

***Attending to the Many Facets  
Of  
Morenian Sociometry  
  
Through the  
  
Prism of Realism***

***Un-published Monograph***

*First draft July 20016*

*Last update February 20018*

***Brendan Cartmel  
+61 (0)427560724  
Integral Socionomy***

Melbourne 3004

Skype: [brendan813](#)

Email: [brendan@integralsociodrama.com](mailto:brendan@integralsociodrama.com)

Web: [integralsocionomy.com](http://integralsocionomy.com)

Social Skills & Relations Development: Integral Sociodrama

Full Member Aanzpa Member of PACFA

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

### **ABSTRACT**

As we go about our day to day professional practices of psycho-therapeutic; group work, role training, psychodrama and sociodrama [variants of Socionomy], we can readily infer that Sociometry is nothing more than the simple metrics of reciprocal social relations. In as much as this implies we are all thoroughly familiar with how simple and easy it is to quickly make pragmatic measures of Tele`, as reciprocal connections in social relations and to sketch mud maps of social networks, this is a good thing.

In-as-much as Socionomy attempts to model, *The Real*, actualised as actor-centric (psychodramatic) systems, then Sociometry nominalises highly variable and nuanced social dynamics. Once Sociometry turns its focus to the very difficult task of nominalising the social unconscious and modelling social system complexity it enables us to do much more than sketch social relations as simplified mud maps. It enables us to bring to the surface social relations' generative mechanisms and uncover the genesis [origin] of the respective sublated social and political forces producing the day-to-day events materialising around the world.

In this commentary I presuppose that measures [numerals and pictograms and Venn diagrams] in and of themselves cannot represent; fluid, flux-like and dialectic processes without these processes failing to convey the depth and richness of much of their intended meaning. Simple arithmetic indices cannot be assigned to dialectics without the import of the respective processes being greatly occluded. Set Theory and set theory axioms enable us to better model social systems dynamics; as does category theory as a, 'maths of the transcendental', as espoused by Alain Badiou. But in short – mathics universalises much more than arithmetic counts. Human limits are experienced as incommensurability between our best measures [model] of what is occurring and the *Real* aspect of the event unfolding; no matter how we understand what is Real or not, and how we factor what Reality is.

My discussion in this paper canvasses the many facets of Sociometry as both the mathics of complex socioeconomic systems and as means to explicating Realism. Jacob Levi Moreno (1889 – 1974) is presumed the founder and pioneer action-researcher of Sociometry; a consummate socioeconomist (relations systems schematist), steeped in realism and dialectic Continental philosophy.

This monograph is intended as preparation for a more thorough explication of Socionomy Practice as *good sense social science* seen through the prism of Dialectic Critical Realism.

# ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

<b><i>Table of Contents</i></b>	<b><i>Page</i></b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>2</b>
Key Terms	1
Hot Links	1
Précis	1
<b>SOCIOMETRY AS LIVED EXPERIENCE – BOTH ART &amp; SCIENCE</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIOMETRY</b>	<b>3</b>
Psychology	4
Neuroscience	5
Philosophy of Realism	6
DCR & Realism as Internal-ism's Human Face	9
Singular-Plural Alterity	10
Sociometry as Singular-Plural Alterity	11
Ontological Foundations Claims of Double \ Mirror \ Role-Reversal	12
Concluding Remarks Regarding Foundations	14
Analytic Philosophy Founding Tools	14
Foundations of Sociometry - Tabulated	16
<b>SOCIOMETRY AS INTELLIGENCE</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>SOCIOMETRY &amp; SCIENCE</b>	<b>18</b>
Nature Of Sociometry As Morenian Science	18
Sociometry as [TDCR] Scientific Realism	19
Sociometry As Dialectics	19
Tele` & Warmup & Doubling as Co-active Ingredients in Group Relations	20
Sociometry is More than...	21
Sociometry & Trans-disciplinarity	22
Sociometry as Social Development	22
Sociometric Mutuality as Social Utility	22
Sociometry As Actors' Relations	22
Sociometry as Actors' Relations and Agency Dynamics	22
Sociometry as Identity	23
Sociometry as Challenge to Existing Social Sensibilities	23
<b>SOCIOMETRY AS SIGN THEORY</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>CLARIFICATIONS Re SOCIOMETRY &amp; SOCIONOMY</b>	<b>24</b>
Socionomy and Sociatry	25
Sociometry As Social Co-Unconscious	25
Sociometry & Re-version	26

# ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

<b><i>Table of Contents</i></b>	<b><i>Page</i></b>
<b>SOCIOMETRY AS SOCIAL SCIENCE</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Sociometry As Social Science Practice</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>The Purpose of Group Work Sociometry</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Participant Observer Locus</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>SOCIOMETRY &amp; REALISM - NEAR FORMS</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Measures and Fallacies</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Realism in Moreno's Writings</b>	<b>31</b>
'Real & Near Sociometry' terms in Moreno's Writings	31
Near & Quasi Sociometry as Pragmatic Practitioner Relations	34
<b>SOCIOMETRY AS BASIS OF DCR SOCIAL SCIENCE</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Sociometry As DCR Retroduction Diagnostics Action Research</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Sociometry As More Than Behavioural - Motivations Psychology</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Review Of An AANZPA Sociometry Thesis</b>	<b>37</b>
Introduction	37
Whole Group Approach	37
Remarks On Framing Of Sociometry in Respect of Realism	37
<b>THE FUTURE OF SOCIOMETRY</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>CONCLUDING REMARKS</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Books</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Journal Articles</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>END NOTES</b>	<b>46</b>

# ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

## **Key Terms**

### **Sociometry**

reciprocal personal \ social relations  
measures with the metric of Tele`.

### **Tele`**

value assigned to a relation; + or – or 0  
[zero] impulse to connect to another  
person.

### **Socionomy**

super-ordinate system of sociometry,  
sociodrama, group-work, role training,  
spontaneity theatre & psychodrama.

### **Mathics**

super-ordinate system for arithmetic<  
algebra< maths< set theory< mathics

### **Incommensurable**

Not able to be measured by the same  
standards as another term in the context.

### **Sublation \ to Sublate**

foundations construct \ to construct - a  
foundation as ontology, epistemology or  
knowledge.

### **Social Un-conscious**

unknown source of social forces  
experienced as generative mechanisms'  
outcomes. For example: grief for a  
Princess's death we never met or barely  
knew.

### **Surplus Reality**

human engagement with generative  
mechanisms materialising the Social Un-  
conscious.

For example: identifying with the persona of a  
Princess we never met or barely knew.

### **Object Relations \ Subject-Object Variance**

relations of persons & artefacts as *our*  
culture \ Un-conscious and conscious  
differentiation

### **Near & Real Sociometry**

Near - attempted empirical measure and  
Real - inducted or abducted or retroducted  
measure

### **Dialectic**

flux \ magma of relations dynamics

### **Dialectic Critical Realism**

Roy Bhaskar's schema of polysemic  
ontology [MELD-ARA]

### **Realism**

abstraction of material things as means of  
taxonomy. A horse [as actuality] is  
categorizable as an animal [abstraction]  
pertaining to an organism to being of the  
Real. A person [as actuality] is  
categorizable as a significant *other*  
[abstraction] pertaining to being of the  
Real [Alterity].

### **Semiosis**

the means to signs [semiotics \ tele`]  
gaining meaning

### **Scansion**

as literature, the dialectic [inter-play] of  
rhyme and rhythm used to interpret prose.

As comprehension of social systems;  
imposing knowledge patterns one upon  
another.

### **Science \ Social Science**

systematic organization of testable  
knowledge

### **Retroduction**

process of retroductive Analysis to  
highlight Absence as historical scission

### **Alethic**

foundational conditions. Alethic modal  
operators (M-operators) determine the  
fundamental conditions of possible worlds

# ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

## **Hot Links**

### ***Key Terms***

[https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/Wiktionary:Main\\_Page](https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/Wiktionary:Main_Page)

### ***Constructive Set Theory***

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Constructive\\_set\\_theory](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Constructive_set_theory)

### ***Descriptive Phenomenological Method [DPM]***

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Descriptive\\_phenomenological\\_method\\_in\\_psychology](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Descriptive_phenomenological_method_in_psychology).

### ***Dialectic***

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dialectic>

### ***Dialectic Critical Realism***

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical\\_realism\\_\(philosophy\\_of\\_the\\_social\\_sciences\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical_realism_(philosophy_of_the_social_sciences))

### ***Entanglement***

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quantum\\_entanglement](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quantum_entanglement)

### ***Realism***

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophical\\_realism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophical_realism)

### ***Object Relations***

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Object\\_relations\\_theory](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Object_relations_theory)

### ***Scansion***

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scansion>

### ***Science***

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Science>

### ***Social Science***

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social\\_science](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_science)

### ***Semiosis***

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Semiosis>

### ***Sociometry***

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sociometry>

### ***Socionics***

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socionics>

### ***Sublate***

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aufheben>

### ***Retroduction***

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abductive\\_reasoning](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abductive_reasoning)

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

### **Précis**

Much of this commentary marks an argument that JL Moreno's explication of *mimesis*, the ancient Greek term for imitating and acting, and the term *alterity* [otherness], as critical for understanding human nature, is currently under-valued and short-changed both from within the Academy in general and from group workers as a whole; even when they do infer or reference his work. <sup>1</sup> I claim Sociometric indices, mappings and judgments derived by Directors when producing dramatic enactments are done more wisely when informed by a deeper appreciation of the foundations of sociometry being ontologically founded. Indeed, it is important not only to know the *claims of*;

1. psychology - as the social un-conscious
2. neuroscience - as inter-acting brains data
3. philosophy - as realism

as underpinning sociometry's foundations. It is also efficacious to know the relations between all three claimants as means to establishing the substantivity of sociometry as crucial to founding good social science practice and any form of social realism as substantive. Such appreciation enables Moreno to be better located in relation to contemporary Continental Philosophy.

To support these contentions, I first describe the varietal bases of sociometry and then outline status quo interpretations of the many facets of sociometry evident in the discourse and professional practice of Socionomists. Socionomists being the collective term for; Psychodramatists, Sociometrists, Sociodramatists, Role Trainers and Group Workers.

I close by briefly remarking on Psychology, Neuroscience and Philosophy as relating to Real-ness as framing sociometry founding, and then end these remarks by referring to Bhaskar's meta-critical approach known as Dialectic Critical Realism (DCR) as means of constructing a meta-framework as a way of appreciating the pioneering depth of JL Moreno's work.

As an addendum I promulgate a new strategy for sociometric projects as means to offering a futures perspective of Sociometry: what I hope J.L. would expect of 21st Century Sociometrists if he were alive today.

Sociometry commentary typically preferences a human science approach that is congruent with Amedeo Giorgi's use of the Descriptive Phenomenological Method [DPM]; as referenced in the Hot Links section. Doing so points out the reductionistic character of deductive and inductive [quantitative and qualitative] data analysis while valorising intuition as abductive process. Even so, I contend Moreno would see DPM as only enabling a 'near' sociometry method and not fulfilling a 'real' sociometry method.

The commentary of this paper compares the Descriptive Phenomenological Method with Dialectic Critical Realism's [DCR] dialectic approach so as to assess the extent each complements and supplements the other, if at all. More will be said about this assessment in a publication on Dialectic Critical Realism Sociometry to be released in the near future.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

Readers more interested in application (applied theory) rather than theoretical foundations of sociometry may wish to read first from the section, 'Sociometry as Intelligence' onwards, and skip sections relating to 'Foundations of Sociometry' before returning to it. Taken as a whole this paper may seem rather protracted and cumbersome. It neither acts as a standalone summary or extract of the anticipated book nor does it present the two parts [foundations and explications of many facets] as standalone topics. Readers' tolerance is required to delve into a subject that is usually treated as a topic that can be approached in a straight forward manner; like that of using a single purpose tool or 'fit for purpose' ruler, when in fact sociometry deserves to be thought more like the skin of a chameleon. In fact the etymology of chameleon says it better - the old English of chameleon is camelion [camel-lion]: two animals in one.

## **SOCIOMETRY AS LIVED EXPERIENCE – BOTH ART & SCIENCE**

Sociometry is the experience of appreciating the **core measures of choosing** as means of knowing social system relations; *as if living [being & having] them as one's Self*, ...AND, making a subjective and objective understanding of the **criterion for choosing** relations in any situation. It is also a means of knowing the extent of **connectivity** and dynamics within social systems as means of understanding social systems' functionality as 'relations systems'. Measures and criterion are appreciated as **objective constructions of subjective choosing** and **subjective constructions of objective choosing** as lived and 'living' processes of one's self.

Sociometry aims to be '*serious*', which means to say, Sociometry approaches both the person to be measured and the criterion they are creating as *real* entities. Persons and criterions are more than *virtual* representations hanging about in otherwise empty space. Hence the philosophy of sociometry needs a founding base and datum. Being serious about integrating the nature and experience of Sociometry as both art and science requires openness to meta-critical philosophy.

Meta-critical philosophy asks us to ponder, 'how do we know what we know?' With these considerations in mind Sociometry becomes a useful inter-disciplinary tool; a means to furthering inquiry into both the *art* and the *science* of relations. Once sociometry is framed as enabling inter-disciplinary work then it becomes the means to each of us being reflexive agents who engage 'the philosophical discourse of modernity' as being mutually respectful of science *and* art. Choosing to engage both, with the intent of nothing less than, emancipating our self as a free-agent enabling human kind's greater capacity to live socially enhanced lives.

Sociometry vis-a-vis sense-making is understanding life is a mathic process with mathics<sup>ii</sup> practice being the work of; forming, categorising and measuring '*choosing processes*'. The sociometrist is impromptu artist and Cartesian mathematician and an aesthete choosing and organising, at any moment in time, processes regarding the significance and immediacy of relations while knowing that respective inter-actions [exchanges] morph over time; unfolding from one commotion into another. We make *sense* of our connections so they are meaningful to us and we make *meaning* of our connections so they make sense in other contexts.

It is hoped through clarifying the relation between, measuring and scansion-ing [cohering criteria], that this paper will go some way to de-mystify decision making and add greater understanding to what we do when choosing.

## **FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIOMETRY**

The questions for inquiring into the varietal foundations of a field of study is, 'what is the basis of this knowledge; what assumptions are the promulgators of this information using to compile their facts and why are they presuming we need to know this information?' In our case the question becomes, 'how can we know what sociometry measures is substantive? In what sense is it consistent with Real-ness? Why are measures not illusory [non-real] or un-real or ir-real [vacuous] or simply non-commensurable?

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

In this commentary we will explore psychology, neuroscience and philosophy of realism as three commonly referred foundations for nominalising Real-ness in respect of social relations and systems. We look first at these foundations and how measures of *actual* phenomenon juxtapose with measures of Absence and 'negatives' of Realness before going on to see the various ways sociometry shows up, for example, as intelligence.

Professionals more disciplined in the subject of psychology than philosophy or science may feel more comfortable framing the foundations of sociometry as emerging from the human un-conscious than from the more abstract notion of alterity, [the non-differentiated unknown], so let's first look at the psychological basis of founding sociometry before tackling the less familiar bases.

### **Psychology**

Of all his contemporary psychoanalysts, Moreno related most to S.H. Foulkes who emphasised the Social Un-conscious, or as Moreno preferred to nominate it, the *Social Co-unconscious*. In as much as the unconscious is the source of all unknowns and therefore the unknowable source of everything we perceive, it is psychology's foundational reasoning that everything comes in the first instance, 'as if from nowhere', or as if from the un-conscious as being 'of no-thing'.

For our purposes here it is sufficient to say Sociometry [as psychology] results from generative mechanisms, (desires, despair and trauma as Earl Hopper puts it), extracting our social worlds as traces of the Real-ness-es of our sub-terrain-ian unconscious. Whether that unconscious is biologically founded, as Freud thought, or socially founded, as S. H. Foulkes and Moreno thought. Simply put, the notion of the social unconscious and social co-unconscious comprises ideas consistent with the view that persons internalize their social worlds as much as have their social system cast pre-formed social-worlds into them. Suffice to say that Eric Fromm saw the unconscious mind was moulded by both the body and society just as Lev Vygotsky saw our physical capacity to speak arises simultaneously with our social (collective) capacity to make language. Body, mind, and society are completely inter-dependent and intertwined and as a result we develop from all three simultaneous co-active sources - in a word - dialectically.

Moreno used the terms "co-unconscious" and "inter-personal unconscious" as founding the recursive processes of the mind-in-society and the society-in-the-mind and the dyadic co-construction of the mind that could represent social systems through sociometry. According to Moreno, memory and the co-unconscious are constituted and activated in accordance with the relationships and active roles of 'the actor', which means that co-unconscious evocations are based on these roles.

In this sense the conceptualization of the social unconscious is the essence of group sociometric inquiry; both as a perspective in the study of personality and social systems, and in the enabling of vital human functioning within the context of human relationships. This is particularly so in relation to the sociality of human nature, as reflected in the constraints and restraints of sociometric measuring, such as those of; gender, class, race, ethnicity, nationality, language groupings, family structures, and organizational life. The social unconscious inquiry finds many expressions within overlapping social contexts and so is always simultaneously a political and philosophical, come religious project.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

Various group psychoanalysts refer to the social unconscious in diverse terms; all are helpful as foundations concepts for sociometry. As a forward to his book, 'The Social Unconscious', Earl Hopper cites various writers and their terms. Enrique Pichon-Riviere when focussing on the ways in which people personified; social, cultural, economic, and political forces coined the term "operative groups". Helena Kli'mova and Marina Mojov`ic cite the development of the 'collective false self' as properties of totalitarian social systems and the co-operation of social psychic retreats. Gerhard Wilke writes of the Matrix of the Social System and observes how important it is to discuss the properties of matrices in their own terms, [as per Bhaskar's polysemic - 'L' and 'D' ontology], and not to reduce them to properties of the people who participate in them. And not to confuse the foundation matrix of the societal social system with the dynamic matrices of the groups within it. Farhad Dalai directs attention to the social defence of ideology that protects against the anxieties that are associated with the recognition of social powerlessness. Regine Scholz considers how the foundation matrix of a society constrains and restrains the measurement of time in connection with the partly co-terminus life trajectories of both persons and their societies.

Operative Groups, Collective False Self Psychic Retreats, Social System Matrix and Social Powerlessness Anxiety and Co-terminus Society-persons Existential Life Trajectories cohere as products-in-process of a Social Co-unconscious evidencing social realism.

### **Neuroscience**

At first blush Neuroscience,<sup>iii</sup> linked as it is so strongly with biological necessity [chemistry \ dna \ human genome and brain scans materiality], seems to establish materialism as an obvious foundation for sociometry. Exciting neuroscience discoveries such as the existence of mirror-neurons indicating psychological empathy has given huge impetus to interest in 'biology as materialism' as basis for knowing human existence. The flaw in the case is that to date there is no evidence of material matter as equating to human consciousness. This shortfall has led to much speculation. One such speculation is that electrons as quantum mechanics choosing to either 'spin-up' or 'spin-down' on subatomic [sub-quark] particles creates consciousness. This is the Orchestrated Objective Reduction (Orch OR) proposal as proffered by Stuart Kaufman, Sir Roger Penrose and Stuart Hameroff.<sup>1</sup> So far the inability to disprove it is measurement itself that creates spin-up or spin-down transitions has proved to be, if not a stumbling block then, a determinative block. The position and momentum or differentiation of the spin components in respect of simultaneity remains un-certain; as per Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle. Until such time as a person is shown to be co-conscious with a laboratory grown brain \ chip such speculation will remain an un-substantiated assumption. The Orch OR approach has also to contend with, or counter, 'entanglement theory' as an alternative solution to quantum spinning.<sup>iv</sup>

That being the case it has not stopped people getting excited about, building on Freud's biological basis, having the understanding the brain as being just the

---

<sup>1</sup> Ben-Menahem, Y (2005) Hilary Putnam Contemporary Philosophy in Focus. pp. 12  
Simeonov, P.L., et al. Editorial, Progress in Biophysics and Molecular Biology (2015),  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pbiomolbio.2015.09.003>. pp. 1

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

opposite of a black-box or [de]mented micro-processor and, to see the brain as a self-reflexive-intelligent creator. There is evidence of brains performing experience-dependent neuro-plasticity but that falls far short of assuming brains will one day, all by themselves, achieve mindful type self-reflexivity.

As referenced in the previous section, Earl Hopper cites writers and their terms in respect to the Neuro-biological Perspective – which I paraphrase here. Malcolm Pines valorises thinking in terms of the "social brain". A. P. Tom Ormay makes clear the social brain is characterized by the capacity for "we-centric" [mirror-neuronal] space. Yvonne Kazarian and Susan Gantt postulate the existence of a group mind on the basis of neurobiology concerning flows of energy and information.

Hopper recalls that it is known that when Einstein asked Freud if he thought that instinct was a mythological concept, Freud replied that perhaps there were such concepts in physics as well. For Freud the body was not an afterthought, but an essential part of the human picture with its reflexes *and* evolutionary aspect. In psychoanalysis, instinct has been the "interface", to use a modern expression, between body and mind. Recent developments in genetics also restate the importance of inherited factors in the personality. That which Freud called the "phylogenetic" does not go away; on the contrary, it increasingly demands its place and focuses on the lingering question that Winnicott (1964) called, 'the "human potential" and the environment'.

Amongst researchers two basic instincts emerged in the 1960s: the original [old] one initiates self-centred acts and the later [new] one makes us belong. The former's discovery has been attributed to Darwin and makes us experience reality from a personal point of view, and, as we grow up, the personal ego develops from it. With the help of the recently discovered social instinct, we can complete the psychoanalytic structural theory of the mind by adding a genuine social function that develops from an inherited biological (brain) base. It enables us to experience reality from a social viewpoint; as we share, do things together and belong to various groups. We might call such a genuine social function "nos", Latin for "we". Both the ego and nos begin to develop after we are born. The baby observers (Stern, 1973) discovered that we display social responses from the beginning of life. Therefore the updated personality structure comprises the id, ego, and the nos. Sadly neuroscience as experimental science is unable to link what its experiments look at and see [chemical activity] with the 'mythological concepts' of human instinct and human ontology [realness] and thus substantively found a theory of personality structure.

### **Philosophy of Realism**

The last foundation to be reviewed is philosophical Realism. General Philosophical Realism is the premise that what is before us [has materialised] does not necessarily bear any resemblance or relation to where it has come from; the ground of its being. It's aboriginality. Theologically and theistically it is the premise that God creates from nothing; creatio ex-nihilo. For Moreno, the aboriginal nature, as to what relations get formed are a matter of Surplus Reality<sup>v</sup>. Just as for Karl Marx 'surplus value' was the space in which generative mechanisms (economies) create materials dialectically (dialectic materialism), so then for Moreno, Surplus Reality is the space where generative mechanisms create sustainable socionomy.<sup>vi</sup> For Moreno to compare his

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

sociometry schema with Marx's dialectic materialism as an explanation for human activity, by all but a few scholars in the period 1930-2000, was easily reckoned an absurdity.

Our point of focus here is not the inadequacies of Marx and Moreno but whether their attempts to be serious in explaining how the world arises (comes about) are at all helpful - as attempts. With Bhaskar and Badiou now rethinking post-Marxist dialectics as indicative of 'serious philosophy' in respect of the 'political *subject*' in relation to the 'social subject', Moreno's dialectics can and need to be re-evaluated as attempts to be 'serious' about generativity. His sociometric measures may be seen as relating as much to an alethic<sup>vii</sup> truth as any sociological metric.

Sociometry as the criterion for our reciprocal choosing in a particular situation, in as much as it is Realism and as a primary instance of spontaneity (sponte`), comes as if out-of-nowhere. As Roy Bhaskar points out, about our rationalisations as to our choosing, in the end all of our decisions are made as if the criteria is, 'There Is No Alternative' [TINA]. With each decision we must take a little leap of faith that things will work out for the better, everything else being equal (*ceteris paribus*), in respect to our emancipation; our greater freedom to choose.

Of course we decide on some occasions we have more time to make the decision than on other occasions. The decision is worth pondering and reflecting what is commensurate and incommensurable. That is the job of our inner philosopher even though there is no alternative s/he in the end is 'time managed'.

As regards our sociometric choosing we are free to choose freely whom we Tele`-ise (be reciprocal with) and Warmup (are paying attention to) and Double (empathise as be ready to act like). The fact that we so often do not choose freely and creatively, and our choices are born of pathologies, then there is the need for sociometric analysis as to the enmity of the criterion and options enabling reworking choosing criterion so as to better align with socio-economic remediation and spontaneously distinct sustainability.

Philosophical Realism, in the form of Bhaskar's 'dialectical critical realism' [DCR] is established via transcendental argument and immanent critique: transcendental critique. Hence it is also referred to as 'transcendental dialectical critical realism' [TDCR].

DCR's logic is to develop transcendental or scientific realism (TR), critical naturalism (CN) and explanatory critique (EC); to show it is possible that  $EC > CN > TR$ , where '>' stands for 'constellationally contains' or 'preservatively sublates', the place of EC. Bhaskar's full system is written as:  $TDCR > DCR > EC > CN > TR$ .

The aim is to critique Social science as explanatory of a structured, differentiated and changing world and thence possible as emancipatory. It is expected that through transcendental realism and critical naturalism as the basis we can develop a theory of philosophical discourse and ideology which critiques positivism as 'lack'. **EC is here thought to be > history and philosophy of science.**

The significant advances of DCR over first-level or basic critical realism are; (1) the meta-philosophical justification of transcendental realism; (2) the situation of the problem of naturalism in relation to the biological sciences, and the development of dialectical concepts centring on processuality and geo-historicity; (3) the theory of explanatory critique, including ideology-critique, leading on to what was soon to be designated emancipatory axiology; and (4) the substantive application of the theory

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

of ideology-critique. As circular as it sounds, it is 'emancipation of dialectic for the dialectic of emancipation', plus the elaboration of a metacritique of western philosophy generally as – irrealist.<sup>viii</sup>

The example of the 2009 Global Financial Crisis illustrates the limits of our irrealist general western philosophy and the urgent need for a meta-theory. Eight years on and we still have no substantive explanation as to what occurred or when the next global financial crisis will eventuate and what to do about it. As Bhaskar points out, "Once the company breaks up [the Bank fails] ... "we are all practising (transcendental) realists" <sup>2</sup> (p. 33).

### ***Transcendental Realism***

In his Scientific Realism Bhaskar develops Kant's metaphysics to distinguish more between metaphysics  $\alpha$  and metaphysics  $\beta$ , thereby breaking the necessary connection between accepting that philosophy is heteronomous or possible only in relation to practices other than itself and transcendental idealism. Metaphysics  $\alpha$  is purely formal; it investigates what some social practice, (for example science) as conceptualised in experience, presupposes about the general forms of the world. Metaphysics  $\beta$  is descriptive *and* critical; it identifies theory-practice inconsistencies and other aporiai (enigma) in existing accounts of social practices in order to arrive at a more adequate conceptual account. If metaphysics  $\beta$  is the philosophy of science and other social practices then metaphysics  $\alpha$  is the philosophy of the philosophy of science and other social practices. The former shows what the world must be like given the relevant social practice, the latter demonstrates that an account cannot sustain the intelligibility of important features of a social practice that it itself calls attention to, and shows how transcendental realism can.

### ***Critical Naturalism***

Bhaskar recalls the disputes regarding naturalism fall into three broad positions: a more or less [usually positivistic] unqualified naturalism; an anti-naturalism, erected on a distinctive notion of social reality as pre-interpreted, conceptual or linguistic in character, normally hermeneutical in inspiration; and a qualified and critical naturalism, grounded in an essentially realist theory of science and a transformational conception of social activity. DCR precedes by assuming the 3<sup>rd</sup> position, that social life is a causally and taxonomically irreducible, but also a dependent mode of matter, and that intentional agency presupposes the causal efficacy of reasons. This assumption is indispensable for the development of a plausible realist alternative to anti-naturalism.

The conclusion is

...the empirically-controlled retroduction of explanatory structures from (here, conceptualised) phenomena, and the synthetic reconstruction of networks of (here, internally related) transfactually efficacious causal structures at work in the production of events, etc. in conjunctures, ***are possible here in the social, as in the natural, world;*** but the ***social sciences will be historic, reflexive, critical and totalising*** in a way in which classical physics and chemistry were not. On the critical naturalist approach, then, the social sciences can be sciences in exactly the same sense as the natural ones, but

---

<sup>2</sup> Bhaskar, Roy (2009) 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, *Scientific Realism & Human Emancipation*, pp. 33

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

on the strict condition that they are science in ways as specific and different as their objects.<sup>3</sup> My emphases.

### ***Explanatory Critique***

An explanatory critique is attempting 'Depth-explanations' and entails two aspects which Bhaskar calls

...(i) the critical and (ii) the explanatory condition. Of course even if the critical condition alone is satisfied, then we also pass immediately to a negative evaluation of practice P (Critical Practice), and of actions based on or informed by P (CP).

For our purposes, and since I have referred to both Moreno and Marx, Bhaskar's remarks re Marx and criticism may clarify the main point he is making in respect of EC.

Criticism, in Marx's words, 'knows how to judge and condemn the present, but not how to comprehend it'. The essence of Marx's objection to criticism may, I think, be stated thus: it employs value (and especially, although not necessarily, moral) terms in the absence of any kind of causal grounding. At its best, i.e. if elaborated in naturalistic (i.e. non-intuitionist or emotivist) form, it can furnish objective grounds for belief and action which, if true, extend our freedom. But criticism says nothing about, although it may of course (intentionally or unwittingly) causally affect, the (causal) conditions of action, the springs of belief and behaviour, the sources of determination. And so it (criticism) cannot illuminate the topic of the transformation of the sources of determination from unnecessary to rationally wanted ones. Only a discourse in which the explanatory as well as the critical condition is satisfied, can be intrinsically emancipatory.<sup>4</sup>

Granting the above quotes as both a technical statement and an all too brief account of critical thought in relation to Realism, the quotes still illustrates just how difficult Bhaskar is to read. It is best to be very determined to fathom what he is communicating when seeking to understand Critical Realism. He [and his editors] made a huge effort in his last book, 'Enlightened Common Sense' to be more easily read.

### **DCR & Realism as Internal-ism's Human Face**

Another philosopher who has had a large influence on how Realism is typically perceived over recent decades is Hillary Putnam. Putnam's inductive argument is that... we know *the Real* is real because we humans (from Plato onwards) have talked of experiencing its 'Many Faces'. We humans have capacity for both recognising and conceptualising. We use our *recognition capacity* to recognise each other's faces; some of us more readily recognise than others. Likewise we have *conceptual capacity* and thus some of us more easily conceptualise what is true, than do others. His thesis is that just as our conceptual capacity does not reduce to our recognition capacity so our capacity for making 'meaning of meaning' does not reduce to our conceptual capacity. Thus we *naively know* the Real is truly there (real). As helpful as Putnam is in defining language as differences between meaning and sense and the real and the true, his work falls short of the rigour exercised by Bhaskar in respect of under-labouring scientific knowledge aimed at assisting Sociometry remediate scientific realism as social science.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. pp136.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid pp179.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

Another philosopher who was popular last century in advocating for Realism was Martin Buber. Many writers who cite Buber do not know that Moreno as a young man in Vienna influenced Buber to focus on the I-Thou relation with Thou characterising Alterity and Absence as founding Realism.

I hope that with the above sections in place, analysis and explication of *Positivism as illusion* can be appreciated to the point of, thirsting to know sociometry as more than a measure of some-*thing* that exists in a final or complete form and yet at the same time something that is potentially transductive.

Let's now turn our attention to clarifying the relation of Realism with Alterity [other-ness], in an endeavour to further clarify what Buber and Moreno's I-Thou relation, can mean as better [more transcendental] praxis.

### **Singular-Plural Alterity**

Contemporary French Continental Philosopher Jean-Luc Nancy founds political philosophy as the 'different' alterity of Singular-Plurality. His work adds much clarity and granularity to Moreno's notions of Socionomy and Sociometry. Melbourne based philosopher Christopher Watkin provides excellent commentary on Nancy's work as Critical Theory and Realism.

### **Socionomy as Singular-Plural Alterity**

One can readily plagiarise Chris Watkin's commentary of Nancy and substitute Nancy's term Singular-Plural-Alterity with Moreno's Socionomy in order to paraphrase Nancy's writing and merge the meaning with Moreno's texts. The assumption being that Moreno's notions of alterity are aligned with Nancy's notion of 'difference' and not those of Buber and Derrida that emphasise other-ness as 'opposite-ness'.

Thus... Socionomy is what gives shape to... **the mutual sharing...** of the

- *in*-common \ *in*-common-ness \ *in*-common-ality of all possible worlds \ life [human or otherwise].

Socionomy avoids on one hand the fundamentalism of essentializing community and on the other the paralyzing (in) difference of absolute [other \ other-ness] alterity.

It replaces any alethic notion of economy [as foundational debt and credit] with the notion of... **an alethic ethics of the same and the-other.**

### **Socionomy & Oiko-nomy & Economy Relations**

If economy is typically framed as activity of debt and credit then it contrasts to the notion of *oiko-nomy* as the activity of house or place with of the activity identification based on natural self-sufficiency.

Subsequently socionomic [mutual sharing] shapes, emerging as they do from oiko-nomy [place activities] means [p]olitics is redrawn at the place where one must keep open the incommensurability [permanence] of human-activity. Whether that means, generally, the incommensurability of justice or the incommensurability of value. It is the in-commensurable **in**-common. The human-relations-activity, in the instance of politics, is the site of an "in-common" decision process only in as much as the manner of the in-commensurability is kept open.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

As with Jean-Luc Nancy's ideas of 'In-operative Community', 'what is shared' in Sociometry, 'is not the annulment of sharing, but sharing itself, and consequently everyone's non-identity, each one's non-identity to himself and to others'. We can figure the relation of everyone's non-identity, each one's non-identity to himself and to others', with the wholly different singular-plurality alterity, as Tele` [Moreno's sociometric nominalisation] and measures of touch-and-exposure [Nancy's nominalisation].

### **Unsociable Sociability**

...'**with**' is neither a unity nor a disseminating multiplicity but a '**concordant discordance**': 'Always there is conjunction and disjunction; joining with division, close with far-away, concordia discors and **unsociable sociability** (... ). The concordia discors of being-in-common requires us to shift our thinking away from oppositions such as individuality and collectivity; the one and the multiple. We need another Copernican revolution, after which...

**....'social being', would now revolve around itself and not; the Subject, the Other or the Same (BSP, 57).**

### **Unsociable-Sociability Sociometric Measures**

What do the singularities [incidents] of unsociable-sociability [and the subsequent incommensurable measure] have in common? Each one [unsociable-sociability singularity] is both unique and identical with all other incidents [moments of relations]. Each one is identical in being unique; it is just as singular as every other. In Morenian terminology the singularity is a sociometric measure - a Tele`.

**Thus the 'what' that sociometric measures [as singularities] have in common is their incommensurability.**

The sociometric measures do share a spacing, a proximity-in-distance [concordia discors], and as singularities of being-in-common they irreducibly share, in their 'compearance' [an appearing in court as them self] - a non-essentialized, non-localizable ontology.

Moreno and Nancy insist on the 'stammering tautology' of a Mitdasein [with-self] where the being-is-the-'with' thus splitting with the horns of the same/other dilemma.

### **Sociometry as Singular-Plural Alterity**

Consistent with Moreno, Nancy describes being-with in terms of the ***just measure of the with***, which is 'the measure of the gap from one origin to another origin' (152 BSP), neither self-present-identity nor entropic dissemination.

Nancy describes 'with' as 'dry and neutral: neither communion nor atomization, simply the sharing of a place, at the most a contact: a being-together without assemblage'. There is neither merely gathering nor simply dissemination, but 'separation at the heart of proximity and intimacy'. For Moreno the sociometric 'with' is objective - dry and neutral. The 'with' is neither a unity nor a disseminating multiplicity but a 'concordant discordance': 'Always there is conjunction and disjunction, joining with division, close with far away, concordia discors and unsociable sociability'.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

Sociometric singularities do not share an essence, they do share a spacing, a concordia discors of **proximity-in-distance**, and as singularities of being-in-common they irreducibly share, in their 'compearance', a non-essentialized, non-localizable ontology.

In his book, 'Being Singular Plural', Nancy addresses the demand to invent, in the **absence of any 'given measure'**, something that would facilitate the articulation of inter-human relations. Alterity (capital A) cannot fulfil this task; it can only oppose to dispersion a sovereign identity of unification; '[t]he Other is the place of community as communion' (BSP, 79), for the reasons that we have already explored in relation to the irreducible link between globalization and fundamentalism'. We need Socionomy as an 'ontology of being-with-one-another' (53), with **both proximity and distance**.

'[P]olitics is redrawn at the place where one must keep open this incommensurability, whether that means, generally, the in-commensurability of justice, or the incommensurability of value' (20).

As per the statement above as regarding Socionomy, in Sociometry practice... 'what is shared therefore is not the annulment of sharing, but sharing itself, and consequently everyone's non-identity, each one's non-identity to himself and to others' (IC, 66). We can figure the relation of everyone's non-identity, each one's non-identity to himself and to others', with the wholly different singular-plurality alterity, as Tele` [Moreno's sociometric nominalisation] and measures of touch-and-exposure [Nancy's nominalisation].

Touch is not a communion; distance and mystery remain, and touch is always an indication of both proximity and distance, contact and impenetrability. Touching in distance characterizes the relation of singularities in the 'we'. In touching one another, with their mutual weights, bodies do not become undone, nor do they dissolve into other bodies, nor again do they fuse with a spirit. This is what makes them, properly speaking, bodies. 30 Existence, once more, is a question of relation, configuration, spatiality, distribution, and '[o]ne must not consider the anatomy of dissection, but of configurations, of shapes' (Cor, 24). Like the political, the body (whether the physical body or the being-together of a body politic) is eco-technical; not oikological. In addition to the motif of touch the motif of exposure [long distance] elucidates the relation of those who have [in first instance] nothing in common. The 'we' is not united by a communal nature or shared values, rather each one is exposed to each other, up against each other without being subsumed into each other. It's a 'bare life' that makes for this community without essence. Like touch, exposure does not grasp or possess, does not yield itself up in its essence. To be exposed is to be on the limit, neither within nor without.

### **Ontological Foundations Claims of Double \ Mirror \ Role-Reversal**

Since Nancy is more politics focussed and Moreno more social skills [Psychodrama] focussed, Nancy has no terms equivalent to Moreno's Psychodramatic [theatrical stage] techniques of; Psychodramatic Double, Psychodramatic Mirror and Psychodramatic Role-Reversal. Still, with liberal interpretation, a reader of Nancy - Watkin can readily plagiarise and paraphrase their writing to merge text meanings so their references to Singular-Plural-Alterity relate to aspects of Double \ Mirror \ Role-Reversal.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

On Psychodrama's theatrical stage the; Psychodramatic Double, Psychodramatic Mirror and Psychodramatic Role-Reversal figure the relation of Singular-Plural Alterity singularities as incommensurability - meaning the Singular and the Plural have nothing in common - and in as much as the; Double, Mirror and Role-Reversal enact measures as touch and exposure... both proximity and distance, contact and impenetrability remain incommensurables. Socionomy's Psychodramatic Double, Psychodramatic Mirror and Psychodramatic Role-Reversal are in league with Singular-Plural Alterity being in total contrast to any notion of 'wholly other' devoid of 'with-self' as advocated by Levinas and Derrida.

Human existence, as enactments of the Double, Mirror and Role-Reversal, once more is a question of; relation, configuration, spatiality, distribution, and '[o]ne must not consider the anatomy of dissection, but of configurations, of shapes' (Cor, 24).

The Socionomic body, like the political, (whether the physical body or the being-together of a body politic) is ecotechnical, not oikological [i.e. of an essence].

Each Socionomic body is exposed to each other body, up against each other without being subsumed into each other; the astonishment of which is nothing other than what comes at the limit. In this sense the collective bodies of the respective Socionomic system [like the passengers on a train] are, in that sense, more than a mass ('foule') but less than a group.

The Psychodramatic Double, Mirror and Role-Reversal indicate a (non) relation, a juxtaposition of singularities one against the other', (CM, 175) just as the coexistence of singular pluralities is equidistant from juxtaposition and integration.

As difficult as it may be when considering the Psychodramatic [theatrical stage] techniques of; Psychodramatic Double, Psychodramatic Mirror and Psychodramatic Role-Reversal we must think from the irreducible primordially of 'being-with'. The bodies being a relation of being side-by-side rather than an "otherwise than being" of transcendence in the face-to-face.' For both Moreno and Nancy togetherness ***is*** otherness.

I am not in [reciprocal \ reciprocative] relation; I am ***singular-plural*** relation, an irreducibly open eco-technical singularity that cannot sequester itself from the web of singular plurality without which it is not.

The ethics of mutuality is a potent solidarity, where the suffering of any one, of each one, is a suffering which I share and, concretely, for which I have responsibility. Why? Because I am not in relation; I ***am*** singular plural relation, an irreducibly open eco-technical singularity that cannot sequester itself from the web of singular plurality without which it is not. And this mutuality does not threaten to become an exclusive coterie that persecutes those outside its bounds, a cosy 'mutual club'. Why not? Because the basis of this mutuality is not a shared value or essence, or even a reciprocal pact to 'look out for each other', but simply this: that the socius's participants have nothing in common; they are in-common.

It is therefore not necessary to invoke the guilt of debt in an economy of reciprocity, as do Levinas and Derrida, in order to sustain Nancy's ethical position. Shared finitude, the mutual exposure of bodies and incommensurability-in-common certainly furnish a different ethical framework to the Levinasian absolute Other, but providing they are understood in their own terms and not as a minor variation on the Levinasian theme, Nancean ethics are just as uncompromising in their insistence on ethical responsibility as the Levinasian alternative.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

My plagiarism and paraphrasing of Nancy-Watkin ends here.

### **Concluding Remarks Regarding Foundations**

In the sense psychology explains the origins of behaviour as emerging 'out of nowhere', the unconscious, it is in full concert with the philosophy of realism and human development being dialectical. In as much as neurological science seeks to be fully objective and representative of the natural world in the form of the material brain, it still concedes such knowledge as it acquires, is subject to a Mind [Nos] putting the knowledge to some good use and in need of explanatory critique [EC]. As means of being consistent, this commentary presumes notions of biologically and socially founded unconscious are sublated by critical realism [natural science knowledge] sublating dialectic critical realism as [social science knowledge] as dialectics arising together simultaneously. Our natural world [biology] and our social world [socius] need not necessarily be treated as arising separately \ dualistically, even though just how they are non-dual is imperceptible.

As students of the psychological foundations of sociometry, who know it as a complex and necessarily abstract phenomenon, we are drawn to the work of Freud, Klein, Bion and Lacan - as well as that of - Foulkes, Moreno, Pichon-Riviere and Bhaskar. Granted all but a few of us can be equally at home in the work of each. We use data and hypotheses from the social sciences, depth psychologies and the neuro-sciences, but recognize that life is located within the cosmos as a whole. Although the universe exists 'in a grain of sand', the study of human relationships and their vicissitudes cannot be reduced to direct information of instincts and the projected phantasies associated with them or MRI screen-shots which in the first place is measuring nothing more than blood flow and nothing of reflexivity. Ultimately, the meaning of human affairs always requires that we contextualize them in time and social space in appreciation of complex [mostly open] living systems, whether in terms of concentric circles or, preferably, a set of intertwined and interpenetrating spirals. We can appreciate all our foundations are formed as if in a Transformational Model of Social Activity [TMSA].

Sociometry as a study of Social Un-conscious constellates as a socio-cultural-communicational network of colleagues practice and ideas. As we shall see in later sections the ideas of the social co-unconscious and critical realism has implications for how Moreno used the terms Real and Near sociometry, and how we best practice sociometry as under-labouring to surface the 'real' and how we can be serious about researching foundations of generative mechanisms related sociometry.

### **Analytic Philosophy Founding Tools**

The above remarks regarding Sociometry, founded as transcendental argument for social realism, presume not only philosophical understanding of relations between measurements and mathics [realism and incommensurability] but also constructive set theory as it connects logics of rhetoric. After all - it is one thing for a Sociometrist to measure a social system and another thing entirely to communicate, as a logical presentation, what the measures tell us.

It is thought un-necessary for this monograph to try to explain in detail how each modal operator can be used when founding and performing Sociometry. It is thought

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

equally vacuous, however, to avoid altogether mentioning Modal Operators as Logical Theory Devices of Analytic Philosophy. The main point of making Modal Operators transparent in his discourse is, in the first instance, to enable readers to recognise when each modality is [or might be] being used and to be able to check whether sociometric reports avoid or overly preference referencing any Modal Operator in particular.

A Modal Operator is a type of logical connective for modal logic. It is an operator which forms propositions from propositions, as non-truth-functional, and thus able to express a modal attitude (such as necessity, possibility, belief, or knowledge) without denominating what is being proposed.

A handy list of main Modal Operators are listed in Wikipedia and listed as follows; [[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Modal\\_operator](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Modal_operator)]

<b>Modal Operator Type</b>	<b>Function</b>
<b>Alethic [M]</b>	determine the <b>fundamental conditions</b> of possible worlds, especially causality, time-space parameters, and the action capacity of persons. They indicate the possibility, impossibility and necessity of actions, states of affairs, events, people, and qualities in the possible worlds.
<b>Deontic [P]</b>	influence the construction of possible worlds as <b>proscriptive or prescriptive norms</b> , i.e. they indicate what is prohibited, obligatory, or permitted.
<b>Axiological [G]</b>	transform the world's entities into <b>values and disvalues</b> as seen by a social group, a culture, or a historical period.
<b>Epistemic [K]</b>	reflect the <b>level of knowledge</b> , ignorance and belief in the possible world.
<b>Doxastic [D]</b>	express <b>belief in statements</b>

It will be obvious to the reader this monograph in emphasising philosophy of 'Realism' is highlighting the Alethic [M] modal operator type because it is explicating determinants of the fundamental conditions of sociometry as a 'possible world' – to speak with Leibniz. I have sort to provide answers to; 'how can we know what sociometry measures is substantive?', 'in what sense is it consistent with Real-ness?' and, 'why are measures not; illusory [non-real] or un-real [un-substantive] or ir-real [vacuous] or simply non-commensurable? Such answers are intended to substantiate foundations – to be alethic.

This monograph assumes Sociometric practice is in itself a Deontic [P] modal operator type because, as 'measuring', it influences the construction [shaping] of possible worlds as proscriptive or prescriptive norms.

I use the word 'Register' to refer to measures related to any one of the analytic modalities. For example, measures of level of knowledge in a social system are of an 'epistemic register' and measures of values in a social system are of an 'axiological register'. Making this distinction enables comparisons to be made between knowledges and values registers in any social system; or more pertinently, the difference in registers measures between different social systems.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

### **Foundations of Sociometry - Tabulated**

The following table juxtaposes tele` as measure of Nearness to the un-commensurability [negative measure] of Realness.

<b>Psychology as Foundation Discipline</b>	
<b>Comparing &amp; Contrasting the Measurable and Non-measurable Un-conscious of the individual or the Social Un-conscious</b>	
<b>Tele` as Sociometrist's Socio-metric Near-ness to a Protagonist</b>	<b>Tele` as Socio-metric [Un-measurable] Real-ness &amp; Alterity</b>
Sociometrist is physically near the protagonist [in the room] as opposed to measuring from a distance; for example, measuring from a written or second hand account of the situation.	Sociometrist is highly aware having proximal location is not the same as appreciating human being-ness; for example, measuring human potential.
Sociometrist is inter-subjectively close to the protagonist. For example both are 'victims of violence'.	Sociometrist is highly aware inter-subjectivity is not the same as appreciating another person as unique and other \ mystery \ a 'thing in it self'.
Sociometrist has good knowledge of [accurately concretised and represented] the protagonist's social system and dynamics [sociology] on the impromptu stage.	Sociometrist is highly aware good sociological knowledge of social systems' dynamics, is nothing like or the same thing, as appreciating the 4 Socratic causes of the particular sociological situation or what the make-up is of any protagonist's zone of proximal development.
Sociometrist is empathically accurate with [a good <i>double</i> of] the protagonist and knows how they feel and is in strong relation to the counter role.	Sociometrist is highly aware that being empathic [knowing <i>how</i> one is] is not the same as knowing <i>why</i> the other is as they are nor what the make-up is of the protagonist's zone of proximal development nor what they are in and of them self.
Sociometrist is empathically accurate with [a good <i>double</i> of] the protagonist's warmup and can anticipate what they are likely to do next in situ. To know the protagonist's act hunger.	Sociometrist is highly aware that anticipating what another is likely to do next in situ is not the same as knowing <i>why</i> the other is about to do something nor how much capacity 'to be' them self they will acquire in attaining extra capability to be them self in them self.
Sociometrist has accurately represented the protagonist's criterion for choosing and what values to hold in situ [who to be axiologically aligned with] as embracing their actual social identity and what makes for therapy.	Sociometrist is highly aware that knowing criterion for choosing personal values is not the same as knowing any person's ontological value nor the alethic truth of them nor their potential as agency for the social system's emancipation.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

<b>Neuro-science as Foundation Discipline</b>	
<b>Comparing &amp; Contrasting the Measurable and Non-measurable of Brain Imaging</b>	
<b>Tele` as Sociometrist's Socio-metric Near-ness to Brain Imaging as a black-box of the Mind</b>	<b>Tele` as Socio-metric [Un-measurable] Real-ness &amp; Alterity</b>
<p>Sociometrist and Protagonists Brains are active in the same area as detected via MRI spectroscopy as indicative of mirror-neural activity and evidence both are feeling the same feeling at the same time and reason for empirical nominalisation of Tele`.</p>	<p>Sociometrist is highly aware that although both Brains area of mirror-neural activity are active at the same time, as detected via MRI spectroscopy, it is not empirical evidence the same phenomenon is activating the mirror-neuron area. There may be complications.</p> <p>Sociometrist is highly aware that although both Brains area of mirror-neuron area are active indicating both are feeling the same feeling at the same time the feeling can mean very different things to each person.</p> <p>Sociometrist is highly aware Brain knowledge does not equate to, Mind knowledge nor, knowledge of what a person may want to do next.</p>

<b>Philosophy of Science as Foundation Discipline</b>	
<b>Comparing &amp; Contrasting the Measurable and Non-measurable of Science; nominations &amp; ordinals &amp; measures</b>	
<b>Tele` as Sociometrist's Socio-metric of Natural Science</b>	<b>Tele` as Socio-metric [Un-measurable] Real-ness &amp; Alterity</b>
<p>Tele` [measures of reciprocity] of natural phenomenon [for example sun and plants and inter-computer activity] in appropriate locality are measures of Actual phenomenon and events.</p>	<p>Sociometrist is highly aware a specific natural being and \ or event is <i>both</i> Actual <i>and</i> unique and as a unique being is totally other [Alterity] in its Real-ness which means the '<i>thing in it self</i>' [the '<i>thing with in it self</i>'] not only cannot be directly measured but measures of similar entities cannot be compared as if comprising a medieval monism because Realness as events are 'one off' instances.</p>
<b>Tele` as Sociometrist's Socio-metric of Social Science</b>	<b>Tele` as Socio-metric [Un-measurable] Real-ness &amp; Alterity</b>
<p>Tele` [measures of reciprocity] of human relations are measures of Actual actions and related phenomenon as achieved through the measuring practice of practitioners. As such social norms apply to individual entities.</p>	<p>The Sociometrist is highly aware a specific social being is <i>both</i> Actual <i>and</i> unique and measures, in respect of Realness, are always achieved only 'as if' they are direct measures of Real-ness when Realness is one step displaced ['splaced' according to A Badiou] from the material world measures.</p> <p>An example of this is the 2009 Global Financial Crisis where not only is it disputed who is sociologically responsible but impossible to measure which entity [financial institution, Bank, Government regulation, Government policy or part of the populace was most and least connected to the resultant instability.</p>

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

Let's now leave; Naive Realism, TDCR as evidencing Polysemic Ontology, Alterity framed in Singular-Plural terms... and further explication for the yet to be released publication, and turn our attention to the resultant implications of such founding.

### **SOCIOMETRY AS INTELLIGENCE**

A feature of Sociometry intelligence [telic intelligence] is paying attention to having more relations than persons in a group. For example there are 6 relations in a group of 4 persons. Inquiring into the choices [choosing], each person makes at any point in time, uncovers the dynamics of the relations within the group. For example who is most chosen and who is least chosen and how that affects each person's choice as to whom to warmup (pay attention) to; why some are connected more so than others. Telic intelligence presumes that as we pay attention to group reciprocity patterning we can derive findings as to how the group is creating 'in-common' intelligence.

### **SOCIOMETRY & SCIENCE**

#### **Nature Of Sociometry As Morenian Science**

##### ***The Nature of sociometry as Morenian science and the Nature of Morenian science as sociometry***

In-as-much as Natural Science studies all sentient beings making choice, and this choosing is reciprocal and the choosing befits a criterion then sociometry is a phenomena that is in-built into the natural world. Birds flocking and dolphins schooling are sufficient evidence of sociometric choosing even though the type of consciousness (Umwelt) accessed by birds and fish and animals is vastly different from that performed by we humans. In as much as Turing [artificial intelligence (A-I)] machines are heuristic their choosing [symmetrical or non-symmetrical reciprocations] also befits a kind of non-human sociometry.<sup>ix</sup> So concerned was Moreno of the relations between humans and A-I [cyborgs \ robots] he devoted all of Book VI in 'Who Shall Survive?' to the topic. He thought of the ontology of cyborgs \ robots as zoomatons; animal-like cultural conserves [technical animals]. Of course this remains, and will continue to be, a hot topic. As JL Moreno says, 'A robot results from the conjugation of man with nature itself'. (p 603) JL's son Jonathon Moreno as ethics professor at Penn State University is currently researching futures of A-I's 'super-intelligences'.

Differentiating between types of sentient beings and A-I's sociometry [as more or less natured and free-choiced \ free-willed choosing], is best explicated via distinctions between Critical Realism as *Natural Science* and Dialectic Critical Realism as *Social Science*. As such, natural scienced sociometry [as per Critical Realism] sublates<sup>x</sup> social dynamics and hence is, retroductively, a basis for practicing Social Science; as per a form of Dialectic Critical Realism. The interactions \ communications of both natural and social phenomena can be used as empirical measures justifying casuistry in a scientific sense. Just how Critical Realism-ed natural science sublates Dialectic Critical Realism-ed social science and

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

retroductively substantiates Socionomic Praxis is the topic in the yet to be released publication; as is discussion of what cognates can tumble out of the term 'science'.

### **Sociometry as [TDCR] Scientific Realism**

It may be helpful at this point to make some clarifying comments on Scientific Realism; in particular the Natural Sciences. The previous section titled Philosophy of Realism refers to rather abstract notions because it is referring to ontological realism. Things become a little less abstract when we consider Scientific Realism from an epistemological rather than an ontological basis. Epistemological Scientific Realism claims we do have access to those regions of the world that are imperceptible. We know we can know even when we cannot fully explain how we know, and we know our models of knowing prescribe the limits of our knowledge. A classic example is gravity. Gravity<sup>xi</sup> was first thought by Aristotle to be something like an immaterial force holding the universe in place; the celestial spheres being weightless as 'air'. Later, with the earth conceived as a globe, it was thought to be an immaterial force pulling things down to the centre of the earth. Later it was thought to be a force-field circling the earth and strongest at the earth's core due to magnetic-like properties. I was taught at university it was a property of mass. Cosmologists until recently have explained gravity in Einstein-ian terms of speed of light and mass. Now that is in question and gravity is thought indeterminate [incomprehensible in laypersons terms]; as beyond mass and outside space and time - bending mass, space and time. Though gravity remains beyond our complete perceptibility we do not doubt it is scientifically Real.

Sociometry as the measures of the criterion for our reciprocal choosing, in as much as it is epistemological Scientific Realism, remains less than something we can make fully predictable, or replicable, but we need not doubt what it measures [socionomy] is ontologically Real. We all (each) persist with making reciprocal relations.

### **Sociometry As Dialectics**

At this juncture it may be helpful to make some clarifying comments regarding dialectics as it refers in particular to the Social Sciences. The literal Greek meaning of dialectic is, 'working things out through contradictions of speech'. The understanding is not that we humans are poor speakers but that the world is complex and when we need to communicate simplicity we need to use contradictory concepts and we can best do this by turning our rudimentary speech into art-form through (tropes) figures of speech capturing contradiction.<sup>xii</sup>

Dialectics is a convenient way of conceptualising how co-active entities relate, dynamically blend and morph with and into one another, even though they come from different sources and have independent natures.

One useful image with which to comprehend the notion of dialectic dynamics is to picture the, relational yet independent, co-actives as if they were thermodynamic entities and all in the one environment yet each with different isomorphic properties. In this image each entity at any one time is either; gas, liquid or solid but never gaseous or liquid or solid at the same time as the other entities. They can co-exist and co-enact and inter-change phase yet retain their unique nature.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

Another metaphor is to see the co-active entities as existing diachronically; each entity simultaneously existing in separate time-zones \ parallel universes. When the time-zones align and co-here then each remains predominant in their own time-zone whilst knowing the other is co-active. The entities co-enact yet each maintain their unique zoned-property while remaining true to the nature of time.

I should immediately emphasise that the above metaphors are exactly that; metaphors. Rhetorical effects pointing to similarity. The similarity in this case is limited to not losing 'own unique nature' while 'undergoing change' as in taking on a different; state, form or property while inter-acting with like entities. The dis-similarity is that gases and time-zones in parallel universes do not work things out through 'contradictions of speech' as humans do.

Dialectics is a convenient way of conceptualising how Tele` and Warmup and Doubling, as aspects of Sociometry, emerge at the same time and yet take shape as if coming from different universes or grounds. How they are simultaneously co-active as relations dynamics, yet do not fuse or lose their own unique nature. It is best to say that for Moreno, Tele` and Warmup and Doubling are The Dialectic Totality, the core Dialectic Nominisation for human activity as defined and described and desperately sought by Jean-Paul Satre. I reiterate the previous references to Nancy and human connectivity as single-plural as also an example of dialectic cognition.

### **Tele` & Warmup & Doubling as Co-active Ingredients in Group Relations**

Dialectics is the understanding that a number of phenomena are inevitably emerging (materialising via behaviour) at the same time. In Sociometry - Warmup and Doubling and Tele` - are co-active, independent and inter-dependent phenomena that, at any point in time, are emergent and either more-or-less, in the fore-ground or back-ground in respect of each other as instrumental in forming relationships and making a social system.

Tele` and Warmup and Doubling are Moreno's terms for; '**be reciprocal with**', '**paying attention to**', and '**empathise as readiness to act like**'.

Sociometry as intra or inter-group relations dynamics (dialectics) comprising Tele`, Warmup and Doubling are:-

- Measures for readiness to move – towards \ away from others in group (Tele`) – as a sign of how much one is motivated to accept (be Warmed up to) the other's situation and \ or has 'entered into another's shoes' (Doubled the other).
- Warmup to Self [inner roles as aspects of identity of Self] and warmup to relations with others is awareness of Group Intra-Connection measures (Tele`) as, temporary yet stable, [habits] relations as simultaneously befits [enhances] the Doubling of others.
- Doubling measures [measures befitting successful action-empathising of another] as how to connect deeply via taking up another's body pre-tension [position], and proximating their orientation and readiness (Warmup) to acting in their situation. Doubling acuity is enacting empathy where empathy is 'taking in' how another is preparing to enact them self in situ; for example how close or distant (Tele`) to another they are prepared (liking) to be.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

### **Sociometry is More than...**

In as much as sociometry sublates sociology then Morenian sociometry means, at any one moment; more than any one of, or a limited collection of, the following interpretations of ways of nominalising \ indexing relations. Each of these nominalisation \ indexations in and of themselves are valid aspects of sociometry.

1. digitised +ve & -ve values assigned to interactions (behaviours) or social roles descriptions or entities. E.g.: - ve Police Person and - ve Criminal; +ve Musical instrumentalist and + ve Composer. An **Inter-action Measure [A Behaviour indicating relations preference: external to any concept of person-hood or self-hood]**.
2. scaled or analogue type +ve & -ve quantifications re Psychodramatic roles. E.g.: highly +ve keen and passionate dance student and slightly -ve pedantic instructing dance choreographer. An **Axiology [values] Indicator [internal marker]** as to how much another person is valued.
3. digitised +ve & -ve measures as means of mapping social (group \ sub-group) patterns. E.g.: - ve and + ve patterns in a social system comprised of diverse Police Force Members and diverse Community Groups. An **Identity [Axiology] Patterning Measure**.
4. Boolean integers [algebraic logics] as sublation for preference and choice as sublation for **complexity theory** – E.g.: - ve and + ve **patterns** at various moments in time when choosing which sports (or movies) to preference or which demography's (sub-groups) prefer which sports (movies).
5. internalised interpersonal choosing as identity requisitions - E.g.: -ve and + ve patterns at various moments in time for a particular protagonist **choosing** particular companions for particular events as per **Diversity \ Choice Theory**; choice criterion based on momentary preference.
6. **Proximity & Separation** measure. The +ve & -ve metrics of spatiality as an indicator of strength of tie as depicted by Proximity To & Separation From other [as per **attachment** theory \ Bowlby] and sublation of relations dynamics. E.g.: long distance very keen lovers.
7. socionomic (social and cultural **resilience**) metrics - E.g.: -ve and + ve patterns at various moments in time when preferencing artistic, economic and political activities. As a sublation of **Cultural Theory**.
8. digitised +ve & -ve values as measure of **spontaneity**. E.g.: Who most quickly warms-up to; what, when and how as sublation of **Spontaneity Theory**.
9. Metrics to enable a psychodrama producer [**means to production**] to more adequately double a protagonist and track their psycho-dynamics. As per **Performance Means**.
10. A **Measure of Warmup** [persons readiness to respond] to others' and group. As per socio-tele`ology - socio-tele`o-genic futures. **Morphogenesis Studies**.
11. A **Measure of Warmup** [persons readiness to respond] to their **psychological functioning** [the various internal roles of a person]. **Intra-person spontaneity**, spontaneity-like instinct inside the person and connectivity to any inner inhibition or inner conflict (psychological-health)].

## **Sociometry & Trans-disciplinarity**

So far we have looked through the meta-physical prism of Realism to see Sociometry having facets of; intelligence, natural science, social science, dialectics [logics] founded by neuroscience [natural science] and psychology [the social unconscious] and philosophical realism. We begin to see Moreno and sociometry as relating to and pertaining to, what the Academy now days calls the, 'Multi-disciplinary' approach to science. The multi-disciplinary approach (knowing a lot of fields) precedes investigations into deeper and compleat knowing as inter-disciplinary projects under-labouring for; 'a theory of every-thing' and 'getting real', as the vernacular expresses it, in order to substantiate a meta-disciplinary perspective and doing trans-disciplinary studies. As the above section makes clear Sociometry pertains to such diverse disciplines as; behaviour-ism, axiology, complexity theory, diversity \ choice theory, attachment theory, resilient cultural theory, spontaneity theory, performance means and morphogenesis [gender] studies.

## **Sociometry as Social Development**

### **Sociometric Mutuality as Social Utility**

As measures of reciprocal relations the natural extension of applied sociometry is establishing mutual-relations cultures. In his project in a girls' orphanage Moreno was able to demonstrate socially isolated persons were able to make constructive relations with others when they were given more opportunity to make reciprocal choice. The most isolated girl was seen (and saw herself) as more mutual once she had lived in all the dormitories (huts) in the orphanage and had 'lived with' and 'more directly' knew more girls than any of the others.

As such sociometric mutuality under-girds social policy criteria-making for inclusiveness in diverse multi-cultural societies.

## **Sociometry As Actors' Relations**

### **Sociometry as Actors' Relations and Agency Dynamics**

#### ***Tele` and Warmup and Doubling as co-active ingredients of actors' relations as dynamics of their agency***

Actors' Sociometric Agency equates to DCR's D ontology \ praxis \ doing reality – as Realness. *Agents* 'doing stuff' via their TINA choosing, in as much as their reciprocating is taken into account. Pre-tention [as in an actor's pre-intentions] equates to the subjectivity of their relations' intentions. Agents are primarily actors – 'participatory social scientists'- in the first place forming their Transformative Model of Social Activity [TMSA] choosing.

As Actors (protagonists) in the drama of life, we make thousands of Tele` choices a year. We can categorise them either as one criteria befitting our singular social identity or a myriad of choices befitting the diversity of our identity. A Warmup can take 40 years to mature. And Doubling is mutative [iterative and friable]. Warmup can mean the process of consolidating one's sociometry [sociometric awareness]. Likewise, Sociometry can mean the process of consolidating one's Warmup [as in

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

creating one's identity]. Warmup can mean indexing \ scaling one's attempt at Doubling another and their endeavour to be agentic.

### **Sociometry as Identity**

#### ***Forming identity - constructing the sociometric core of the actor as Axiology***

Identity as internalised inter-personal sociometric choice - 'the sociometric core of the actor' - refers to the generative mechanism residing at the 'core of the actor'; described alternatively by Moreno as, the S-factor [spontaneity factor] and the actor's Creative Genius. This identity generative mechanism is typically referenced as the preferred set of values the person takes-up; the habit underpinning their axiological choices which eventually coheres (materialises) as their evolving character.

### **Sociometry as Challenge to Existing Social Sensibilities**

Viewed this way it is easy to see how Sociometry is far more psychologically challenging for citizens learning to engage with the modern world than is Psychodrama. Understanding the nature and experience of Sociometry requires openness to a meta-critical philosophy of science and art as means to engaging in 'the philosophical discourse of modernity' – emancipative human [social \ cognitive blending] capacity. Sociometry is reflexivity into the identity and dynamics of all social systems. It is making *social* identity criteria.

Psychodrama, on the other hand, '*only*' requires being open to experiencing integrative (emotions based) catharsis as personalised social and cultural atom repair (psycho-therapy). It is reflexivity into a 'person only' identity and relations and not social relations as modelling the emergent culture of society as a whole. Psychodrama defined as small 'p' psychodrama is limited to being concerned with the dynamics of a person responding to one sociometric dynamic; the one comprising their immediate needs-pressures locus of concern.

Sociometry [being concerned with the criterion of choice for protagonists generally] makes one's **social identity** and, in as much as the protagonist represents the group and this group represents other groups, all social systems identity, an Object<sup>xiii</sup> of awareness. Psychodrama (in the first instance) only makes one's 'acting out' [personal identity as action in relation to a core **individual identity**] an Object of awareness.

Again – it is actually a moot point to make comparisons between sociometry and psychodrama when sociology is both writ large.

## **SOCIOMETRY AS SIGN THEORY**

Having canvassed introductory ideas on Sociometry as science of social development, and before making further explorations into DCR as sociometry, it may be helpful to make some clarifying comments regarding Sign Theory and Semiosis. Any commentary of Sociometry is in-complete without considering it as communications and that necessitates paying some attention to elementary sign theory.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

In as much as Sociometry is the use of signs [symbols, indices and diagrams], Peircean Sign Theory provides an adequate base from which to know how signs work in respect to communications when applying measures (indexes) in respect to choice making. Tobin Nellhaus on page 45ff of his 2010 book, 'Theatre, Communication, Critical Realism', provides an excellent explanation of how, semiosis uses Peircean Sign Theory to deploy semiotics, and that semiosis is much more than semiotic [sign centred] arithmetic as precursor to an 'explains-all' technology or theory of everything. Signs help us communicate in both a *short-hand* way and in a *catch-all* way. Sociometry as sign making [signing to others our Tele` as our willingness to 'be reciprocal'] enables us to simultaneously make 'short-hand' and 'catch-all' communications regarding our capacity to connect via our Warmup [readiness for 'paying attention to'] and our Doubling [willingness to 'empathise as readiness to act like']. As we short-hand and catch-all with others we transform our signs (semiotics), as flagged activity (conation), into our deep communications (Semiosis).

In as much as Sociometry is our socio-cultural–communicational arrangements that are especially important in the formation of our social un-conscious, and includes our collective assumptions (disavowals and social defences) and pre-understandings about social reality, then it equates to Nellhaus's use of the term semiosis. Sign Theory is adequately explained also in Per Linell's book, 'Rethinking language, Mind and World Dialogically'; as is Dialogism.

### **CLARIFICATIONS Re SOCIOMETRY & SOCIONOMY**

It is now more than the right time (high time) to make further clarifications regarding the boundary between sociometry and socionomy and I thank you the reader for your patience in persevering to understand our subject despite the lack of distinction made so far between the two nominations. As I stated in the Abstract, Sociometry in its simple form, is the nomination of reciprocal relations with Tele` as the measure of reciprocal-ness. As such it is very useful because it enables us to make quick measures of connections in social relations and to sketch mud maps of social networks.

Sociometry in its complex form is the nomination of the dialectic process of; reciprocal relations [Tele`] + Warmup [paying attention to] + Doubling [readiness to act like] an 'other' person. One way to scope Sociometry is that it is bounded as person \s to person \s studies; the intelligence of personhood in group in respect to the group's collective intelligence; the making of more good sense.

The way to scope Socionomy on the other hand is to say it is bounded as a person's *agency*, collective as that is, because of the agents sociometry. It is the work [science] of the collectivised individual *agent* to construct their Transformational Model of Social Activity [TMSA] as means of initiating their work. The purpose of this work \ science is to model the generative mechanisms that surface *The Real*. Socionomy under-labours for nominalising the social unconscious and modelling social system complexity.

As such Socionomy is Moreno's attempt to nominalise Jean-Paul Satre's 'Dialectic Totality'; Satre's core Dialectic Nominalisation for human 'Need and Praxis'. If we wish

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

to nominate a metric of Sociometry then we can call it a 'socio'; the measure of human agency in respect to human emancipation.

In summary; Sociometry [Tele'] is a measure [unit] of social intelligence and Sociometry [Socio] a measure [unit] of sociometric emancipative agency.

### **Sociometry and Sociatry**

One aspect of Moreno's vision for humanity was that as Sociometrists became more sophisticated in their science practice they should become expert Sociatrists (Who Shall Survive? p 118). By Sociatrists he means that just as there is psychiatrists devoted to the psychic health of individuals then so there are sociatrists ('soci-chiatrists') devoted to the psychic-social health of social systems. The sociatrists are to use their sociometric knowledge to be agents of social emancipation and enable the proletariat to be the agents of their social systems emancipation via a bottom up micro-engagement emancipation strategy as, 'one at a time, group by group' via the 'Rule of Universal Participation' (p 62).

Focussed as he was on science, emancipation for Moreno was no utopian abstraction. He was very aware of Emancipation as the dialectic of freedom and stasis; free-self-determined experimentation and resilient sustainability. He uses the term emancipation with exactly that meaning, in various contexts, five times throughout the 1978 publication. The socio-economic sociatrists act as free agents responding both 'to freedom freely alienating itself' and the 'preservation of its achievements', to speak with Satre. Stated with negative logic, agency is the contingency of the free individual socio-economic sociatrist to stop the functionally transformative group from disintegrating.

As stated before... as actors (protagonists), in the drama of life, we make thousands of Tele` choices a year establishing reciprocal relations. We do so in the hope we advance our agency in the world as having options for both greater freedom for creativity within our social system, constraining as it is, and for sustaining our resilient identity within our social system, perturbed and unstable as it is.

It is the work of the sociometrically aware socio-economist to craft their sociatric interventions as social initiatives enabling emancipation as a praxis balancing freedom and sustainability.

At this point I shall not expand the similarities of Moreno and Bhaskar and Satre as regards emancipation theory except to say that when Bhaskar talks of 'Dialectic: Pulse of Freedom' and Satre says,

dialectic as the logic of creative action... in the final analysis, (is) as the logic of freedom' (p 69)

he \ they are all defining 'dialectical Reason' as encapsulating emancipation as - to speak with Satre and use negative logic speak - 'a totalisation without a totaliser, or a de-totalised totalisation.

### **Sociometry As Social Co-Unconscious**

To reiterate... Tele` and Warmup and Doubling are Moreno's terms for; '**be reciprocal with**', '**paying attention to**', and '**empathise as readiness to act like**'.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

For the purposes of containing this chapter we will elide politics, [decisions regarding organisation in respect of seriality] as yet another facet of sociometric socio-economic praxis other than to say that, Moreno is in league with Bhaskar and Satre's thesis that history is a wager between the individual and the group. The liberal and the civil society. It may be a facile remark to make in respect of liberalism but I'll make it anyway. In the USA even the gun-lobby delegates at the Republican Convention hand their guns in at the entrance desk while citing 'the right to bear arms'; without seeing that as a contradiction.

To the mix of facets covered so far I now expand on the framework of, 'the social unconscious' or as Moreno preferred to nominate it, the *Social Co-unconscious* as it relates to social development and social science as mutuality.

It is best to say that for Moreno, Tele` and Warmup and Doubling as Social Co-unconsciousness are *The Dialectic Totality*, and sociometry the core *Dialectic Nominisation* for human activity as defined and described but not identified by Satre.

Sociometry as the core Dialectic Nominisation for human activity is a convenient way of conceptualising how Tele` and Warmup and Doubling, emerge at the same time from the co-unconscious and take shape as if coming from different universes or original grounds. How they are simultaneously co-active as relations dynamics, yet do not fuse or lose their own unique nature.

Sociometry is evidenced as human Tele` [movement towards (choosing) others and reciprocal relating] patterning relations as groups' social dynamics in respect to criteria of socio-economic agents creating social development.

Sociometry as mathics is the categorisation and measurement of persons' warm-ups [inner roles valency as aspects of identity of Self] in respect to group relations as they pattern respective social dynamics befitting requisite social [remediative] development.

It is a moot point as to when sociometry (analysing choosing) of social systems befitting types of development becomes sociometry (requisite development) befitting human emancipation. As per the previous discussion of dialectics, at any point in [diachronic] time, sociometry and sociometry relate as co-active phenomenon integral to the dialectic critical realism paradigm. Sociometry, as the super-ordinate system, is not only focussed on criteria, making social systems dynamic and developmental, but the developments that make cultures resilient and sustainable. In constructive set theory terms, resilience > development > criteria > measures.

Sociometry is the super-ordinate system comprised of; Psychodrama [my experience of myself \ my psyche] + Sociometry [my social network measures] + Sociodrama [my capacity to relate to stratified \ emergent social systems] anticipating 'what we do next' to make my \ our culture resilient and sustainable.

### **Sociometry & Re-version**

Socio-economic Sociometry as mathics [concept configuration and numeration] is capacity for simultaneously re-version-ing (remediating \ choosing remediative relations) Self and Social System - as one co-action.

Sociometry [telic-intelligence] is the ability [competence] to simultaneously calibrate \ re-calibrate activity in respect to re-version-ing \ remediating \ reorganising - Self and

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

social system development - as one co-action. The Sociometric Core equates to the mathics [taxonomising and calibrating] of anticipatory reciprocations gendering stable relations as emergent development. Such understanding of social development is in line with Lev Vygotsky's dialectic approach to human development where, as in the instance of child language development, the child [person] attempts to *fill-in* what is missing [absent] in the adult's communications by appropriating speech and language. It is also in line with social morphogenesis as proscribed by Margaret Archer; 'Morphogenesis and the Crisis of Normativity'.

## **SOCIOMETRY AS SOCIAL SCIENCE**

### **Sociometry As Social Science Practice**

Sociometry as a Group-work Practitioner's Practice is a Psychodrama Director \ Producer coaching [enabling] an actor (and \ or a social system) choosing [selecting or rejecting] others by nominalising relations criterion. In nominalising the criterion the Director \ Producer pays attention to the reciprocal nature of the choosing such as to factor interactions' dynamics as experienced relations. The Role and Counter-Role valency. The Psychodrama Director \ Producer highlights the criteria sustaining creatively resilient relations. This is the case whether the Director \ Producer is working as a clinical psychologist psychotherapist or as a social scientist more generally. In the former the Director \ Producer is more likely to spend more time focussing on the personal aspects of relations while in the latter to spend more time focussing on the social aspects of relations.

### **The Purpose of Group Work Sociometry**

The Purpose of Sociometry in Group Work as Group relations work is to enable everyone to fully Reverse Roles with everyone else in the group. As such it is an aspiration; time restraints make this goal an impracticality even in marathon groups. The pragmatic purpose of Sociometry in Operative Group Work is for members to accurately and fully reverse roles, *equally* with as many persons as possible, given the time restraint. The 'equal' qualification focuses attention on the intent to build reciprocity and mutuality, evenly and simultaneously between all group members, and maximise awareness of how 'being in each other's shoes' [affects] is, what in fact the group is as a whole; the group's culture. That way each group member can accurately reflect on and map their Tele`, in real time, and ponder their criterion-making and what makes for more positive role response in some cases than others. They can ponder why other members are at times more \ less positive to respective members. A criterion for the emergent conative culture (values and normative expectations and orientation to action) can then be proposed as a working hypothesis. Members' mud-maps of the real time Tele` track the group dynamics.

As such Sociometry Group Work is quite different from T-Group Work. In T-Groups attention is focussed on the person most urgently needing therapy or the person the Group feels the group is most capable of providing therapy for. In the same way Sociometry Group Work is quite different from Personal Growth Work where attention is focussed on the person most *ready* (least restrained) to work and

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

become an exemplary model of good group work which others will then hopefully replicate and normalise. Sociometry Group Work is much more group focussed [an us each all-doing-this-together approach] rather than being individual focussed. It is fully in line with Wilfred Bion's concept of the 'work group'.

None the less the business ideal of sociometry is to empower each member as protagonist to get each group member to fully role reverse with their default role system – no matter how much that remains out of reach. To take the time to 'be in their shoes' while they enact both their formative primary cultural atom and their progressive social roles in their expanding world.

Given that, from a developmental psychology perspective, we radically change \ transform over time, it is easy to see why this daunting project has to date not been adequately resourced in all but a few cases. The other major reason the sociometry project has failed to attract much support to date is that it has been seen to be at odds with conventional social science in respect of how to reconcile person's sensitivity to private and public dispositions when exposing 1<sup>st</sup> person \ 2<sup>nd</sup> person – objective \ subjective - perspectives. Academic institutions almost exclusively focus on 2<sup>nd</sup> person perspectivity (objectivity) rather than balancing 1<sup>st</sup> person \ 2<sup>nd</sup> person (objectivity \ subjectivity) perspectivity.

### **Participant Observer Locus**

The most radical stance of Moreno is that the Sociometrist works as a scientist who has placed them self in the Participant Observer position. In the 1930's, well before the maturing of anthropology as 'science', proffering an integrated Participant and Observer science placed Moreno at complete odds with the social science approach of the time where the scientist (for example anthropologist) was purely objective observer trying to eliminate any subjective participation (personal) findings. As a result Sociometry was heavily marginalized and frozen out of the Academy's mainstream discourse. Time has done much to heal this great divide. Auto-ethnography and Discourse Psychology are now rated as legitimate tools of social psychology and subjectivity is recognised as fundamental to social science reflecting reality as other than in dualistic form. The controversy is now limited to how to conduct best praxis that includes actors' accounts rather than prolonging debates on the value of Lacan or Lewin [spectator-observer] objectivity over against a Morenian actors' [participant-observer \ singular-plurality] subjectivity with objectivity perspective.

In the pluralistic [mixed] methods field of contemporary Social Science praxis it is now high time the Participant-Observer is much more recognised as an influential factor in re-organising society. It is now time Actors, as always acting from within society, are more often seen as the crucial inclusion to making social science complete. Moreno's vision of a science of diverse participant-observer collectives generating a bottom up micro-engagement emancipation strategy as, 'one at a time, group by group' [and totally different from an individualist volunteerist approach] via the 'Rule of Universal Participation', is closer to gaining greater recognition as theoretically credible than ever before.

These short remarks about inter-subjective perspectivity anticipate a much richer discourse into understanding how 'scientia' and 'religio', as prediction \ certainty and re-binding - meaning and sense making, have been parsed over the last two and a

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

half millennia and Hellenic times when science and religion were not seen as constituting a conflict. Peter Harrison in his brilliant book, 'The Territories of Science and Religion', demonstrates how easy it is to see how someone like Moreno could parse 'scientia' and 'religio' through the lens of the reflexions and reflexivity of the Participant-Observer [singular-plurality alterity] as a non-conflicted lens clearly focussed on explicating 'the Real'.

The meta-critical question of the 21<sup>st</sup> century is how we ground (found) a less schizoidal (dualistic) social science praxis and make the respective practice more integrative. This is the objectival-subjectival social research project DCR seeks to make substantive.

## **SOCIOMETRY & REALISM - NEAR FORMS**

### **Measures and Fallacies**

To this point we have introduced Sociometry as 'the participant observer' science of social development and flagged notions critical to foundations (whether psychological, biological or philosophical) for sociometry \ sociology Praxis. It will be helpful to make some more, yet still all too brief statements, about Absence and Alethic truth as under-labouring both sociometry and DCR foundations before examining how Moreno himself made reference to Realism and Dialectics.

DCR and Sociometry both seek to establish their foundation as more than speculation. Bhaskar, as we saw in the section Philosophy of Realism, relies on transcendental critique. Moreno [not knowing TDCR] relies speculatively on Merleau Ponty type phenomenology a (blend of abductive and inductive) logic of the 'flesh'. Both seek to establish practice as nominalising [nominating and indexing] protagonist's constructive response [reciprocal choosing criterion] as being founded in the 'real'; as in reality. They understand experience of others as containing:-

- Absence as generative mechanisms, in respect of who is *NOT* here [and not fully here] affording Reality; the displaced moment [M], <sup>xiv</sup>those not yet fully emerged [E] or the un-differentiated [L]. Our Sociometric choice being an attempt to fill in that absence.
- Alethic Praxis [socionomic truth practice] as truing-truth determined by dialectically blending natural and social generative mechanisms via making ethical criterion in respect to reciprocated choosing [relations making] affording greater human emancipation by filling in crucial absent relations and aspects of un-fulfilled relations.

To expand this topic there needs to be an explication of the relations between cognitive science understood as human limits, as espoused by Rom Harre` in his book 'Cognitive Science: Philosophical Introduction', and cognitive science as human capacity for DCR type freedom \ emancipation, as envisioned in Bhaskar's book, 'Dialectic: Impulse of Freedom'. The expansion of the topic 'human limits and freedoms' is further undertaken in a chapter of the anticipated book.

I hope it is sufficient for our purposes here to say, in respect of DCR framing dialectic as negatite` [as illustrated by the negative of a photograph being the pen-ultimate (less than fully processed) form of the finalised and actual photograph], that

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

Moreno's term of *Near Sociometry* lines up with Realism's view that, here and now type, actual things are derived from aboriginal forms. I hope it is sufficient for our purposes here to say DCR's explanation of here and now type actual things [persons] taking on form as they morph dialectically, as if out of nothing [Absence], have pen-ultimate type form. Just as I hope it is sufficient here to say Nancy's singular-plurality alterity is explanation enough of Moreno's term of 'Near' as referring to 'in-common' connectivity [intimacy] and not just what is common to two individuals.

The *Real* comes up from the depths of the unknown [the other \ singular-plurality alterity] and, via respective generative mechanisms, 'takes-on' material form as it gets *Near* to material surfaces and actualises as another of life's *actual events*. *Near Sociometry* is explanation enough for things [relations] actually 'being right there' in front of the social scientist and for s\he being able to measure the workings of the 'actual' <sup>xv</sup> [presenting \ represent-able] and measurable inter-action as an accurate [true], yet only *near-ly Real* measure of the *Real* nature of the *Absent*. If you like... a rudely made Platonic Ideal relationship seeking to be fulfilled.

Thus '*Near*' sociometry, in contrast to '*Real*' sociometry, is the material connectivity to the 'generative mechanisms, [the under-lying forces at work], generating [materialising] the *actual [near]* inter-actions surfacing out of the teleological forces buried in the aboriginal ground of nothingness [Absence]. The intention of the 'generative mechanisms' is to be the 'pulse of freedom' enhancing human emancipation which the sensorial limited sociometrist [human] can only appreciate as an emergent property of what is becoming 'actualised'. Thus in practice the sociometrist [measurer] only works with 'near sociometry', in the sense that the measurables as emergent properties, are only near to being the full 'alethic' truth about the generative mechanism's intent when procreating the emergent world. In that sense the *near* sociometry is the sociometry that has only ever *nearly* [always only yet partially] fully emerged. The sociometrist is forever reduced to taking 'snapshots of events' in moments of time when the protagonist's whole life comprises an epic portraying humanity's emancipatory sociometric struggle.

The sociometrist can only see the actualised [behaviouralised] Tele` [and what the generative mechanisms, that are in play are actualising] as 'inter-actions'. The sociometrist cannot see the Real world the generative mechanisms relate to and what is really creating the Tele`. The actualised Tele` is always poster-iori the pulse-of-freedom's generative mechanistic creative force.

DCR presumes we humans function in a Demi-real world that is only at best a facsimile of, and therefore is proximal to – *Near* to being and ever becoming - more the Real world. The DCR critique of contemporary society is that our culture is such that we often act as if according three fallacies.

The Epistemic Fallacy equates to saying a particular measure [as indicated by assigning a sign] *fully captures* the ontology of the 'thing \ being' that is \ was measured. The Ontic Fallacy equates to saying the quantified \ qualified measure, E.g. Tele` 'x', assigned to one being can be *applied equally* [transposed] to any other 'being \ person \ thing'. The Primal Squeeze as Fallacy equates to the praxis squeeze between anthropic fallacy & liberalism. It equates to saying, 'from my perspective, my sociometric assignation is as good as any other person's assignation in capturing true nature; when in reality the nominaliser's sign<sup>xvi</sup> never fully captures the true nature of both the choice and what is being chosen.

## **Realism in Moreno's Writings**

### **'Real & Near Sociometry' terms in Moreno's Writings**

That Moreno is foremost a Realist [speculative in approach] philosopher is incontestable. He directly deploys the term 'real' more than 35 times and uses its comparative term 'near' (meaning non-real) on 18 occasions alone in the 1978 3rd Edition, 'Who Shall Survive?' There are also references for the need to be 'realistic' and to 'realize', et cetera. Any literature review sees that Moreno was a Realist throughout all his life. There are 10 uses of the term real and 7 references to the term near in the 1934 Edition of Who Shall Survive? Moreno as Realist accords with his Realist theology as illustrated in the following quote from page 21 of the 3rd Edition.

My first scientific dream was that if I were God, the Creator of the universe, I would be able to start an adequate science of the universe. Or, if I would have been at least there and near the source on the first day of creation, his auxiliary ego and participant observer, instead of being born into the twentieth century of an elusive mankind's history, my account of the meaning of the universe would have some semblance of reality. This fanciful dream of getting into the midst of creation, (my emphasis), of "ongoing life and production," has never forsaken me.

I interpret Moreno's aim to 'start an adequate science' as semblance of reality to mean he wanted a transcendently real science consistent with Bhaskar's TDCR. Moreno wanted his science to be integrated into the science of the Academy as a legitimate science commensurate with naturalistic (materialist) philosophy. I am contending that Moreno was not content with Sociometry as science being eth-real. He does not cite [mis- \ interpret] Hegel's notion of Being as pure spirit as he might easily have done if he wished to be non-material or even Gnostic xvii. He only cites Hegel in reference to dialectic logics [sublation]. Although Moreno's philosophical training was not sufficient for him to do more than speculate about realism he was not content for his science to be founded solely as phenomenology [all appearance] or existentialism [all a subsequence of empirical decision making].

The following references indicate just how determined Moreno was to speculate on his, quote, 'theory of socio-metric realism and sociometric methods... experiments' [p 551] so as to establish realism as founding the science [empiricism] of Sociometry. He says in Preludes page xv, 'It may be said that I tried to do through sociometry what "religion without science" has failed to accomplish in the past and what "science without religion" has failed to accomplish...'. He fabricates a teleological narrative for history where Realism history culminates through the science of Sociometry. He postulates Realism accumulates as; firstly Christianity<sup>xviii</sup> \ religion (p4, 1934), secondly as Bergsonian Creative Evolution (as a 'real advance over Spencer') (p8, 1978), thirdly as Freud (as real advance re psychology), fourthly as Nietzsche (overman-ing culture) (p9), and fifthly as Marx as real advance re economics (p11). To sixthly Sociometry (p21 1978), as social reality of "Ding an sich" ... a "sociology of the people, **by** the people and for the people" (my emphasis).

Perhaps the following quotes best capsule Moreno's Realism in respect to his relation to theatre and drama and science; fantasy realism relations to realism philosophy \ theology \ science. The occasion was with children in a garden in Vienna in 1911.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

"The most important part of the story was that I was sitting at the foot of a tree, like a being out of a fairy tale and that the children had been drawn to me as if by a magic flute and removed bodily from their drab surroundings into the fairy land. It was not as much what I told them, the tale itself, it was the act, the atmosphere of mystery, the paradox, ***the unreal become real***" (my emphasis).

p xviii

"I suffered from an idee fixe... that there is a sort of primordial nature which is immortal and returns afresh with every generation, a first universe which contains all beings and in which all events are..." **real** (my interpolation).

Some readers of Moreno may have in the past interpreted his use of the term 'real' as nothing more than an adjective; real equates to 'very' or 'specific', such as a very (real) common man (p xxxvii). I do not dispute Moreno does on occasion use real as an adjective - I am just saying any literary criticism review emphatically reveals Moreno is foremost a Realist philosopher. Not only that, his realism is tied to his identity as a Dialectic philosopher in the Continental [etymological] tradition. Moreno only makes sense as both realist and dialectician. As I flagged before, it is only through the lens of realism and dialectics that Moreno's use of the term 'near' makes total sense. In the forth coming book I will include an appendix documenting a complete literary critique of terms Moreno associated with Realism. Terms such as; ontology, meta, ambiguity, nascendi, axiology, aboriginal, sublation.

Not appreciating Moreno as foremost a realist and dialectician has led many to conclude he was a flawed character; prone to exaggeration and megalomaniacal ranting. They cite him comparing himself to; God, Marx and Hitler for example. Without denying he was at times a difficult person I would emphasise that any critique of a realist and dialectician philosopher must factor in the fact that realists and dialecticians see the world very differently than non-realists and start their discourse from very different premises than say secular materialist scientists. For a start realists, in order to emphasise they focus on negation (contradictory concepts) love to use paradox and exaggeration and lots of irony to highlight disparity of working in this (near) world while talking about the real (other \ absent) world. An example of this is the ancient Greek pythagorean mathematician Thales who, upon proving a geometric theorem, sacrificed an ox to demonstrate that he saw mental and body domains as connected. At least Moreno to my knowledge did not go as far as Thales to show a scientific point as connected to the Real.

To reiterate Peter Harrison's point, it is legitimate practice to propose, in say 1925 in Vienna, to look through the lens of the Participant-Observer and parse the words 'scientia' and 'religio' as a Continental Philosopher in a far different way than the terms science and religion were being parsed in the USA in say, 1930 to 1970 through the spectator-observer lens of secular humanities academics. It is also legitimate to enthusiastically argue in 1970 in New York that the 1925 Vienna Participant-Observer lens saw some aspects of the Real more clearly than any secular spectator-observer ever could - anywhere, any time; even if the argument's interpretation would be misconstrued.

To say Moreno was 'losing the plot via megalomania' when he says, 'It may be said that I tried to do through sociometry what "religion without science" has failed to accomplish in the past and what "science without religion" has failed to accomplish...' is to fail to see he was allowing the option of parsing the Latin terms 'scientia' and 'religio' as both inner qualities; as "intellectual virtues \ habits" of the individual (as

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

Aquinas did) and not for example contrasting 'inner' and 'outer' *practices* as his audience in the USA would most likely have interpreted him. That is if they were able to deduce the intended meaning of the sentence at all. To be brief; it is legitimate to interpret Moreno's use of the term science in the sentence as meaning *Scientia* as defined in Thomas Holyoake's 1676 Dictionary as, properly speaking, the act of the knower, and *Religio* as the act of the 're-binder' (the one who makes sense of the act of the knower). I propose this is a much more psycho-dramatic [action oriented] interpretation.

As a Realist, Moreno knew enough about dialectics to see the need to equally emphasise both Near and Real sociometry. We have seen in the section titled, 'Sociometry as Co-unconscious', that Moreno much more readily expressed Nearness in terms of Social Un-conscious and Co-unconscious'. He used the terms "co-unconscious" and "inter-personal unconscious" as founding the recursive processes of, 'mind-in-society' and 'society-in-the-mind' and in that sense Sociometry as science only ever remains 'Near to' and never 'actually is' the *Real* social conscious and *Real* co-conscious social mind. Generative mechanisms (socio-economic and psychological) extract social worlds as real-ness-es of our social unconscious and we persons internalize these social worlds and as a consequence remain ever one step removed from Real social conscious sociometry and science measures (actualities) as a direct medium to Real-ness.

Moreno also articulated Near and Real variance as referring to 'very well related' measures \ indexations. A cluster of measures that are either very indicative of the actual dynamics of a system, at a moment in time, or only valid as a rough guide as to what is currently happening. As deficient practice, Near sociometry is a too; partial, brief, rushed approximation, to accurately depict the truth of the actual dynamics of the system being studied and therefore become a ready objective measure of the relations being experienced. *Near* measures are acquired by a sociometrist who has not taken time to fully relate to the protagonist \ actors \ social system. This focus of Moreno is excellent instruction as to account for the 'need for error' and fully aligns with DCR's need for awareness of Ontic, Epistemic and Primal Squeeze Fallacies.

A *quasi* sociometry is one that is, [literally] 'equal in law' to, the *Real* sociometry. In other words quasi sociometry are measures the sociometrist uses as; 'truly indicative of' or 'an adequate approximation for' or a 'good enough practical assessment', to establish and maintain pragmatic relations. Pragmatic relations with the protagonist, if not all the system's actors, in order for a sociometric intervention to be able to be authentically and genuinely applied and be successful. In this case quasi refers to the necessity of the sociometrist to make an adequate model of the social system in question. *Quasi* refers to the sociometrist's attempt to '*try to get Real*' (to use the vernacular) and being aware their best efforts are but those of a social modeller. They need to use modelling theory to make their models allow for the 'need for error' and acknowledge that pragmatic social interventions are unlikely to fully map the *Real* system; given that not everything else is being equal (*ceteris paribus*). The best map is only one of many resolution's interpretation of the territory and therefore while the map is a true representation of 'the whole' it is not a full representation of 'all' the territory; to speak with Nietzsche.

Umwelt is the term for what biologist's say is the limits of a person's scope of sensing the material world. We only hear to a certain distance. Our Umwelt, hearing can be

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

extended by the use of scientific instruments like radio head phones. Used in this sense *Near* sociometry refers to the sociometry derived through the limited sensory capacity of the sociometrist's limited senses.

Neither Moreno knew, nor Aanzpa \ IAGP Writers (as of now) know, DCR terminology and therefore do not interpret the terms *Near* and *Real* in the same way DCR applies these terms. The assumption of this paper is that as brave as he was, in not having a DCR literate readership and being reduced to philosophical speculation as his only method, Moreno only ever partially expressed and realised his full understanding of *Near* and *Real* variance as philosophy; and hence meta-critical thought and resultant philosophy for science.

Thus far we all have fallen short of explaining how the sociometrist is using the measures as basis for a DCR project being substantively emancipatory. This limitation leads to not seeing sociometry as an anticipatory (transductive) science, and also to not more fully exploring 'absent roles' within the system being investigated. As a result such sociometry elides retroductive methods and preferences abductive methodology. The practitioner's work becomes focussed on resolving conflicts in a short-term timeframe so the protagonist feels emotionally adjusted. The work is not so focussed on building social capacity suited to emancipatory [open] systems scenarios. Not being aware of the near and quasi nature of sociometry means the Director sees little or no difference between using Tele` measures as if they are 'psychological instruments'; instruments like those in a natural science laboratory, and that the same scientific methodology cannot be genuinely used in both individualised psychology and social psychology cases. A contemporary popular science expression for this is that the terms *Near* and *Quasi* are indicative of a science only being capable of representing a digitise-able and not an analogued world; one which is much less directly presenting the *Real* world.

### **Near & Quasi Sociometry as Pragmatic Practitioner Relations**

The idea of near & quasi sociometry as underpinning pragmatic relations practice is a regular theme in Psychodrama writings around the world. Such Sociometric Practitioners rightly emphasise the need to stay 'in relation to' and 'be sufficiently warmed up to' and to be 'an adequate double' for the protagonist while Directing \ Producing sociometric work. These writers also emphasise the two way relations aspect as being critical to inter-actions being fully sociometric. No doubt using the two way relations between the sociometrist and the protagonist [via doubling and warmup] as a means of [basis for] depicting and understanding the social system being studied, is critical; and it is crucial these aspects be thoroughly appropriated.

Another way pragmatism interprets Moreno's term *quasi* (one requiring more abstractive cognition) is to have it refer solely to the process of modelling and sketching the Tele` of the social system in the form of a sociometric network diagram [sociometry]; the sociometrist in effect carrying a brief sketch in their head and not having access to a large size 3-D screen detailed animation. In such cases the diagram in the head is *quasi* in the sense that the 'map is never the total territory' or the two dimensional sketch can never fully describe the three of four dimensional [emergent] aspects of the actual social system. The sketches as models are only facsimile [quasi] representations of what it actually feels like in 'real time'. Such an interpretation is spurious in the sense that it elides implications pertinent to *Realism* interpretations and simply points to any model having limits rather than the possibility

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

Absence does in fact permeate the whole model. It is not so much the representations are only copies of things [simulacra] that are obvious but that there is a whole lot of things that have not been represented. Even, as it were, with the best computer game graphics.

Such attempts of pragmatism to make use of the term *Near \ Quasi* are efficacious, up to a point. That does not negate the potential benefits of exploring the veracity of retroductive methodology [for example counter-factuals] in as much as it endeavours to surface absent forces and drives. Near-ness relates as much to being *Near to social emancipation* as it does the Director being psychologically or spatially *Near* to the protagonists actual or intended functioning or having made a good model of behaviours. What is required is a greater respect of social history and how social history gets formed.

It is the view of this commentary that to date there has been insufficient documentation as to the parallel process of; 1.0, the psychologically or spatially near & quasi sociometry between the sociometrist and the protagonist and 2.0 the near & quasi sociometry between the protagonist and their social system's *retroduction*.

Such DCR sociometry work relates to the warmup of both the protagonist and the sociometrist in respect of nominating [nominalising \ indexing] their vision for human emancipation as much as simply finding what, to the protagonist, seems [feels like] a 'progressive' [alleviating stress \ anxiety] development.

## **SOCIOMETRY AS BASIS OF DCR SOCIAL SCIENCE**

### **Sociometry As DCR Retroduction Diagnostics Action Research**

Knowing Sociometric Measures in the first place are only Near & Quasi indicators of Real Sociometry is to acknowledge - 'the need for error' is *the* definitive factor - distancing us from directly knowing the generative forces that are producing what we are measuring. It is to realise we need additional reasoning logics than; abduction, induction and deduction if we are to conduct forensic social science practices that diagnose generative forces and discover more than, 'more-of-the-same-old' type of explanations of the way things appear as they do. We need additional methodological leverage if we are to achieve outcomes which do more than fall short of transformations that are fully emancipative.

Dialectic Critical Realism adds Retroductive Analysis to the mix of scientific [logics] methods as means to under-labouring for clarifying founding connections. DCR's retroductive forensics highlights specific Absences as Scission in a specific time and place [splace, to use Alain Badiou's term].

The schema for DCR's forensic methodology is DREI(C). D in the acronym stands for the description of some pattern of events or phenomenon; R for the retroduction of possible explanatory mechanisms or structures; E for the elimination of competing alternatives; I for the identification of the causally efficacious generative mechanism or structure; and C for the iterative correction of earlier findings. The simplest introduction of the schema is provided in Chapter 4, 'Enlightened Common Sense'. As applied scientific research it is expanded as RRREI( C) to involve both abductive *re-description* and *retrodiction*.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

Some readers (clinical psychologists in particular) may wonder why bother with notions of Realism and Dialectic when the idea of social unconscious and forensic psychology is explanation enough of Moreno's use of terms Near and Real. The answer is that Sociometry applies to much more than just clinical psychological analysis \ forensics. It applies to all social sciences generally; humanness comprising a number of ontological levels. A laminate system typically classified via the academia categories of the; physical, biological, psychological, psycho-social, socio-economic, socio-cultural and normative.

Only DCR substantiates Retroductive \ Splace Analysis and understands scission as sublimation. Dialectic Critical Realism's Retroductive Analysis provides another platform entirely for conducting science [systemisation of testable knowledge] as an alternative to relying solely on the use of the more reductionistic methods of inductive qualitative analysis or quantitative deductive analysis or the 'luck' of abduction.

Thus I spell out the value of DCR type Retroduction Diagnostics and cite examples of its application in greater detail in the yet to be released publication. Suffice to say here that Sociometry as Diagnostic Tool and as Action Research investigates the protagonist and group from more than just a behavioural and motivations psychology framework. Social Emotional and Cognitive Fluidity Indexes as framing developmental psychology is factored into action research projects as frameworks for factoring Absences.

### **Sociometry As More Than Behavioural - Motivations Psychology**

To date Psychodrama [Socionomy and its variants], as practiced around the world, preferences behavioural \ motivations psychology over other psychologies. This has produced good outcomes in that productions have highlighted immediate changes in behaviour and changed motivations as evidence of protagonists acquiring new roles. Also protagonists have been enabled to enact their catharses directly and fully demonstrate the affect their motivations and behaviour has on them self and others. However the under-preferencing of Social-Emotional [Piaget type] and Cognitive type psychologies has been one of the great Absences of Psychodrama theory and practice. As indeed has been the case within the Academy's psychology as evidenced by Cognitive Behaviour Therapy taking on centre stage status.

A more integral Socionomic diagnostic and action research practice would include unpacking the currently used conflated psychology, in which Social-Emotional and Cognitive psychologies are hidden. It would include making independent assessments that preferenced equally the Needs-Press [needs and pressures] motivations psychology and the Social-Emotional [Piaget type] and the Cognitive type psychologies as needing to be dialectically factored into the emancipatory mix. The assumption in this approach is, that human communications (language and empathy) may well be a conduit for conveying ideas as measures from one mind to another yet, the process is more complex than as-if it were solely a *tele`-mentation'* flagging just ever yet more behaviour to be measured.

## **Review Of An AANZPA Sociometry Thesis**

### **Introduction**

Simon Gurnsey's sociometry thesis titled, 'Seizing The Moment', is the most thorough recent statement of sociometry and sociometric work by a successful Aanzpa examinee. It is a worthy project and read. The exacting challenge of delivering organisation performance improvement - at the same time as - remediating relations to become more mutual for all, plus strengthening the organisations vision - is palpable. From the get-go the thesis quickly posits a number of ideas as keys to commencing good \ pragmatic sociometric practice.

### **Whole Group Approach**

#### ***The involvement of the Whole Group***

One such key idea is that Sociometry Practice is the deep understanding pertaining to the whole group's own ways of getting things done and the sociometrist actively bringing, 'the unconscious to conscious, the covert to overt, revealing many truths about the nature of the relationships in the group'. The point is well made. I refer to it here because it relates to Near-ness. The sociometrist works to factor as much of the whole group's mutual functioning into their social intervention as possible. They do not, for example, pander to just the wishes of the most powerful individual in the group. The implication is that, as the sociometrist factors the whole group mutuality (all the individuals involved and their competence for mutuality), they attain more (get more *Near to*) Real sociometry as socionomic science.

While this inevitably is most likely to be true, and hopefully in this case is in fact true, I hope the above commentary established that a more scrutinized connecting of Realism and Dialectical critiques enables a more thorough analysis of what mutuality might mean in any particular case thus gendering even more pertinent options for social consultative interventions. The emphasis moves from factoring a whole of group mutuality approach to factoring the generative mechanisms that formed the whole group's issues in the first place - the whole group's historical scission.

As this commentary is very theory focussed (and for the sake of brevity) I will not at this point discuss how a DCR'd sociometric practice, compared to non-framed DCR sociometry, offers additional pertinent interventions, but I will make further brief remarks on the framing of sociometry.

### **Remarks On Framing Of Sociometry in Respect of Realism**

#### ***The Social Science Context***

In as much as Aanzpa theses elide any discussion as to how Morenian Sociometry as science is founded they imply any number of foundations can be deployed. As such the reader is left to ponder Sociometry exists in a contextual vacuum devoid of a paradigm for Realism and as to what pertains to appropriate scientific methodology and what accounts as the 'need for error' in making relations theory. For example a brief reference to the now popular cognitive science as social science approach, such as the so called '2<sup>nd</sup> wave of cognitive science' as espoused by Rom Harre', would enable comparison of its *connectivism* and Morenian sociometry as allowing

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

the brain to compensate for the 'need for error' when things don't go as the brain (cognition) expects they would. Another example would be Discursive Psychology and how we prepare our language for 'seizing the moment' and Morenian Sociometry with its preference for spontaneity over language preparation. Such limits of theses is totally understandable from an Aanzpa thesis perspective. Aanzpa theses are limited in size and are meant to emphasise how sociometric work is conducted as practice more so than demonstrating theory.

As the most outstanding feature of Morenian Sociometry, when compared to contemporary conventional approaches to social science, is the *experience of the participant-observer*, then the Husserlian [Platonic idealist] phenomenological lens is often assumed the default lens for founding sociometry. A paraphrase of Husserl's definition of Phenomenology is, 'Cognitive Realisation of [what] lived consciousness [is] which leads to presupposition-less pure descriptive clarification of 'the thing'; the experience'.<sup>5</sup> Husserl's Essential Structure is an Eidetic [recalled] search which is not 'from the individual person' alone but as an 'instance of'... 'base structure'; via ideation. The 'free imaginative variation' leads to... 'necessary general' meaning.

An operative group, in as much as it uses the Essential Structure and utilises the co-unconscious of the group tends towards presupposition-less pure descriptive clarification. Thus any individual's specific [existence] example is, 'a case besides-the-point'; a Reduction of the phenomenon making a 'reduction to the essence'. Psychodrama sharing sessions are designed so as to under-labour presupposition-less pure descriptive clarification of 'the thing'; the experience' in question.

### ***Phenomenology as an Incomplete Program***

In as much as Husserlian Phenomenology is seeking the Platonic Ideal of the 'presupposition-less status' it is an incomplete program. Phenomenology [description] is little 'b' being... until Big 'B' Being [Appearance] is attained. Stopping the search mid-program, as is required in social science consultations projects, means the Appearance is in-complete; or at least its completion is indeterminate. Husserlian Phenomenology is incomplete in another sense as well. The phenomenologists (operative group) are unaware of any impacts of structural mechanisms that are absent from their immediate experience. The 'individual group' in the social system is as much a reduction as the individual is of the 'general meaning'; the gaps that Merleau-Ponty and Jules Deleuze sort so much to fill in.

Now that the more encompassing DCR approach is available it is important that future theses research how the Husserlian phenomenological approach sublates DCR and note the advantages that accrue with the expanded framework. One advantage is that the DCR frame enables more flexible use of myth as Dialectic Thought Forms and reduces accusations of solipsism as reduction.

### ***Mythic Story & Dialectic Thought Forms***

Theses using a phenomenological base often include a particular mythic story as conferring inspiration on the sociometric practitioner and as such makes reference to fantasy Realism. Fantasy Realism's facility to invoke feelings of un- or non-worldly

---

<sup>5</sup> Bruzina, R (1970) *Logos and Eidos: The Concept in Phenomenology*, pp. 67

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

powers implies users (hearers and readers and storytellers) have capacity to use their imagination as means of achieving non-restrained creativity. The Real in Fantasy Realism refers to non-located universal possibilities. Being non-located and universal, such possibilities can just as well actualise here as elsewhere. It is a point well made; it provides evidence the practitioner is highly imaginative and willing to go beyond the restraints of their conventional rationality. It is unclear though how such stories (or any story in particular) relate to any particular situation other than through some form of lateral thinking and associative logic deploying archetypal associations.

Classicists in referring to Greek Myths have always emphasised universality. For such a reason such writings would be better served by referring to a number of mythic stories and inferring the relevance of any number of associations. The power in fantasy is derived from being able to work with many ways of being non-restrained; to be wizard like and conjure from *any* - thing. Invoking a number of myths enables inductive logics to gain power or extend thinking beyond abductions.

Including the fantasy Realism reference as a one off begs questions of, 'why not expand the use of archetypes as a Jungian psychologist would?', or 'why not refer to other forms of Realism such as Formal Realism'? Only referring to fantasy Realism reduces the philosophical basis as pertaining only to phenomenology; a weakened Husserl-ian phenomenology at that, bounded purely by poetic or at best rhetorical verisimilitude. Without reference to other forms of Realism (for example literature's Formal Realism or Science Realism) the sociometrist as social scientist is at risk of being seen to be founded only on less-reasonable rather than more-reasonable (asymptotic) forms of 'science'. The point is that only using Fantasy Realism implies Disneyfication is sufficient and explicating constellationality is superfluous. Fantasy Realism used on its own distances conventional social scientists and distracts them from exploring other forms of Realism for which to base sociometry.

No doubt it is instructive for the working sociometrist to imaginatively deploy fantasy Realism and to feel very creative by projecting all sorts of images. The point of this commentary is that it would be efficacious to include more approaches to Realism than just using myths. For example using dialectic thought forms as founding the 'grammar' of mythic stories as done in Otto Laske's Dialectic Thought Framework. Investigation into dialectic thought forms fluidity, and indexing of dialectic thought forms fluidity, is very instructive for any sociometrist and extends understandings of how to relate sociometry and social science as methodology; even if such work goes no further than methodological constructionism.

### ***Problems of Solipsism & Authenticity***

A major difficulty (according to the DCR lens) of *only* using the typically Husserlian phenomenological lens is that it is unable to distance itself from the Primal Squeeze (third) fallacy that DCR highlights. To reiterate previous remarks, the fallacy has to do with self-referenced subjectivity. It equates to the praxis squeeze between anthropic fallacy & liberalism and un-substantiates the consultant other than them saying, 'from my perspective, my sociometric assignation (imagination) is as good as any other person's assignation (imagination)'; when in reality neither nominaliser's sign (imagination) fully captures the true nature of both the choice and what is being chosen.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

Referring to myths seeks to balance \ remediate; the need to be particular (self-referential) with the need to be referenced universally; via archetypal forms. This is always only ever partially successful as science - science of the Real. It only ever counts as much as rhetoric counts as science as the methodology \ logic deployed is purely abductive \ inductive and therefore self-referential. This reinforces the argument of those critics wishing to dismiss the work as solipsism. The problem is a Real one – pun intended. The sociometrist as participant-observer needs to be self referential [subjective] in the sense that their measures need to be authentic of their direct experience. The problems of Solipsism & Authenticity are partially overcome in practice when sociometry is conducted in an 'operative group' and the group tests intervention social dynamics consensually. As we shall see in chapters in the yet to be released publication, applying DCR's retroductive enquiry and selectively preferencing; deduction, induction and retroduction logics as referencing measures of generative mechanisms as non-subjective [natural science type] events, counters reliance on self-referential methodology.

## THE FUTURE OF SOCIOMETRY

The future of Sociometry lies with gaining further diagnostic clarity into Dialectics - as:

- conditions of social structure-making [structure generation] in general [Clinemen]
- formulating balances of inter-disciplinarity. E.g.: psychology & axiology (e.g.: Anxiety & Super-ego plus Courage & Justice) [Scansion]. Operationalising trans-disciplinarity as imposing one disciplinary pattern upon another.
- Operationalised Forms ['Constructive' Set Theory axioms, et. al. where Sets are just 'sets' and not limited to 'types' of entities.]

Such discussion is too detailed a project for this paper but we can use the analogy of development of gene-editing from the biological sciences to elucidate conceivable project strategy.

CRISPR <sup>xix</sup> has two main rivals in the genome editing game; they each have equally odd names: zinc-finger nucleases and TALENS. Like CRISPR, these gene editing systems can deliver a DNA-cutting enzyme to a particular gene. But they have one key difference: while CRISPR is made of an RNA molecule, zinc-finger nucleases and TALENS are proteins, which are much trickier molecules to work with. So tailoring a zinc-finger protein or TALE (TAL Effector) protein so that it's the right shape and charge to bind to a particular gene is far more complex than ordering a custom sequence of RNA that's a perfect match. And complex translates to more time consuming, more expensive and less accuracy, tolerance to work with, than CRISPR. CRISPR technology has another benefit — it can target multiple genes in a cell at once.

The point of the example is that if sociometry can 'code \ decode' some of our Transformational Model of Social Activity [TMSA] retroductivity we may be able to 'CRISPR-like' deploy the social processes to good remediative effect. We would be taking into account Badiou's point about Splace being unique yet generic. I should clarify the pun between tale and tele` is entirely incidental.

- Philosophical Future

In respect to Jean-Luc Nancy's Singular-Plural-Alterity, Watkin's Journal Article concludes [and I paraphrase with Morenian insertions] as follows. Important though these Singular-Plural-Alterity [foundations claims for Double \ Mirror \ Role-Reversal ontology] observations are for a proper understanding of the uniqueness of Nancy's contribution to the current rethinking of the ethical, there is much more at stake here than a disputed reading of Nancy's philosophy. If we take on board (i) Nancy's [+ Moreno's] analysis of the collapse of the primordial 'we' into (anonymous) 'one' and (integrating) 'I', (ii) the link drawn between this dyad and the problems of globalization and fundamentalism, and (iii) the argument made that fundamentalism and globalization (and therefore a fortiori the same/ other dyad and the (in) difference by which Derrida attempts to think ethically within its absolute and incalculable aporia) are mutually compounding and inextricably linked, we have a pressing case that continuing to think ethics under the all-pervasive rubric of same and other is not only unnecessary but could also be responsible for blinding the future of philosophical Continental thought to what is at stake in the most important philosophical and political problems facing it, and us, today.

## **CONCLUDING REMARKS**

This commentary has sought to attend to the many facets of Morenian Sociometry as seen through the prism of Realism and Dialectic thought [Nancy's alterity of difference] and thus honour JL Moreno as a philosopher steeped in Realism and Dialectic via the; Continental, Greek, and Sephardic<sup>xx</sup> traditions.

The fact that both Moreno and Bhaskar centre their approach to social science as predicated on social life being the makings of the enacting and agentive **participant - observer** means the two approaches have much in common.

The place of Retroduction logic, as proffered by Dialectic Critical Realism, in founding Sociometry \ Socionomy practice has yet been barely begun; though it no doubt is fertile ground.

Although using different language to express their visions; Moreno in terms of Spontaneity and Creativity and Bhaskar as Human Emancipation; both were intent, as social scientists, to found socionomic practice. These pioneers provide a substantial basis from which to grow Socionomy practice.

The genius of Moreno is to relate the experience of the actor to the Real generative nature of social systems' generative mechanism - without re-sentimentation [psychologism]. Sociometry connects the mimetic relations between the actors [agents \ disciples of creativity] and the social systems' generative mechanism. Sociometry aligns the actors and mechanisms process as a generative centre. Moreno is clear that, dialectic as negatite`, in respect of social systems, is the 'result of congregational choice' (via mimesis) and not about 'shadow' as per a psychologism. Diagnosing and managing the generative mechanism is a project for and of the in-common [singular-plurality] collective.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

### **Books**

- Archer, Margaret (2016) *Morphogenesis and the Crisis of Normativity (Social Morphogenesis)* Springer Coventry
- Badiou, Alain (2009) *Theory of the Subject*, Continuum Publishing London
- Basseches, Michael (2010) *Dialectic Thinking and Adult Development*, Ablex New Jersey
- Basseches, Michael (2010) *Psychotherapy as Developmental Process*, Routledge New York.
- Ben-Menahem, Yemima (2005) *Hilary Putnam Contemporary Philosophy in Focus* Cambridge University Press Cambridge
- Bhaskar, Roy (2008) *Dialectic The Pulse of Freedom*, Routledge, Oxon
- Bhaskar, Roy (2016) *Enlightened Common Sense*, Routledge, Oxon
- Bhaskar, Roy (2010) *Plato Etc: Problems of Philosophy and their Resolution*, Routledge, Oxon
- Bhaskar, Roy (2016) *Metatheory for the Twenty-First Century: Critical Realism and Integral Theory in Dialogue (Ontological Explorations)*, Routledge, Oxon
- Bhaskar, Roy (2009) 2nd Edition, *Scientific Realism & Human Emancipation*, Routledge, Oxon
- Clayton, G. Max (1989) *Group Work Training Manual*, The Australian College of Psychodrama, Caulfield, Australia.
- Clayton, G. Max (2004) *The Living Spirit of the Psychodramatic Method*, Resource Books, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Fonseca, Jose` (2015) *Contemporary Psychodrama*, Routledge, Oxon
- Goffman, Erving (1959) *The Presentation of Self In Everyday Life*, Penguin Books, London.
- Gurnsey, Simon (2014) *Seizing The Moment*, Aanzpa Thesis, <http://aanzpa.org/>
- Harrison, Peter (2015) *The Territories of Science and Religion*, The University of Chicago Press Chicago.
- Hale, Ann (2012) *Three Cyclical Models Which Enhance Consciousness of Interpersonal Connection*, International Sociometry Training Network.
- Hale, Ann & Little, Donna (2004) *Sociometry Processing of Action Events*, International Sociometry Training Network
- Hopper, Earl & Weinberg, Haim (2011) *The Social Unconscious In Persons, Groups, And Societies Volume 1: Mainly Theory*, Karnac.
- Inglis J & Steele M, (2005) *Complexity Intelligence and Cultural Coaching: Navigating the Gap Between Our Societal Challenges and Our Capacities*, Vol 1 2005 Integral Review, <http://integral-review.org/>

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

- Jakobsen, Liselotte (2002) *Explaining Society*, Routledge, London
- Kegan, Robert (1994) *In Over Our Heads, The Mental Demands of Modern Life*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge Massachusetts.
- Kellermann, Peter F. (2007) *Sociodrama and Collective Trauma*, Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London & Philadelphia
- Laske, Otto (2008) *Measuring Hidden Dimensions of Humans Systems, Foundations of Requisite Organisation (Volume 2)*, Interdevelopmental Institute Press, Medford Massachusetts.
- Lewin, K.(1948) *Resolving Social Conflicts and Field Theory in Social Science*, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC
- Linell, Per (2009) *Rethinking Language, Mind and World Dialogically*, Information Age Publishing. USA
- Moran, Dermot (2005) *Edmund Husserl Founder of Phenomenology*, Polity Press, Cambridge
- Moreno, Jacob (1994) *Psychodrama and Group Psychotherapy*, ASGP&P Beacon House, McLean Virginia
- Moreno, Jacob (1978) 3rd Edition, *Who Shall Survive?* Beacon Publishing Company, Beacon, New York.
- Moreno, Jonathan (2014) *Impromptu Man*, Bellevue Literary Press, New York
- Nancy, Jean-Luc (2000) *Being Singular Plural*, Stamford University Press, California
- Nellhaus, T. (2010) *Theatre, Communication, Critical Realism*. Macmillan, New York
- Vygotsky, Lev (1978) *Mind in Society, The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge Massachusetts.
- Yablonsky, Lewis (1981) *Psychodrama*, Gardner Press, New York

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

### **Journal Articles**

#### **Marxism**

Moreno, J. L. *Sociometry & Marxism*, Source: *Sociometry*, Vol. 12, No. 1/3 (Feb. - Aug., 1949), pp. 106-143 Published by: American Sociological Association. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2785381>

Moreno, J. L. *Sociometry, Comtism and Marxism*, Source: *Sociometry*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (May, 1945), pp. 117-119 URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2785231>

Meyer Henry J. *Review: The Sociometries of Dr. Moreno*, Source: *Sociometry*, Vol. 15, No. 3/4 (Aug. - Nov., 1952), pp. 354-363 Published by: American Sociological Association Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2785747>

#### **Nancy**

A Different Alterity: Jean-Luc Nancy's 'Singular Plural', Christopher Watkin. Published by: *Paragraph* 30:2 (2007) 50-64

URL <http://www.eupublishing.com/doi/full/10.3366/drt.2016.0134>

#### **Sociometry**

Moreno, J. L. *First Note on the Sociometric System*, Source: *Sociometry*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Feb., 1955), pp. 88-89 Published by: American Sociological Association. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2785832>

#### **Realism**

Galileo and Plato Author(s): Alexandre Koyre Source: *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Oct., 1943), pp. 400-428 Published by: University of Pennsylvania Press Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2707166>

### END NOTES

---

i The ancient Greek term mimesis means to imitate [to be an actor] and has been variously used by philosophers since time immemorial. One late contemporary of Moreno who also founded his work on mimesis was theologian René Girard. Girard formulated his well known anthropological-theological thesis of [imitation] Mimetics without any reference to Moreno's mimesis as personal psycho-drama. Girard's Mimetics has found strong reception in diverse disciplines as; literary criticism, critical theory, anthropology, theology, psychology, mythology, sociology, economics, cultural studies, and philosophy. Girard's Mimetics emphasises humans primary activity is to imitate \ mimic each other because humans desire what others want. In this sense the drive to 'Double each other' is just as foundational to both Moreno and Girard. However despite the sameness of Moreno's Tele` and Doubling with Girard's Mimetics 2-way [symbiotic] relations Girard never explores Sociometry. Granted Girard seems pre-occupied with 'scape-goating' as a grand narrative for Catholic apologetics and so wants to contrast his theme with Moreno's grander vision of humans as 'creative genius' rather than competitors or replicators. For Girard, our 'desires' are copied from models or mediators whose objects of desire become our objects of desire. Other imitators, having the same model as we have, must compete with us for the same objects. In such a mimetic framework jealousy and envy are inevitably aroused and exemplary social explanation. For Girard - the concept of a general and spontaneous desire is illusory; ir-real. This document argues Bhaskar's DCR enables us to re-evaluate spontaneity theory in relation to human emancipation and Realism; with fetishisms [such as Girard's] being ir-real.

Alterity [Otherness] is a main understanding of why and how humans need to continually enquire throughout their life-span. Contemporary French Continental Philosopher Jean-Luc Nancy explores 'different' alterity as Singular-Plurality. Because contemporary philosophy is focussed so much on 'difference' as a post-modern idiom and Nancy is not familiar with Moreno he expresses his ideas of alterity [Other] in different ways than Moreno. I contend it is self evident to any reader familiar with both writers that the difference of Nancy's from Moreno's notions and ideas of alterity [Other] is purely superficial. The section titled, 'Singular-Plural Alterity' explains the similarity of Nancy with Moreno. Further explanation will included in the forth-coming monographs on DCR Sociodrama and DCR Psychodrama.

ii Mathics is meta-maths cognition. Just as maths is the more abstract form of arithmetic so mathics is the more abstract form of maths. Mathics takes into account taxonomy boundaries as illustrated through set-theory pondering, 'when should an identity belong in one set and on another occasion belong in another set'. Classically Mathics balances fideism (global categorisation) with quiddity (smallest categories – atoms). Constructive Set-Theory includes Zermelo–Fraenkel [ZFC] set theory which includes the axiom of choice where C stands for Choice \ Choosing Relations.

iii Recent new discoveries in Neuroscience via advances with MRI scanning means summarising what the science involves is instantly complicated. The following remarks may help those of us less familiar with the issues appreciate the complications. The MR-imaging of brains involves 3 basic components; brain cellular structure, the nominations of functions to be tested and the interactivity (blood-flowing) the images depict. The fact that cellular structure varies considerably across individuals and changes rapidly with age makes the cell structure complications obvious. Each brain significantly shrinks once an individual is over 50 years of age yet our functionality can change little. Nominalising functions (tasks set for the client) is inordinately complicated. Who \ what determines which function to measure? How many functions should be measured to relate function to brain geography \ typology? For example, how many Laplace transform equations should the client be asked to solve when each of say 5 equations is solved slightly differently each time? Do 10 clients each given the task of masturbating go about the function the same way? Interactivity is also complicated. Given brain plasticity - is each region (cellular structure and image colour location) relating to the same function of diverse individuals? To resolve these issues one highly rated recent study says it is best to limit research to just 100 correlations of; cellular structure, functions and interactivity graphics, nominations. It is most likely our ideas of neuroscience will change as much in the next decade as they have in the past decade.

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

---

iv Entanglement is more commonly viewed as an algebraic concept. While bundling of subatomic particles is verified the question of what this means or relates to is open ended. Note the reference in the Hot Links section.

v Surplus Reality is the term Moreno used to describe the meta-physical realm where relations dynamics are given full expression. Real relations sublimate Actual relations. Realism explicated as Natural Philosophy is particularly well articulated by Alexandre Koyre in his 1943 article, 'Galileo and Plato', as listed in the Journal Articles Bibliography. Koyre speculates there must be a Realism that would integrate [synthesise transcend and include] the inadequate and opposing Realisms depicted by Plato and Aristotle. This article argues this Realism is in-line with the Surplus Reality espoused by Moreno.

vi The term Sociometry was used by Moreno in a number of ways. Firstly as comparison to demography as the nominalisation of demography. Just as demography is a matrix of populations; ages, sex and locations etc, so then sociometry is the nominalisation of human socius - a matrix of populations' demographic social relations; networks and connectivity. Jonathon Moreno in his book *Impromptu Man* is accurate in emphasising that his father preceded digital social networking (Facebook et. al.) by some 60 years. Moreno also used Sociometry to mean connectivity as founding personal identity; the way attachments and social association generates identity. As re-iterated later in the text, because Moreno saw all humans primarily as actors, sociometry as such is the super-ordinate system comprised of; Psychodrama [my experience of my active self \ my psyche in action] + Sociometry [my social network action measures] + Sociodrama [my capacity to respond to stratified \ emergent social systems] anticipating 'what we do next' to make my \ our culture resilient and sustainable. Note the above listing in the Journal Articles Bibliography.

vii Alethic Truth. The truth of, or real reason(s) for, or dialectical ground of, things, as distinct from propositions, possible in virtue of the ontological stratification of the world and attainable in virtue of the dynamic character of science.

viii These paragraphs are such a close paraphrase of Mervyn Hartwig's excellent Introduction to Bhaskar's SR&HE they virtually constitute a cut & paste.

ix Moreno discusses Ontology of Sociometric Theory on Pages 59 to 63 of *Who Shall Survive* [1978] and then sociometry in relation to the Status of Science on Pages 63 to 64; making the case for sociometry as sublating natural and social science.

x Sublate is the term for what founds (is foundation for) an entity. Kant's logicset limits as Reason...yet... it is reasonable to step beyond the limit *Reason* has posited. In scientific realism terms the world is knowable if not explicable. There is difference between the Knower and the Subject Known. A Sublation assumes a particular thought has a basis in the Real. In this sense the Natural world sublates the Social world and the Natural sciences sublimate the Social sciences.

xi Have you updated your understanding of Gravity lately? Check it out... <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gravity>

xii Bhaskar gives a good overview of the etymology of Dialectic at the start of Chapter 6, page 87, of *Plato Etc: Problems of Philosophy and their Resolution*.

xiii The term Object in this instance is used in reference to Subject-Object nominalisation as a derivative of ontogeny [origin of body]. As far as personal \ social identity is concerned [in the first instance] subject and object are inseparable, one being essential to the other. As the Hegelian dialectical matrix says of scission - there is no unity that is not split. Thus the need for an Interlocutor => characters as place holders. In psychodrama the action of the actor is an object [act] of the subject [actor's] identity. The protagonist's drama [action] makes Object their [in as much as they act on the group's behalf, then **our**] identity, '**The Sociometric Subject**'.

In reference to Moreno's use of the term Near sociometry he implies... the act as an Object is Near [close enough to measure] and the other as counter-role [subject] as the recipient of the act is un-Near. Moreno may be inferring the Object [measured act] **is not**, as with Lacan, Imaginary [Symbolic or an epistemology] but *Other* or *Real* sociometry which measures the protagonist's role and the counter-role's *FULL* identity.

xiv MELD-ARA is the notation of DCR's polysemic ontology. M = moment [physicality], E = emergence [of a new entity as being], L = level of differentiation [an organism is another being]

## ***The Many Facets of Sociometry Through the Prism of Realism***

---

altogether than an atom], D= Doing \ praxis [outcomes of human activity]. D ontology results in Appreciation, Reflexivity and Awakening as meld-ara.

xv Actual equates to [approximates \ is near to] the 'thing in it self as it is [exists]'; the thing in its extant is-ness such that it can be represented; its dimensions \ ordinals [when referencing sets \ systems].

xvi For the sake of brevity this discussion elides reference to an in-depth philosophy of numbering such as proffered by Frege; quote 'the properties of number conceal their nature'. Briefly - assigning the ordinal 4 as in fourth choice assumes some sort of sorting - ordering *supposes* a psychological subject of which the ordinal zero defines 'this is not everything else' without defining what 'else' it is separated from. Hence the 4th is defined only in as much as it is part of a sequence and not what it is definitively not part of. Ref: <http://cahiers.kingston.ac.uk/pdf/cpa1.2.duroux.translation.pdf>

xvii The reference to Gnosticism in this instance is best understood as inferring the world is dualistic via the powers of Force and The Understanding being equal; as described by Hegel in Phenomenology of Spirit.

xviii Moreno's placing of Christianity as the first step anticipating sociometry revolutionary history [both in moral influence and geographical sociometric spread] at first glance seems unfounded and unjustified. It makes much more sense when linking the Golden Rule of Christianity, 'do to others as you would have them do to you' with Moreno's Role Reversal technique as a founding psychological and moral tool for forming post-revolutionary culture \ society. Moreno is imputing that Role Reversal, as 'walking a while in others' shoes', fulfils in a practical sociatric way the social moral force founded by the 1st Century Christians that proved culturally revolutionary to the point slaves and free related mutually.

xix CRISPR - gene editing <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-04-07/crispr-gene-editing-technology-explainer/7217782?section=health>

xx Sephardi Jews - [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sephardi\\_Jews](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sephardi_Jews)