

Sociometry, Peace Research and Creative Conflict Transformation: An invitation to an encounter between J.L. Moreno and Johan Galtung¹

By: Dr. Wilfried Graf

Translated by: Augustin Nicolescou

Note: This is a translation of the original article published in German in the journal *Zeitschrift für Psychodrama und Soziometrie*. Please contact the author before quoting the translation.

Summary:

In his seminal work Who Shall Survive (1934), Moreno expresses his hope that sociometry will ultimately prepare the ground for a “Science of Peace.” On this basis, the author would like to invite the reader to a meeting between sociometry, sociatry, and sociodrama, (especially the contributions of J. L. Moreno) on the one hand, and peace research and conflict transformation (especially the contributions of Johan Galtung) on the other.

In the first part of this article, J.L. Moreno is re-examined as an early pioneer of peace research. The second part consists of a discussion of the similarities and differences between J. L. Moreno, as the founder of sociometry and psychodrama, and Johan Galtung, as the founder of peace research. The third part outlines the possibility of bringing together both approaches for a method of creative conflict transformation, conflict counseling, and mediation.

1. Moreno as a Peace Researcher

Moreno belongs to a group of Jewish philosophers such as Buber, Canetti and Broch, who, in the early 20th century, sought to approach the problem of peace by way of a creative encounter between science and mysticism. They developed a diagnosis and prognosis of “mass delusion,” as well as a sociotherapy based on a method of dialogue, which are surprisingly up to date, even though their discovery by modern peace research has been a long time in coming. Nevertheless, concerning Moreno, in 1985, the then Austrian Institute for Peace Research and Peace Education implemented a research project on “the social psychology of peace” using psychodramatic methods (Graf, Ottomeyer 1986).

The decisive evidence of Moreno’s self-understanding as a peace research pioneer comes from Moreno himself. In the second edition (1953) of his 1934 work Who Shall Survive, Moreno foresees the broadening of “therapeutic” proposals and services coming from the social sciences. He refers to the tendency in sociology to speak of a “sociatry,” of “anthropotherapy” within anthropology, and of “theotherapy” within theology, saying that it was his development of group therapy and sociodrama which prepared the mental climate for these new therapies. Sociometry would, however, need to control these tendencies and to monitor that it does not become abused through the influences of subjective scientific prejudices. Finally, the last sentence, “On the other side, all of these therapeutic attempts give

¹ Revision of a lecture given at the conference of the Federation of European Psychodrama Training Organizations (FEPTO) held on 21 April 2005, in Vienna. I owe much gratitude to my psychodrama teachers and colleagues for important experiences and their advice, especially Jutta Fürst, Helmut Haselbacher, Gudrun Kramer, Monika Lauer Perez, Klaus Ottomeyer, Elisabeth Pfäfflin, Hildegard Pruckner, Roswith Riepl, Susanne Schulze and Michael Wieser.

one more and more the confidence that sociometry, with its new objectivity, will ultimately prepare the ground for a 'Science of peace.'" (Moreno 1954, 470). In the German edition this sentence fell victim to revisions which were made in the first and last parts of the book. This revision was approved of and favored by Moreno himself, possibly due to the callow and problematic hypotheses of the "saturation point" (Sättigungsgrad) in inter-ethnic relations, which had been applied in particular to the relationship between Germans and Jews.²

If Moreno speaks here of sociometry as the basis for a future science of peace, he is talking of his work in its entirety, i.e. more than sociometry in a narrow sense. As is generally known, his work as a whole includes "a study of divinity, a study of people, a study of the society... ,which many people take to be unconnected, [however for Moreno] all three belong together" (Hutter 39). His project of a science of peace can therefore, on closer inspection, easily be found throughout his entire paradigm:

- in his therapeutic philosophy (creativity, spontaneity, tele)
- in his therapeutic social theory (sociometry, sociodynamics, sociatry)
- and in his therapeutic praxeology (psychodrama, sociodrama, and axiodrama).

Therapeutic Philosophy (Creativity, Spontaneity, Tele)

Moreno's therapeutic philosophy is also the foundation of his project for a science of peace. As a philosophy of a cosmic, societal and human dialectic of creativity and spontaneity, it assumes that mankind represents a complex unit on the basis of diversity, which is interlaced and held together by the forces of the tele. "The object of a true therapeutic method should not be anything less than the whole of mankind," writes Moreno already in 1934, in his first edition of Who Shall Survive. And he cites this sentence once more in his 1957 programmatic article, "Global Psychotherapy and Prospects of a Therapeutic World Order."

"The question thereby suggests itself, what does Moreno actually understand by therapy?" With this question, Ferdinand Buer opens this exciting debate about Moreno's article in the 1991 *Jahrbuch für Psychodrama, psychosoziale Praxis & Gesellschaftspolitik*. Buer goes on to give the following answer, "mutual support—that is precisely what Moreno means by therapy. This definition finds itself more in the tradition of an anarchical socialism focused on mutualism, than in the tradition of clinical medicine" (1991, 47). It would thereby also belong to the tradition of American Pragmatism, as Buer has since stressed (1999, 37).

Before one decides whether one wants to support this alternative meaning of therapy, or seek to translate it into the more understandable current concepts of, self-development, self-help, and mutual liberation, one must truly understand it. Freudians, Marxists and Gestaltists polemicize strongly against the project of a therapeutic society and world order (Buer 1993, 75-122). Moreno's utopia is particularly and blatantly misunderstood by the gestalt therapist Stefan Blankertz who, referring to Paul Goodman, writes of "a pacified world society that has

² The citations are my own translations of the text in the French edition (Moreno 1954), which is a translation of the second American edition (Moreno 1953) and which was republished in an expanded version by A. Ancelin-Schützenberger and Zerka T. Moreno. For a publication history of "Who shall survive" see the foreword of Rainer Dollasse (1996, xIff) in the third German edition (Moreno 1996).

transcended all internal conflicts and passions with inconceivably destructive energies against everything that is interpreted as “external” (Buer 1993, 95). It is particularly frustrating that Blankertz repeats this charge, word for word, 12 years later in the new Lexikon der Gestalttherapie (Blankertz, Doubrawa, 1991). If one takes the whole of Moreno’s work, rather than individual sentences, articles, or passages, for Moreno it is clearly the opposite: it is a matter of a practical philosophy for liberation, a therapy for self-therapy, a help for self-help, which, however, is not stuck in the “here and now,” but rather dialectically envisages the three time horizons of present, past and future. His point is unequivocally that conflicts are not to be managed on the surface level, but rather conflicts are to be creatively transformed on the basis of his therapeutic philosophy of encounter and dialogue.

Therapeutic Social Theory (Sociometry, Sociodynamics, Sociatry)

Moreno’s therapeutic social theory (originally referred to as sociometry, as a science of social “principles”) covers a complex interconnection of sociometry, sociodynamiks and sociatry. Consequently, sociometry increasingly becomes accepted as an expanded generic term for the entire sociological (and/or “socionomic”) triangle. I would regard sociatry or sociotherapy as a more adequate general term.³ Sociometry in the narrower sense is, mainly, empirically oriented; it tries to measure, simulate and visualize the deep structures of the social relations. Moreno does not identify this sociometric instrument in a physical-scientific sense, but rather “as situational research [...] that examines the social microstructure and replaces the ideal of objectivity, which is ultimately neither obtainable nor desirable, by the question of the subjective insider’s view of the people concerned” (Hutter 294).

Sociodynamics attempts to understand the dynamics on the basis of this sociometric analysis, Sociatry’s objective is for a sociotherapy of the social relations. “Sociatry is a healing sociometry,” writes Moreno, “the science of social healing. It is therefore a matter of ailing societies. It is in contrast to social psychiatry, which has to do with the impact of society on ailing individuals. A societer is a therapist who is proficient in society” (Moreno 1957, 37). With this expanded understanding, sociometry aims for social conflict research and conflict transformation with methods of participatory action research, which enables scenic understanding and dialogical learning. It strives for a therapeutic conflict intervention, or rather a nonviolent conflict resolution of micro-, meso- and macro-conflicts, with the vision of a sociometric reorganization of society, thereby critically-constructively distinguishing itself from Marxism.

Therapeutic Praxeology (Psychodrama, Sociodrama, and Axiodrama)

In Moreno’s predominantly group therapeutic praxeology, psychodrama actually represents only *one dimension* within an overall complex dramatic process, which aims for a creative, as well as spontaneous, reorganization of roles, structures and cultures. Psychodrama thereby deals with the intra- and interpersonal conflict dimensions, sociodrama deals with the social conflict dimensions, and axiodrama deals with the cultural conflict dimensions.

³ When “Sociometry and psychodrama” or even simply “psychodrama” is mentioned in the text, the terms are meant to refer to the entire “Moreno-System,” in other words, it includes the philosophy of creativity, as well as socio-dynamics, sociatry, as well as socio-drama and axiodrama.

This comprehensive approach of Moreno, a complex co-therapeutic philosophy, a social theory and praxeology, remains incomplete; it took a back seat in his own praxis and did not really prevail after his death. He was also partly unable to free himself from the positivistic reductionism and biologicistic misunderstandings of sociology in the first decades of the 20th century. The therapeutic philosophy of creativity was kept up by many psychodramatists either as a moribund cultural conserve or misunderstood as a private religion and replaced with more “profane” or more “scientific” paradigms (psychoanalysis, system theory, constructivism). Sociometry was often narrowed down to a purely quantitative, statistical concept of measurability of social relations, which needs to be critically questioned. And psychodrama was reduced to psychotherapy. Even so, the creative integral spirit of psychodrama and sociometry did not disappear completely. The therapeutic philosophy of Moreno has meanwhile been comprehensively reconstructed, particularly in the works of Buer (1999), Hutter (2002) and Schacht (2003).

In order to reinvent and to further rethink Moreno’s comprehensive approach of a complex co-therapeutic philosophy, social theory and praxeology in the present time – *after* postmodernism – the dimensions of psychodrama, of sociodrama, as well as of axiodrama, would have to be interrelated holistically into an integrative, complex understanding. Here, however, I only wish to point out the potential significance of Moreno’s corpus with its therapeutic philosophy, social theory and praxeology for the fields of peace research and conflict transformation. And conversely: through a dialogue with modern peace research, Moreno’s vision of a sociotherapeutic reorganization of society and the world order could be understood in a new way – and as the practice of creative conflict transformation, be interpreted in a new way. Therefore, Johan Galtung’s theoretical and praxeological approach, with his key notions of “actors,” “structure,” and “culture,” strikes me as particularly suited for a new interpretation of J.L. Moreno’s approach, with his three dimensions of “psychodrama,” “sociodrama,” and “axiodrama” – and vice-versa as well.

2. Galtung’s Transcend Method as an Interpretation Tool for “Conflict-Drama” and “Conflict-Society”?

„Of course there is drama at the micro-level, but in general it appears that the world is governed by drama that takes place at the MACRO-level, even at the global level. There is drama within countries, between classes of which they are composed; there is drama between the countries. ... But how can one express all this as something that takes place in the mind and the soul of a handful of persons, say, in a family, in a school, an office, or maybe a little town? ... One needs a stage that at least takes in scenes from the First, the Second, the Third and the Fourth worlds ..., and if at all possible from several of the four classes in all places.”

–Galtung 1988, 202

The Norwegian peace researcher, Johan Galtung, has been engaged in more than 45 conflicts around the world, over a period of more than 40 years. While Moreno focused primarily on the micro- and meso-levels of conflict within and between persons, groups, organizations, and cultures, working with methods of group therapy and drama-based methods, Galtung focuses primarily on the macro- and mega-levels of conflict within and between nations, states, regions and civilizations, dealing with these conflicts primarily by means of dialogical methods (Galtung 1998). Both have a “secret” spiritual core within the framework of a

secular, post-modern and multicultural-oriented cosmology that is the key to making their overall philosophical, theoretical and praxeological systems accessible; for Moreno, it is the Jewish mystics (Hutter), for Galtung, it is Gandhi.

Like Moreno, Galtung also differentiates between the surface level and the deep structure of a conflict constellation, and he likewise makes a point of bringing into awareness the discrepancies between the surface level and the deep structure. Moreno researched the sociometric matrix with the contradictions and dynamics of attraction, repulsion and neutrality in inter-personal and societal relations. Galtung, inspired by a Taoist-Buddhist epistemology, explicitly incorporates two additional possibilities, which can be implicitly found in Moreno's work as well: the compromise between attraction and repulsion, which usually remains unsatisfactory, as well as transcendence, the creative negation of the contradiction between attraction and repulsion (Galtung 1998).

Moreno sees the macro-sociological ideologies such as Marxism or Liberalism enhanced or revised through his paradigm of microgroups. He virtually replaces the Marxist macrocosm with a Shakespearian microcosm. However, as Buer (1999) and Ottomeyer (1987) have shown, there remains a deficit with Moreno when going from the micro-sociological to the macro-sociological. Hutter also questions this claim of Moreno, because he is not able to adequately grasp the qualitative leap from the sociometric micro-level to macrosociological and economic phenomena. "It is very characteristic of the monetary-administrative system – becoming too complex in the Modern era – that it operates beyond the lifeworldly structures of roles and relations, thereby impairing or even destroying the latter." (302). Galtung's complex theory of violence and peace could perhaps allow to better grasp the qualitative jump from the microsociological to the macrosociological level (Galtung 2000). Conversely, with Galtung, the psychological dimension often remains underexposed.

Direct, Structural and Cultural Violence

Like Moreno, Galtung would like to overcome both Marxism's reductionism on the economic system, as well as the reductionism of Liberalism on the political system. Galtung's approach, like Moreno's sociatry, is based on a philosophy of creativity and, also like Moreno, he aims for a sociatric reorganization of society and world order, by dismantling direct, structural and cultural violence, as well as by developing direct, structural and cultural peace (Galtung 1998).

Direct violence is an event; structural violence is a process with ups and downs; cultural violence is a constant, which remains essentially unchanged due to the slow transformation of fundamental aspects of cultures over a long period of time. Galtung likens the timeframe of the three forms of violence to the theory of earthquakes. An earthquake is an event (direct violence), the movement of the tectonic plates is a process (structural violence), and the existence of fault lines between the plates is a rather permanent condition (cultural violence).

Based on Galtung's approach, social conflict constellations can be analyzed and dealt with along three levels:

- on the level of individuals or social actors (their subjective intentions, behavior patterns, and interactions, influenced by the deeper underlying basic human needs),

- on the level of social-structural conditions (the concrete contradictions between the apparently incompatible goals of the actors, influenced by the deeper, underlying, patterns of social relationships, and collective contradictions) as well as
- on the level of cultural conditions (the subjective assumptions, attitudes, and patterns of thinking of the actors, influenced by the deeper, underlying, inter-subjective, cultural assumptions, attitudes and patterns of thinking).

The Civilizational Unconscious

Galtung refers to the deeper dimensions of a collective and unconscious socio-cultural cosmology, which influences the behavior of the actors, the social structures and the culture. He makes the assumption that a large part of conflict factors are rooted in these deeper dimensions of culture, society and human behavior, in the “collective unconscious” of deep cultures, deep structures and basic needs. Galtung speaks of a “collective unconscious,” as well as of a “collective subconscious.”

In order to avoid confusion, I would suggest to use collective, un- or preconscious, as Galtung’s concepts tend to be closer to those of Freud’s collective unconscious. It does not refer to the unconscious in the Jungian sense, as it is not ahistorical, and does not deal with trans-cultural archetype on the individual level common to all human beings. It is about making conscious a collective unconscious which, in contrast to Jung’s collective unconscious, historically, socially, and culturally influenced and changeable. Here, again, there is a connection to Moreno, who understood the unconscious as a co-unconscious between man, society and cosmos. Galtung introduces an anthropological unconscious (basic human needs), a social unconscious (latent contradictions and social structures, the so-called deep structure) and a cultural unconscious (implicit attitudes, and assumptions, implicit cultural meanings- the so-called deep culture). Does this not sound like Moreno’s co-unconscious in a complex conflict constellation between actors, structures, cultures? One could also speak of a “civilizational unconscious,” in order to distinguish Galtung’s concept from other concepts of the collective unconscious.

Social Deep Structures

Galtung differentiates between eight basic social structures or fault lines:

Nature: Human vs. Nature (speciesism);

Gender: Male vs. Female (sexism);

Generation: Old vs. Middle-aged vs. Young (ageism);

Skin color: Light vs. Dark (racism);

Class: Powerful vs. Powerless, (classism) which includes

- Political power, who decides over/represses whom
- Military power, who forces/kills whom
- Economic power, who exploits whom
- Cultural power, who conditions/alienates whom

Normal vs. Deviant, (stigmatization)

Nation/Culture: Dominant vs. Dominated (nationalism, fundamentalism)

Geography: Center vs. Periphery, (centralism)

Galtung’s social fault lines result from similar dynamics as those which Moreno

finds in microstructures (attraction, repulsion, neutrality). He examines unconscious sociometric patterns or syndromes within and between the macro-sociological deep structures, which makes it possible to make the deep structural grammar and sociodrama conscious on the surface level. It would be an exciting challenge for sociometric and socio-dramatic action research to link Moreno's sociometric microstructures with Galtung's macro-sociological deep structures.

Deep Cultural Assumptions

The social relationship patterns on the deep structural level correspond to cultural patterns of meaning, collective pre-and unconscious (cognitive) patterns of thinking and (emotive) patterns of feeling, which (de)motivate and (de)legitimate the deep structural, mostly asymmetric, power relations. Galtung refers to deep culture, by which he means the automated, forgotten, or displaced assumptions and attitudes residing in the collective unconscious, and to which individuals and groups, quasi "axio-dramatically," fall back to when faced with deep conflict and crisis. These are the raw materials for "axio-dramatic" dynamics of escalation and polarization, which are fueled by fundamentalist policies of elites. Such deep cultural patterns of meaning can be identified within all areas of culture (religion and ideology, language and art, empirical and formal science), and they are used to legitimate direct or structural violence.

The Transcend Approach

Against the background of a specific theory of violence and peace and his worldwide experience, Galtung has, over the past 15 years, developed an approach for conflict transformation, peacebuilding and reconciliation which seeks to overcome the limits and deficits of mainstream approaches to civilian conflict transformation, such as conflict management, conflict resolution, negotiations and mediation.⁴

The Transcend approach does not differ so much from other approaches on the practical methods for counseling, moderation, facilitation, mediation, negotiation, etc. There are necessarily commonalities on this level. Transcend is above all integratively oriented, meaning that it combines actor-oriented, structure-oriented, and culture-oriented methods. Essential to this method, however, is a specific philosophical, scientific, and praxeological approach. Transcend is guided firstly by a complex philosophy of peace ("peace by peaceful means," inspired by Gandhi's Satyagraha), secondly, by a complex, critical-constructivist peace theory (coming from a critical theory of structural and cultural violence) and thirdly, by a praxeology of (deep) dialogues, in order to get from the surface level to the "collective unconscious" deep dimension of a conflict constellation.

In the Transcend approach, conflicts are addressed through a dialogical, interactive manner, together with all conflict parties. The Transcend Dialogue does not, however, begin with a "round table." Rather, each conflict party is worked with separately for a while, in order to prepare them for later negotiations or mediation. It is about helping the parties help themselves, using peaceful means. Galtung puts forward that non-violent conflict interventions and creative proposals by a third

⁴ In the setting of the first training in Vienna, the Transcend approach was further developed into a "Six Step Process" geared especially towards mediation and conflict counseling. Since 2005 trainings in the "Six-Step Process" have been offered in Germany (www.transcend-germany.de).

party are needed once a certain stage of escalation has been reached in order to transform hardened conflicts. Transcend conflict counselors consciously assist in elaborating creative proposals, and when needed, also bring in international experts. It is often necessary to work with the conflict parties separately for some time, particularly when dealing with deep structural and cultural dimensions.

The Transcend approach places conflict work along a spectrum going from violence prevention (rather than conflict preventions), to conflict transformation, to peacebuilding and reconciliation. It is therefore not only about the prevention of violence and the deconstruction of different forms of violence, but also about the construction of a culture of nonviolence, empathy and creativity. It is not necessary to wait for the conflict parties to be ready to negotiate voluntarily and in a spirit of mutual trust. In general, one begins to work with a conflict party interested in possible solutions, however maintaining from the outset, a perspective of sustainable conflict transformation for all conflict parties. In asymmetrical conflict constellations, an “empowerment” of the weaker conflict party is generally necessary at the beginning.

The Transcend approach tries to take into account the structural and cultural violence from the start, in the diagnosis, prognosis, as well as in each of the phases going from preventive to therapeutic conflict interventions. One does not start with intervention, negotiation or mediation, but rather with the structural and cultural causes of violence and war. To this end, alongside socio-economic inequalities and political discrimination, belongs the cultural imprint of the social collective. In contrast to power- or rights-based approaches, Transcend points deliberately to the necessity for equitable, problem-oriented communication and general understanding between different social groups, classes, nations, and civilizations. Most other methods of civilian conflict transformation limit themselves primarily to the level of direct violence. In the best case, this means that a compromise will be reached in order to end the direct violence. Usually, the problem itself is not resolved, but rather is just put on hold. In these cases, there is no lasting peace to speak of.

Transcend aims for a sustainable solution perspective overcoming the contradictions of the conflict parties and transcending the incompatibility of goals, through a creative overarching solution. It is not about the interests of party A prevailing of those of party B, or that both parties, in a more favorable case, find a compromise. The method tries to find the perspective for a solution that goes beyond that of a simple compromise. The search for an overarching formula for the contradiction, the “transcending” of the previously incompatible goals, can only be reached if at least one of the conflict parties succeeds in recognizing the unconscious patterns that have contributed to the spiral of violence. A condition for this is for the conflict party, through a dialogue with independent conflict counselors, to begin to recognize and constructively transform the violent or destructive “illegitimate” aspect of the party’s own conflict strategy.

In its implementation, the Transcend approach must, ideally, keep in mind and work on four levels:

- the deliberate, but not necessary disclosed, strategies of all conflict parties;
- the social-psychological level of the relationships between the conflict parties;
- the individual pre- and unconscious (cognitive and emotive) of the conflict parties;

- lastly, the collective pre- and unconscious (cognitive and emotive), which can coincide, but not necessarily- depending on whether both parties come from the same culture or not.

Basic Human Needs

In contrast to Marx and Freud, Galtung defines two material and two immaterial basic needs, which are in no way hierarchical, but rather should be understood to be equally important. These are Survival, Wellbeing, Identity and Freedom. The question is, which of the basic needs are threatened (even if only in the mind of the conflict parties) as well as which ones are prioritized and/or suppressed. Furthermore, it is important to note that these basic needs can be negatively affected by structural and cultural violence. If one looks at the conflict from this perspective, one is not only limited to recognizing the deeper root causes, but one can also discover possible alternative solutions.

In the Transcend approach, the basic human needs are a frame of reference for the dialogical differentiation between legitimate and illegitimate goals in the context of a sustainable solution. Firstly, in a dialog process with each conflict party individually, the goals of the conflict parties can be better understood and reformulated in the light of the basic human needs, by which they are driven in the long run. Secondly, the goals are only recognized as legitimate, if the basic needs of the other parties are taken into consideration. Thirdly, the goal is the elaboration of a perspective for sustainable peace, an overarching formula, which integrates all of the legitimate goals of all of the conflict parties.

The Transcend approach tries to initiate many different solution perspectives for all levels. On the level of direct violence, it seeks to ensure respect and satisfy the basic needs of all conflict parties through the promotion of nonviolence. On the level of structural violence it seeks to overcome the boundaries of the social fault lines through the promotion of creativity. And on the level of cultural violence, it seeks to transform the destructive aspects of the deep culture through the promotion of empathy (tele) in regard to the Others.

Similarly to Moreno's sociatry and group therapy, Galtung's Transcend approach considers that one can find in the pre- and unconscious deep structures and deep cultures not only the destructive and escalatory patterns of relations meaning, but also the social and cultural alternatives and resources which can be rediscovered and made conscious through a common dialogue, in a process of dialogical counseling, and with methods of creative, scenic group work, with constellations and role-play, with role-change and role-reversal.

3. For creative conflict transformation with conflict-dramatic and conflict-sociatric methods

Ferdinand Buer has referred to the dialectic, which propagated Moreno's ideas beyond the psychotherapeutic field, and into social, pedagogical, cultural and spiritual fields. "This dissemination of psychodrama into the different social sectors certainly has something to do with the need in these sectors for a vital and life-giving method" (Buer 1999, 228). Conversely, this confrontation also influences the form of psycho-socio- and axio-drama theory, as well as the theory of sociometry/sociodynamics/sociatry. "Here, psychodrama can integrate [with other methods], so that, at least for outsiders, it is no longer apparent" (Buer 1999, 228).

If Moreno's approach is to be used for civilian conflict transformation, the philosophy, social theory and praxeology of psychodrama and sociometry must be concretely related to this practical field.

Two dangers which Buer outlines would need to be avoided when translating psychodrama into new formats and fields of work. Firstly, the dissolution of psychodramatic-sociometric approaches into merely technical instructions for the various new formats and fields of work. It would mean carrying out conflict counseling, mediation or conflict management with some technical know how of role-play or constellation work, but at the cost of the spirit of Moreno's approach. Secondly, the encapsulation of psychodrama, whereby the application of psychodramatic philosophy, social theory, and praxeology in conflict work remains a purely private thing.

On the basis of Buer's distinction between format versus method (Buer 1999, 229) I would like to suggest a field of work, "civilian conflict transformation" with "conflict-dramatic and conflict-sociatric" methods. In brief, "scenic conflict transformation." To this end, I would like to invite psychodramatists to develop specific psychosocio-axio-dramatic and sociometric-sociatric methods for conflict counseling and conflict mediation and to create links to other creative, solution oriented conflict transformation methods. This would be in the sense of a "strategic" psychodrama (Williams 1991), and within the context of this contribution, in the sense of a solution-oriented conflict drama, and of a solution-oriented conflict sociatry.

In the meantime, one can fall back on a number of further developments in sociometry (Puckner 2004) and psychodrama in the direction of conflict transformation, such as Ottomeyer's scenic-materialistic psychodrama (Ottomeyer 1987), Buer's "Aufstellungsarbeit nach Moreno" within the scope of the approach of sociometric action research (Buer 2005), H.C. Sabelli and L. Carlson-Sabelli's "Prozess-Methode," especially "Diamonds of Opposites" (Carlson-Sabelli, Sabelli, Hale 1994), Anne Hale's sociometric cycles (ibid), Felix Kellermann's "Diversity Sociodrama" (Kellermann 1998), Angelika Groterath's "Interkulturelles Soziodrama" (Groterath 2005), and Adam Blatner's "Techniques for Resolving Conflicts" (2002). B. Fichtenhofer, K. Richter and T. Uh-Tückardt have outlined a "psychodrama in conflict transformation and mediation" which they have linked with the conflict management approach of F. Galsl, as well as G. Schwarz (Fichtenhofer, et. al. 2004). In her article "The Psychodrama of Mankind. Is it really Utopian?," Rosa Cukier links the updating of Moreno's utopia of a therapeutic world order with the psychoanalyst Vamik Volkan's work on large group identity, collective traumata and informal diplomacy (Cukier 1998).

In addition to such advances, developments and new linkages, which can only be mentioned in passing within the context of this contribution, I would like to call for the more micro-social, scenic, and process-oriented theories and methods of Moreno (and the further developments which were made) with the more macro-socially, systemically and solution-oriented theories and methods of Galtung to be brought together.

With a "conflict-dramatic" and "conflict-sociatric" conflict transformation, it is not about psychotherapy, and also no longer only about psychodrama, but rather about a complex psychosocio-axio-dramatic understanding, as well as sociatric work, transformation and re-organization of conflict constellations. It would mean

understanding and working on complex conflict transformation on three interwoven levels:

- on the level of scenic dramatic, psycho-political actions, using role-influenced interactions and needs-driven relationship patterns,
- on the level of social-structural relations, using sociometrically measurable micro-social and macro-social power structures, and the resulting contradictions and conflicts of goals,
- and on the level of cultural meanings, using development dynamics of cultural and deep structural conserves, which generates and legitimates the role-influenced interactions and the sociometric relationships.

It would make sense to use the model of “diagnosis – prognosis therapy” for this kind of expanded concept of sociotherapy. Peace research in the context of Moreno could then be as follows. Firstly, to assess the sociometric deep structures of groups (diagnosis). Secondly, to examine their socio-dynamic development tendencies (prognosis). Thirdly, to stimulate proposals for a sociatric conflict resolution (therapy).

Such a conflict-dramatic and conflict sociatric conflict transformation can refer to micro-, meso- or macro-constellations. I would also explicitly argue for a corresponding conflict transformation in international conflict constellations, especially through dialogical conflict counseling and conflict mediation, as well as through peace processes supported by civil-society. At present, the Transcend approach is being used in a dialogue project in support of the peace process in Sri Lanka, ongoing now for several years. Similarly to Vamik Volkans TreeModel (Volkan 1999), a complex dialogue approach (in the first phase) is linked with a long-term dialogue lasting several years within and between the conflict parties (in the second phase), and with the goal of the elaboration of concrete solution-oriented proposals (Voykowitsch 2005). The idea is not to replace the official diplomatic efforts, but rather to supplement, and possibly correct the traditional approaches and methods. In this process it has become evident that there is not only a need, but also the possibility for a civil society-based, informal dialogical method of international conflict resolution- especially in the areas of conflict transformation, peacebuilding, violence prevention and reconciliation.

In Transcend projects, the first goal is to initiate a deep dialogue with each of the conflict parties alone. In these dialogue projects sociodramatic role-plays are used. But more importantly here is the endeavor to use Moreno’s sociometry and theory of creativity (in connection with Galtung’s approach) as a theoretical interpretation tool for the process of dialogue and counseling. In the initial phase, it is important to understand the subjective goals of all conflict parties. At the same time, hidden actors should be identified, in order to integrate forgotten or hidden conflict parties.

In the deep dialogue phase, the goal is the development, differentiation and reformulation of the goals of each conflict party through a dialogical or scenic exploration of the deeper dimension (basic human needs, deep structures and deep cultures). In this phase the social power constellations and their historical alternatives first need to be uncovered, as well as the cultural impediments and resources, and the potentials for violence and peace. The goal here is to discover or develop legitimate goals for conflict parties, initially with the help of role-reversal (while working with each conflict party alone), as a preparation of a role-change

(when meeting with the other conflict parties, and within the context of negotiations and/or mediation).

In the integration phase, the legitimate goals of all conflict parties are finally integrated into a sustainable solution. In the concluding phase, the new, adequate roles are concretely practiced, and the creative meetings, negotiations or mediations with the other conflict parties are concretely prepared.

To contact the author:

Dr. Wilfried Graf
Schelleingasse 2/14
A-1040 Wien
graf@iicp.at
www.iicp.at

Bibliography

- Blankertz, S., Doubrawa, E. (2005): Lexikon der Gestalttherapie, Wuppertal 2005.
- Blatner, A. (2002): Techniques for Resolving Conflicts.
www.blatner.com/adam/level2/conflictres.html.
- Buer, F. (2005): Aufstellungsarbeit nach Moreno in Formaten der Personalarbeit in Organisationen. In: Zeitschrift für Psychodrama und Soziometrie, Heft 2, Wiesbaden 2005, S. 285 – 310.
- Buer, F. et.al. (1999): Morenos therapeutische Philosophie. Zu den Grundideen von Psychodrama und Soziometrie. Opladen 1999.
- Buer, F. (1991): Kommentar zu Jakob Levy Moreno: Globale Psychotherapie und Aussichten einer therapeutischen Weltordnung. In: Ferdinand Buer (1991): Jahrbuch für Psychodrama, psychosoziale Praxis & Gesellschaftspolitik 1991, Opladen 1991.
- Buer, F. (1991): Jahrbuch für Psychodrama, psychosoziale Praxis & Gesellschaftspolitik 1991, Opladen 1991.
- Buer, F. (1993): Jahrbuch für Psychodrama, psychosoziale Praxis & Gesellschaftspolitik 1993, Opladen 1993.
- Carlson-Sabelli, L. / Sabelli, H. / Hale, A. (1994): Sociometry and sociodynamics. In: Holmes, P. / Karp, M. / Watson, M. (Ed.), Psychodrama since Moreno. London 1994, p. 147 – 185.
- Cukier, R. (1998): The Psychodrama of Mankind. Is it really utopian?
www.rosacukier.com.br/ingles/f-artigos.htm.
- Dollase, R. (1996): Wege zur Überwindung der Asozialität des Menschen. In: Moreno, J. L. (1996): Die Grundlagen der Soziometrie. Wege zur Neuordnung der Gesellschaft. Unveränderter Nachdruck der 3. Auflage. Opladen 1996.
- Fichtenhofer, B. / Richter, K. / Uh-Tückardt, T. (2004): Psychodrama in Konfliktberatung und Mediation. In: von Ameln, F. / Gerstmann, R. / Kramer, J. (Hg.), Psychodrama. Heidelberg 2004, S. 485 – 500.
- Galtung, J. (1988): World and social transformation – and the theater? In: Galtung, J., Methodology and Development. Essays in Methodology, Volume III, Copenhagen 1988, p. 194 - 203.
- Galtung, J. (1998): Frieden mit friedlichen Mitteln. Opladen 1998.
- Galtung, J. (2000): Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means (the Transcend Method). Manual (zu beziehen über www.iicp.at).
- Graf, W., Ottomeyer, K. (1986): Szenen der Gewalt in Alltagsleben, Kulturindustrie und Politik. Wien 1989.
- Groterath, A. (2005): Fremd ist der Fremde nur in der Fremde – Interkulturelles Soziodrama – Intercultural Sociodrama – Sociodramma Interculturale. In: Thomas Wittinger (Hrsg.), Handbuch Soziodrama. Die ganze Welt auf der Bühne. Wiesbaden 2005.
- Hutter, Ch. (2002): Psychodrama als experimentelle Theologie. Rekonstruktion der therapeutischen Philosophie Morenos aus praktisch-theologischer Perspektive. Münster 2002.
- Kellermann, P. F. (1996): Diversity Sociodrama.
<http://peterfelix.tripod.com/home/diversity.htm>.
- Moreno, J. L. (1934): Who shall survive? (A new approach to the problem of human interrelation). Washington, D. C. 1934.

- Moreno, J. L. (1953): Who shall survive? Foundations of Sociometry, Group Psychotherapy and Sociodrama. Beacon, N. Y. 1953.
- Moreno, J. L. (1954): Fondements de la sociometrie. Seconde edition revue et augmentee par Anne Ancelin-Schützenberger et Zerka T. Moreno, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris 1970.
- Moreno, J. L. (1957): Globale Psychotherapie und Aussichten einer therapeutischen Weltordnung. In: Ferdinand Buer (1991): Jahrbuch für Psychodrama, psychosoziale Praxis & Gesellschaftspolitik 1991, Opladen 1991.
- Moreno, J. L. (1996): Die Grundlagen der Soziometrie. Wege zur Neuordnung der Gesellschaft. Unveränderter Nachdruck der 3. Auflage. Opladen 1996.
- Pruckner, H. (2004): Soziometrie. Eine Zusammenschau von Grundlagen, Weiterentwicklungen und Methodik. In: Fürst, J. / Ottomeyer, K. / Pruckner, H. (Hg.), Psychodrama-Therapie. Wien 2004, S. 161 - 190.
- Schacht, M. (2003): Spontaneität und Begegnung. Zur Persönlichkeits-entwicklung aus der Sicht des Psychodramas. München 2003.
- Ottomeyer, K (1987): Lebensdrama und Gesellschaft. Szenisch-materialistische Psychologie für soziale Arbeit und politische Kultur. Wien 1987.
- Volkan, V. (1999): Das Versagen der Diplomatie. Zur Psychoanalyse nationaler, ethnischer und religiöser Konflikte. Gießen 1999.
- Voykowitsch, B. (2005): Sri Lankas Weg aus dem Bürgerkrieg. Österreichische Friedensbrücken. In: Die Gazette, September 2005.
- Williams, A. (1991): Forbidden Agendas: Strategic Action in Groups. London 1991.