

An approach to Neutrosophic dialogue and a response to WEF's *Great Reset*:

How dialogue is required in order to preserve social justice with anger management

V. Christianto¹ & F. Smarandache²

Abstract

In recent debates, there are arguments on the role of anger in order to preserve social justice. For instance, in www.opendemocracy.net, there is promoted phrase: "*anger is the language of social justice*." Others call for anger fueled with love (Sisonke Msimangs). Is that true? Is it achievable, the so-called "*anger with love*?"

Introduction

In recent debates, there are arguments on the role of anger in order to preserve social justice.

For instance, in www.opendemocracy.net, there is promoted phrase: "*anger is the language of social justice*." Others call for anger fueled with love (Sisonke Msimangs [3]). Is that true? Is it achievable, the so-called "*anger with love*?" [1] See also Cantrell [4].

In this article we argue that in order to preserve and strive social justice, we need to balance the rational mind and emotions. In the language of anger management, we need to keep the functioning of *frontal lobe at a collective level*, instead of reptilian brain [11-14].

If we fight against injustice but with reptilian brain, then the result is lack of rational consideration which may leave many effects of disastrous proportions.

Neutrosophic dialogue: a re-consideration

We should know, who played behind these ongoing rapid revolution. It is the WEF³ and its proponents, according to Anthony P. Mueller, a German born Professor of economics who now teaches in Brazil [2]. The goal is captured in the catch phrase: *The Great Reset*, whose goal is

¹ Email: vic104@protonmail.com

² Email: fsmarandache@gmail.com

³ WEF stands for : *World Economic Forum*

projected to be similar or even larger in scope in comparison to French, Russian or China Revolution.

And for you to know, the ongoing Revolution is not about left or right anymore; it is more about achieving *global techno-totalitarianism* [2].

Hannah Arendt has discussed classic analysis on the origins of totalitarianism [5]. Nonetheless, in a recent book by one of us (FS), it is argued that in reality, most nations display a degree of mixture between freedom and some degree of totalitarianism, etc. Actually it is possible to find locations or regions where in each society in the world we have a degree of democracy, degree of dictatorship, and indeterminate or neutral degree (rules, regulations etc. that may apply to all societies) [8]. FS also defines as follows: *Neutrosophic Sociology (or NeuroSociology)* is the study of sociology using neutrosophic scientific methods. The huge social data that we face in sociology is full of indeterminacy: it is vague, incomplete, contradictory, hybrid, biased, ignorant, redundant, superfluous, meaningless, ambiguous, unclear, etc. [8, p. 9]

What can we do to avoid the upcoming social upheaval? Again, we submit the viewpoint on the urgency to do dialogues, in the sense of dialogical communication of Martin Buber [10]. Even in democracy nations, sometimes the dialogue is lost in the process. The democracy without dialogue will lead to segregation and a long line of self-talking.

Science, *techne* and dialogical communication

Now let us put the aforementioned discussions on technological choices, dialogues, and approach to nature into a more philosophical perspective.

It is known that there are natural sciences, social sciences, and emancipative sciences etc. The main distinction between natural sciences and social sciences is mostly about what and whom to control: in natural sciences, a scientist tries to control nature through comprehension of certain aspects of nature, which then they be reduced into some kind of laws of nature. In social sciences, a scientist tries to achieve more understanding (*verstehen*) of certain people or society, in order to properly do dialogue with that society/people. Therefore, it is wrong if a social

scientist tries to “control” the society in question as his/her goals, because human beings should not be an object of control, but a partner of dialogue.

Many problems that we found in society come from two chief misapplied sciences: natural sciences which becomes “*techne*” or technology, which not only aiming to control Nature, animals and so on, but also control people and society. And social sciences which work in wrong way to not do dialogical communication to achieve goals as community, but to control each other.

To these wrong applications of science, which often happen because of either socialism or capitalism,⁴ then comes a third possibility: emancipative sciences, which are aiming to liberation to the aforementioned “*techne*” stronghold.

In this sense, small tech-high touch can be viewed as one way to counter the pragmatic-hegemonic practices of techno-utopianism, especially with the high tech, big tech approach.

That is our perspective, which may be influenced by Buddhism economics thinking of EF Schumacher, along with dialogical philosophy of Martin Buber [9][10].

How to do anger management

According to one of a former professor of psychology, the trick of anger management is to keep functioning the *frontal lobe*, that is the part of the brain which functions as rational mind [11-14].

Of course, if we want not just immediate result but also perpetual result in spiritual sense. We should achieve higher, from just *frontal lobe* to spiritual brain [6][7].

⁴ Added note: "There is no pure socialist or capitalist society. Each society has a degree of capitalism (private businesses and organizations) and a degree of socialism (social aid to poor, state businesses and organizations). Whichever degree is bigger, that's considered the type of society."

References:

- [1] TM Master. Link between moral anger and social activism. URL: <https://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu/rutgers-lib/26136/>
- [2] Anthony P. Mueller. *From Lockdowns to the Great Reset*. URL: <https://mises.org/library/lockdowns-great-reset>
- [3] <https://www.google.com/amp/s/amp.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/mar/07/sonianke-msimangs-2020s-vision-for-social-justice-to-prevail-we-need-anger-fuelled-by-love>
- [4] Deborah Cantrell. Love, anger and social change. *U. of Colorado legal studies research paper no. 19*, 2019. URL: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3385835
- [5] Hannah Arendt. *Origins of totalitarianism*. URL: <https://www.azioniparallele.it/images/materiali/Totalitarianism.pdf>
- [6] Mario Beauregard & Denyse O’Leary. *Spiritual Brain*. Jakarta: Penerbit Obor. Cet-1, 2009.
- [7] Caroline Leaf. *Switch on your brain*. Jakarta: Light Publishing, 2019.
- [8] Florentin Smarandache. *Introduction to Neutrosophic Sociology*. Brussels: Pons Publishing House, 2019. URL: <http://fs.unm.edu/Neutrosociology.pdf>
- [9] EF Schumacher. Buddhist economics. *Schumacher Center for a New Economics*. url: <https://centerforneweconomics.org/publications/buddhist-economics/>
- [10] Martin Buber. *I and Thou*. Translt. Ronald Gregor Smith. EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 1923. url: https://www.burmalibrary.org/docs21/Buber-c1923-I_And_Thou-ocr-tu.pdf
- [11] Helen O’Neill and Tamsin Ahmad, Publications and Research Manager, Headway – the brain injury association. Managing anger – after brain injury. *Headway*.
- [12] Pawliczek CM, Derntl B, Kellermann T, Gur RC, Schneider F, et al. (2013) Anger under Control: Neural Correlates of Frustration as a Function of Trait Aggression. *PLoS ONE* 8(10): e78503. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0078503
- [13] A. Teresa Martins et al. Traumatic brain injury patients: does frontal brain lesion influence basic emotion recognition? *Psychology & Neuroscience*, 2011, 4, 3, 377 - 384 DOI: 10.3922/j.psns.2011.3.011
- [14] Jean R. Seguin. The frontal lobe and aggression. *Eur J Dev Psychol*. (PubMed Central CANADA)

Version 1.0: 18th august 2020

Version 1.1: 21st august 2020

Version 1.2: 29th aug. 2020

VC & FS