I had the chance to read it in Turkish by Erkan Ertekin. I will be very short in giving the very very main idea. Lacan talks about Antigone as a protagonist. According to Lacan its her desire aims at the following- the beyond of *Atè* (misfortune). Those whom know this tragedy will remember that her uncle, the King Creon announcing the law that her brother Polynices will not be buried after his death during the battle against his country to get the kingship of Tebai from him. Oedipus's loyal daughter Antigone's desire to bury her brother is not just a simple event. This desire is something that will change the others and the world. It is a new Truth that will change the Law. It is a new perception of Real.

Jacques Lacan catches the creative moment of Antigone as the scene that she buries her brother's dead body late at night when everybody was in dark. The messenger comes and describes the scene to Creon: "First they removed the dust that was covering the body, and then, they placed themselves up-wind so as to avoid the awful smells because it stank. But a strong wind began to blow, and the dust started to fill the air and even. And at the very moment when everybody tries to escape to cover their heads with their arms, and go to earth at the spectacle of the change in nature, little Antigone appears at the height of the total darkness of the cataclysmic moment. She appears once more beside the corpse, emitting moans like a bird that has just lost its young. "This represents the splendour of Antigone. This is where, according to Lacan, beauty and ethics arise. To me this is what the creative moment in psychodrama. After this moment protagonist's face shines and she/he becomes beautiful. I will come to this point when I present my protagonist in psychodrama. In the right space of my slide, you see this scene in the painting of Marie Stillman named *Antigone* by Sophocles. She lived between 1844- 1927. She belongs to a group of painters called pre-Raphaelite brotherhood, the first avant-garde movement in arts.

Later Creon decrees the punishment Antigone will be made to undergo: she will be placed alive in a tomb. In fact every protagonist takes the risk of death, that is the death of her or his own subject. It becomes a "to be or not to be" of Hamlet. The dress of being a subject she wears until that time will change. According to Lacan the ethics, the moral philosophy of psychoanalysis is to cover up the Deep Own Desire of the Subject and let her/ him be able to follow it.

### **The protagonist of Moreno: Not an ancient hero but his patient**

I mentioned about Lacan's protagonist also to emphasize the moral philosophy of Moreno who made a change in a paradigm when he choose the word protagonist which is taken from Ancient Greek Theatre, instead of using the term patient or even client. To him, every ordinary individual, person is a protagonist, the one who undergoes the test; he/she is a hero of his/ her own life. He calls to the potential of the person not to the sick part of him/ of her. He does not write about the pathology of psyche but about an acting, relating, choosing, spontaneous, creative, co-creative, co-lover, god like, cosmic qualities of the psyche. This is a moral stance toward the other, who he also calls with the term "you".

By bringing the term protagonist to daily life he was also taking a psychodramatic role from the world of phantasy, from the world of arts, to reality level. He is perhaps the first one dealing the phase of what he calls second universe in which the child makes a distinction between the real and the phantasy. From this distinction arises the psychodramatic roles and social roles. Moreno, was also offering to the patient a group to take him or her out of social exclusion, isolation. Although the tittle of his book Who Shall Survive reminds us of Darwin, he does not leave the weak of the species to death. He works with the isolate, with the inhibited. He tries to upraise him/ her to Godhead of his/her life, his/ her fortune.

By emphasising the potential "good" qualities that can be reached through practical action, a functional basis, not an abstract idea of goodness entity, Moreno is more Aristotelian than platonistic. The potential for spontaneity is there in deep level. In fact, the protagonist even in the birth time was spontaneous. This is not a rational being. Even when he/ she is not rational the body is there to be spontaneous. Spontaneity and creativity is a virtue to be reached in practice. Spontaneity can be defined as an unconservable force operating in a person, in the moment that leads a person to make an adequate response to a given new situation or context, or a new response to an old situation. It is a warming force for creativity. Spontaneity acts through a person as creativity; ranging from simple novelty to the original and significant developments, new understandings. And it is a quality of God. Moreno, in The Words of Father says that spontaneity has become a biological as well as a social human value. It is today a reference for the scientist as well as the politician, for the artist

as well as the educator. If it is true it must be a frame of reference for the theologian. A theology of Godhead cannot begin without this concept of spontaneity as a first principle. In order to exist meaningfully we must find a path of creativity and identify with the creator. Thus we can become not only part of creation but a part of the creator as well. The world becomes our world, the world of our choice, the world of our creation- a projection of ourselves.

On the other hand in the practice of treatment, Moreno is more a consequentialist than virtue-ethical always going after the consequences of the interactions between the psychodramatist and the protagonist and between group members (the basic question is: how does it effect you?). From another perspective, there are universal goods and beauties: creativity and beauty of the drama (in treatment and in life as well).

### **Man is the measure of all things**

And on the other hand there is domain of high subjectivity. The moral conduct is highly axiological. Psychodrama is always also an axiodrama. The protagonist is free to choose her/his own values in her all subjectivity. As Sophists say "The measure of everything is human". For example Protagoras (481-420 BC) says "The wind is cold for the one who gets cold, and the wind is not cold for the one who does not feel cold". In this sense the protagonist, with the helping hand of spontaneity is free to choose what is good, what is right, what is beautiful, even what is true to him/ her. In this regard psychodrama is relativistic. The painting in the slide is Henri Matisse (1869- 1954) , The Dance (1909)

In the history of philosophy post Kantian German philosopher Nicolai Hartmann (1882- 1950) after Max Scheler (1874- 1928) says that by loving, hating, choosing, deciding we have the values. Our actions are towards values which are not rational but mostly emotional. This trend, which is called meta ethics is later found in Alfred Jules Ayes (1910- 1989) emotivist theory of ethics who says that ethical sentences do not express propositions but emotional attitudes.

In the slide you see on the left one of Alberto Giacometti's paintings. He is a painter from Switzerland who lived between 1901- 1966. I interpret the Picture as showing the protagonist not yet reached her goal; yet unspecified; not yet reached a creative "being moment". On the right is a painting from Orhan Taylan a Turkish artist who born in 1941, from this year 2012.

### **A Psychodrama Protagonist**

Following Moreno that everyone of us is important and unique as a protagonist in life, I choose to give a case example of a protagonist, a real person in treatment. She is both universal and unique as

Antigone. I will use this example and with the method of induction I will go into discussion of the moral philosophy of psychodrama using this case work as a frame for what psychodrama does.

The protagonist accepted her story to be used even with of her own face but according to my Institute's ethic codes I will not use the real images. In Dr. Abdülkadir Özbek Psychodrama Institute we started not to broadcast the real case videos in our presentations since 2010. So, my trainees and I after watching the real video session made a simulation video. Whole session was a three hour session, two hours of which was her case; we reduced it to 30 minutes and then I again cut it to a 12 minute presentation. It will it in two pieces. Let's see the start and discuss the moral philosophy in it.

### **The choice of protagonist: an egalitarian philosophy (video)**

A protagonist is simply in pain, in conflict with him/herself or with others; he/she has sometimes symptoms and diseases according to the dominating view of psychiatry's categorical (that means of kind) classification of mental health disorders (Ayşe has major depression more than 2 years, deepening at some periods; and/ or problems according to dimensional (that means of extension) (Ayşe is dependant and she is highly obsessive) classification. And at least he/she is aiming to know and develop him/ herself. And the most important is she is volunteered to search him/herself for what he/she wants: A better life, flexibility, less pain, happiness, peace, harmony, revenge, fair fight or whatever. He/ she is in a group of healers.

As Moreno (1889- 1974) says, every other person is a healer for the other. Opposite to what Sartre (1905- 1980) later said, "hell is the others" , he probably sees the other side of coin and says that the "heaven is the others". You see in the left side of the slide a sculpture from Alberto Giacometti (1901 - 1966) and in the right from Orhan Taylan (1941-). Sartre sees beings in existence in Giocometti's figures.

Psychodramatic session is divided usually a 3hour lasting sessions where any member who is volunteered to work has to stand for the right to work.

The choice of protagonist is done usually in an egalitarian way: The candidates stand up and the tendencies in group are made clear. Who wants to work for whom especially in regard of being touched by the problem in a similarity basis? This is to assure emotional support level. It is a choice of majority unless the time issue let's it be an unanimous choice, an all yes form of consensus. Or unless the wise man of the group, the expert on the field, the psychodramatist, recommends or chooses someone to work. You see here a choice of majority. Let's watch more.

## **Ayşe's Psychodrama**

Let's talk about a little bit about encounter, our cornerstone first and then talk about the session of our protagonist. The encounter of the protagonist with the therapist is the first step. The therapist has all the three roles mentioned in our Conference's title. She/ he is the King because she sets the rules of the game for the group. When to role reverse when to connect to past. She/ he is the wise man because she is questioning like Socrates; seeing her body and reading her body like a wise man. She is the fool because she does not accept that she knows nothing before seeing and touching her inner life. The protagonist also has all three roles. She is the king of her world; only when she lets you can enter his country. She says where to go, what to look at. She is the wise man because she leads the way to get out of the trouble. She is the fool because she herself doesn't really know where and how the problem arised. She does not know where to go, how to choose. So they encounter. The psychodramatist is transparent as a person. He/ she can share, He/ she can answer almost all questions about him/herself. Tele is at work.

We see here in the first scene how "today" Ayşe is anxious and obsessed about his husband. Then by the question of the therapist we go back to a near future past, to 8 years ago when she separated from her lover and siblings at the same time and see how breathless she became. Letting go her breath is a small cathartic piece of sadness and fear. Again he therapist asks "does it remind you something previous as sad and separated as here?" So again we go deeper to her 11 years old time. And here we reach a deeper memory in which she was witnessing and having a torture by her father. I thought she is here even younger from 11; 5-6 years old. (In the sharing phase this approved by her). She escapes from reality. Through her gaze, her body language we reach her phantasy about a ideal man, a future husband which is played by the same auxiliary playing her husband. The double and this auxiliary playing the ideal husband help her emotionally survive more strongly in this second time. The mirroring technique puts her into the role of the wise woman leading herself to heal. Like Antigone in the scene with his dead brother like a bird, here our protagonist while taking her, her mother's and siblings' revenge in the deep cathartic mode is in her creation. The law, the cultural conserve says "obey your father" but here she breaks the role in surplus reality and encountering her father in a new way. This is the creation scene. And her creation also has an effect on the audience. They change in the meantime. Here, we can also connect how her wish of the father's death in an accident is the fear of today, imagined, obsessed death of her husband. After the catharsis the therapist asks what would be a miracle for her at that point. She answers: A loving family... This is her "deep desire" and psychodrama makes it as if real. Encountering with his father this time with love her face shines. She then goes back to previously painful two scenes; but this time there is no pain. She sends them with joy. In the sharing there is the encounter with the group members, all equal.

Sharing from their own life. No body is giving advice, nobody is interpreting, nobody is judging, no power struggle. Eye to eye, face to face. After this psychodrama we learn from her that for the first time in her life she encountered her father as a person, as a pure human being, forgiving him from the heart gave her a second change, to re-relate.

### **The encounter is the cornerstone of the moral philosophy of psychodrama**

***The first step in encounter: Here and now encounter between the psychodramatist and the protagonist***

***The second step in encounter: Surplus reality encounters in the scene: Protagonist encounters with representatives of the others from his/ her social atom and encounters herself through the double***

***The third step in encounter: Here and now encounters in the group***

***The fourth step in encounter: Encountering with ones from the social atom after the session***

Psychodramatist is always a participant researcher. As Peter Howie (2012) states this immediately places psychodrama outside of the positivistic/ empiricist tradition which is part of enlightenment tradition.

As Marshall and Batten (2004) quoted from Crigger, Holcomb and Weiss (2001) who wrote that the notion of power maybe less problematic for a community when researchers join the community rather than enter as experts or interlopers. Creating partnership with research participants as both individuals and as a group may reduce the risk of unethical or unintentionally insensitive action and treatment. Additionally, research projects that are carried out using participatory methodologies. May be more effective both in terms of ethical conduct and accurate research results.

As you witnessed in the protagonist's play The "Encounter" is cornerstone of the moral philosophy of psychodrama.

As Moreno describes, it means contact of bodies, confrontation, countering and battling, seeing and perceiving, touching and entering into each other, sharing and loving, communicating with each other in a primary, intuitive manner, by speech or gesture, by kiss and embrace, becoming one - una cum uno. It encompasses not only loving, but also hostile and threatening relationships. It is not only an emotional rapport like the professional meeting of a psychian or therapist and patient, or an intellectual rapport, like a teacher and student, or a scientific rapport, like a participant observer and his subject. It is on the most intensive level of communication (Moreno 1969, p 26)

“The participants are not put there by any external authority; they are there because they want to be- representing the extreme authority of the self-chosen path. The encounter is extemporaneous, unstructured, unrehearsed – it occurs on the spur of the moment. It is in the “moment” and “in the here and now” “hic et nunc”. It is the sum total of interaction between two or more persons, not in the dead past or imagined future, but in the fullness of time- the real, concrete and complete situation of experience. It is the convergence of emotional, social and cosmic factors, the identity and total reciprocity” (Moreno, 1969, p 26). The Picture in the left is a painting form Orhan Taylan.

We all know his motto, the poem about encounter:

And when you are near / I will tear your eyes out/ And place them instead of mine/ And you will tear my eyes out/ And place them instead of yours / Then I will look at you with your eyes.../ And you will look at me with mine...

It is this philosophy that he created the techniques of role reversal, sociometry, group.

### ***Martin Buber (1878 - 1965): I and Thou***

He was an Austrian born Israeli philosopher, accepted as existentialist. In his book *I and Thou*, published 10 years later than Moreno wrote the *Encounter* (1914). Buber claims that there are two modes of engaging the world. The mode of experience, in which we gather data, analyse and theorize and the mode of encounter in which we simply relate. In the first mode we treat the other, intimate objects, animals, the world or the God as an object, a thing and It. For example Marx related God as an opiate, Nietzsche as a crutch or Freud as part of our neurosis. Buber tells us how to build a fulfilling and meaningful society by proper use of the neglected second mode of engaging the world and God. In this mode the I and the You are transformed by the relation between them. Modern rational society became exclusively an It-World with the exclusion of encounter. I –Thou/ You is a loving responsibility. The I of the encounter views all of space and time, the entire universe through the You. Encounter is also what Buber says pure present. It can not be reduced down to the qualities of language, time and space. If we can say You to the entire world we suddenly feel a loving responsibility toward everyone and everything. Love is not in but in between. We open ourselves to come into contact with anything that You has to offer, with the fullness of the You's being. The hate cannot be felt to the whole of the You; it may only be towards only a part. Within the It world we become alienated, oppressed and doomed rather than powerful. It is only encounter; the cosmic force of love between human beings can save our society, by allowing us to build a community based on shared loving responsibility. I- You is a mode which is reciprocal and participatory. The I of It is

“ego” while the I of You is person. Socrates was able to say You to men; Goethe is a sample who said you to the nature; Jesus could say You to the God, the eternal You. A man of nearly pure ego on the other hand is Napoleon according to Buber. Coming to the encounter with God there is a moment of readiness which Buber calls “man’s decisive moment”. It is both ways It involves both choosing and both being chosen. Buber thinks that we reach God through encounter with human beings or with nature. While encounter with God does involve a feeling of complete dependence but it also involves the opposite of that feeling a feeling of complete creative power. This requires to live in paradoxes, too. When we say You to human beings they respond with words; when we say “You” to the God he responds by transforming us. The encounter with God comes to man that he may prove its meaning in action in the world. Here in the left you see Michelangelo’s (1475- 1564) Creation of Adam fresco.

According to me Martin Buber has a very similar to Moreno’s philosophy but yet he had no chance to be able to put them into practical way. Meanwhile Moreno developed tools which are themselves even used without naming the philosophy.

Another difference is that Moreno used I-God concept which is giving the person limitless power to create his/ her own world as well as his/ her destiny. In parenthesis I would like to mention another point about how he thinks about man and God relation. He, in the Words of the Father says “The principle is clear, on the level of creativity. We do not identify Shakespeare with Hamlet, Lear, Macbeth, Juliet or Cordelia. If this is true in the relationship between dramatist and one of his characters how much more pertinent must it be for the relationship between man and God .” (Moreno JL, The Words of the Father, 1923, 2011 ).So to me, for Moreno, it is not a problem of whether God exists or not but it is a problem of believing in the virtues of God that makes the person powerful enough for creation.

In Islam/ sufi history it was 10<sup>th</sup> century that mystic Hallac’i Mansur (858- 922) said “Enel Hak” that means I am Hakk (one name of God) (and he was tortured and peeled of although not because of that)

According to Jonathan Moreno, Moreno’s identification of himself with God can, in one way, be understood in terms of Nietzschean irony.

### ***Nietzschean Irony***

Ours is a world in which “God is Dead” in the sense that pre modern values no longer have the gravity they had. Unless we provide a compass we are lost. It awaits a “overman” to embrace reality to love our destiny. If there is no God we can still “will” God to be. And we all have the spontaneity and creativity to do it.

One way that I put Friedrich Nietzsche (1844 - 1890) and Moreno together is that their putting the “body” in priority to rationality. They open the gate to the irrational, the psyche, as did Freud. And spontaneity is there in deep level. In fact, the protagonist even in the birth time was spontaneous. This is not a rational being. Even when he/she is not rational the body is there to be spontaneous. There to survive.

Nietzsche appears as the first philosopher who opposes the rational reasoning to be the main mean of reaching reality. His overman is in fact was a reminder of the body. He was putting body- body and body- object culture forward to mind- object culture. So he opened a road to phenomenologists (Husserl) and to existentialists (Kierkegaard, Heidegger and Sartre).

To me, I-God is also a possible connection for all of us since we have a God in our innate being. Because all of us had an omnipotent mother in our unconscious. We all passed through primary narcissism.

**Emmanuel Lèvinas** (1906- 1995) is a postmodern constructivist philosopher. He is important to mention about because of what he put in the philosophy about encountering. For Levinas the meaning of being human resides neither in man’s rational yet finite capacity for knowledge and for action (referring Kant), nor in his finite ability to be (referring Heidegger) . Rather the meaning of being human resides in his ethical responsibility for the Other. He calls “ethics as the first philosophy”. He thinks philosophy as the wisdom of love. He drives the primacy of the ethics from the encounter. In face to face relation (remember Moreno’s eye to eye encounter) the Other’s proximity and distance are both strongly felt. The revelation of face makes a demand. “Thou shall not kill me” Different from Buber and Moreno here the relation is not reciprocal; not symmetric; it’s asymmetric. The face gives itself priority to the self. Imperative comes from the Other. The face of the Other in this sense traces where God passes. And God is the infinite Other.

The photo in the left side of the slide is from Cindy Sherman (1954-) She dresses herself as the movie characters, the others and takes pictures of herself. She role reverses.

### **Some bridges to some philosophical traditions: Traditions with similarity to psychodrama**

Coming to the end of my presentation I want to mention some more connections.

Peter Howie gives a list of philosophical traditions with similarity to Moreno’s thoughts:

Hermeneutic/interpretive philosophy because what is known is a function of both the observer and observed. Human beings actions are the result of a creative response to their content and are thus meaningful to themselves at the least and can be interpreted and understood by the others.

Phenomenology because it values the subjective experiences of a person. If the protagonist relates his or her expressions to god or to ideology it is still the protagonist's own subjective view of what god or an ideology is.

Existentialism because psychodrama creates a vehicle for individuals to take their place in the world, to craft meaning for themselves.

Social constructivism because the participants develop or construct their knowledge through their own efforts through interaction with ideas and interacting with other people and a learning environment that includes teachers and teacher's ideas.

Postmodernism since here human beings are meaning creators and psychodrama is explicitly or implicitly used to develop new and original meanings.

## **Closure**

Let's have a look to Carl Orff's O fortuna by Jean Pierre Ponelle:

I have a chance for a life. What if I have it for once? Is it the blind fortune that drags me to its own flow? It is turning... It is turning... Is there somewhere to go that I decide? The angel is at the right side, the devil is on the left. Who am I among them? Which one is me? Should I be an angel? What about the devil in me? Can I choose? Can I choose to be? How should I act? Where to go? Turn and turn. Effects from the God, the King, from the Wise Man, from the Fool. Am I lost in the Other's desire? Who am I down there? The masked lady? The prostitute? The king? The king? The poet? The prayer? The poet Masked and masked? I need to de-mask. How can I do it?

Money, Violence, Death...O which mask? O Fortuna... Am I blind? Or am I spontaneous genius? Act... Act... The death is there. To be or not to be... Shall I survive?

## REFERENCES

- Lacan J (1959-1960) The Ethics of Psychoanalysis: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Jacques-Alain Miller (Ed) Book VII translated by Dennis Porter.
- Levinas E (2010) Sonsuza Tanıklık, Metis Yayınları, İstanbul
- HowieP (2012)Philosophy of Life: J.L. Moreno. Revolutionary underpinnings of psychodrama and group psychotherapy. (<http://www.moreno.com.au/philosophy>). Group: The Journal of the Eastern Group Psychotherapy Society, Volume 36.2, Summer 2012, pp. 135-146.
- Marshall A and Batten S (2004) Forum: Qualitative Social Research Volume 5 No 3 Art 39, September.
- Moreno JL (1923) The words of the father. Norht-West Psychodrama Association, 2011.
- Moreno JL Encounter (1914) Flugbericht 1, Einladung zu einer Begegnung. Wien u. Leipzig.
- Moreno JL (1934, 1945, 1953, 1993 ) Who Shall Survive: Foundations of Sociometry, Group Psychotherapy and Sociodrama. New York: Beacon House.
- Moreno J L and Moreno Z T (1969). Psychodrama Third Volume. New York: Beacon House
- Moreno JD ( 1994) Psychodramatic moral philosophy and ethics. In Innovations in Theory and Practice. P Holmes, M Karp, M Watson (eds) Routledge, London
- Özlem D (2010) Etik: Ahlak Felsefesi. Say Yayınları, 2. Baskı, İstanbul
- Shekaespeare W (1599) As You Like It. [www.william-sheakespeare.info/script-text-as-you-like-it.htm](http://www.william-sheakespeare.info/script-text-as-you-like-it.htm)
- Shekaspeare W (1600) Hamlet. [www.william-sheakespeare.info/script-text-hamlet.htm](http://www.william-sheakespeare.info/script-text-hamlet.htm)
- Carl Orff: O Fortuna Jean Pierre Ponnelle 1975. (You tube)