Social Exclusion – its General Principles Related to Bullying, Criminality, Criminal Organization, and Extremism

Emile M. Hobo, M.Sc. — February 12th, 2018

E-mail: e.m.hobo@hotmail.nl

Contents

What Is Social Exclusion?

There's a difference between social exclusion and social exclusivity. Social exclusion means that people simply refuse to interact with you. Social exclusivity means that you're not a part of a particular gang, maybe even "the cool gang", but those in the gang are more like a team that likes to work together, without socially limiting others. They do recognize you in the hallway and value your existence in a positive way.

Let's face it, we all to some extent have our own kind of people that we do feel most comfortable with. You can compare it to a mental and/or social relationship, without the physical attraction. What it boils down to is *compatibility*, a concept coined by Lajos Egri (2004) in relation to relationships. What he didn't go into much is that relationships happen on all levels and should be recognized as such.

Next to having people we feel most comfortable with, there's also such a thing as social dependency and coherence. Different people like to organize themselves in different ways according to different convictions. On the one hand you can discern organizations based on socio-economic conventions. On the other, personal beliefs up to the point of religion also generate larger cohesive structures of both interdependency and support. Some people choose to opt out in terms of these kinds of organizations and favor survival.

To each their own.

If you want to discern whether people socially exclude or not, it's first important to look at all of the world views and how they contrast. Social exclusion typically entails the notion that you either belong to the same social group, with the same conviction, or you're excluded from it, meaning you're either the oppressed, repressed or the enemy. But how does this happen? And how do we bring people back together?

If you want to bring people together, people need to realize that we're all relevant, we're all necessary, we're all important. All people's lives matter. But why?

Let's first do as said and index the different world views as present in society in more or less generalist terms.

Adhering to a particular worldview can be an *individual* matter, but it can also be a matter of a *group*. Individuals prefer to operate on their own, without having to be held *accountable* for everything they do. Groups adhere to a specific set of rules that they *conform* to. The distinction is largely based on general consensus. People that favor working in groups prefer that everyone sees it, before the group accepts that something needs to happen. Individuals sometimes feel they see things that other people don't and tend to take risks.

Considering the point of view of a *secular state* with room for religious debate within its own context, meaning that it isn't a part of the government, the state in terms of organizations based on sustenance needs to value four points of view: social, liberal, tribal and survival.

A *social* person prefers to work within a social context, where employment is provided by someone else, typically the state, or an employer that adheres to state guidelines in terms of pay and safety measures in place. Socials do believe that when employed by a liberal company, when the company profits, they should at least profit to the extent that a social minimum without financial worries is provided. Specific social trades are dependent on performance measures based on society's need to provide healthcare, safety, an education, and a basic infrastructure.

A *liberal* person seeks to invest time and money in new endeavors and craves responsibility, as such taking a risk setting up ventures, but by contributing taxes, does still value a proper social system to rely on when ventures backfire. Also, although minimal pay needs to be provided at all times when employing others, the minimum should grow to at least a social minimum without financial worries, before further expanding business ventures. Specific liberal trades are dependent on performance measures through competition induced by consumer's needs, based on freedoms to express and experience oneself.

A *tribal* person prefers to work in a group that engages initiatives based on agreed upon group views without the intervention of a monetary system and without state guidance.

A *survival* person operates outside of the confines of the state, based on what nature provides and what oneself can construct to sustain one's existence.

Within these different groups it's still possible to identify subsets also based on whether people are *progressive* or *conservative*. Being progressive means that you see things that need to be changed. Being conservative means that you see things that need to remain the same. Most people will, based on the necessity to sustain or fix, alter their views in terms of temporarily being conservative or progressive, based on present circumstances.

Other than that, separate from organizations based on sustenance, you can also have different belief systems, of which religious systems are a subset. These belief systems focus mainly on the origins of the world and existence, as well as on what makes our perceptions be the way they are. They for instance seek to explain what qualitative experience (Chalmers, 1996), or the way we perceive colors and other manifestations of our senses beyond just a logical fashion, thus also experientially, entails.

Please note that leftwing and rightwing groups haven't officially been defined, because they don't relate to a clearly identifiable organization of any kind, and are typical denominators to identify people as positive or negative, without wanting to go into the how and the why. They aren't scientifically definable constructs and as such should be abolished.

They also tend to be abused as what some people would call "neutral" denominators for radical views. This means that for instance instead of racist they prefer to call it a rightwing party. Since they only use exclusion, passive violence through a prejudiced criminal system, to oppress people and not so much active physical violence, unless people resist, they claim they aren't an extreme right radical party, even though in the end it boils down to the same thing. The only difference being that instead of engaging in violence, they create situations that they try to make look like the violence was warranted, because people either run away, take up a non-cooperative stance or fight back, disregarding the fact that they were right to do so.

Those identifying any of these groups as something that should be opposed to, venture into the realm of extremism, meaning that they aim for social exclusion of specific groups of people. The main question in the end for this essay will be: "How do we keep people included in society, when we simply run into them, for as far as they want to be, and how do we prevent them from turning against other groups?"

What Does It Mean To Be a Radical?

To be a radical means that you actively turn against particular groups of people. This may manifest itself in two ways: either you're against the entire group of people or you identify that a particular problem like crime or radicalism typically only occurs within a particular group of people, even though in reality it occurs in all groups of people.

The belief that crime or radicalism typically only occurs in a particular group of people is often difficult to recognize for people that adhere to these views themselves. They adhere to this belief system out of fear, but at the same time they recognize that not all people in the group they are afraid of are criminals or radicals. The fact that they on the one hand recognize this, means that they don't see themselves as radicals, yet they want to exclude complete groups out of fear that they encounter a radical other than themselves. They believe radicals to be more prevalent in these groups than in their own.

When you illustrate to these people that radicalism happens within all groups of people, they tend to label extremists that belong to more excessive forms of their own culture as exceptions to the rule. Within their own belief system, they feel that extremists are a minority, and within other groups they see them as a majority. What they fail to recognize is the sliding scale of extremism, with different levels of extremism, that they themselves are already a part of.

Evidence can mostly be found by arguing with people with these views on for instance relatively safe places for them to utter their views, like social media. A lot of this was derived from direct experience using Twitter.

So, what is the sliding scale of extremism? According to Zannoni et al. (2008) radicalization happens in four phases. Other research noting these phases tends to misinterpret radicalization as something that only happens within particular groups of people, but the Islam for instance doesn't entail ISIS. Islam isn't the same thing as ISIS, it's what ISIS uses as both an excuse and a delusion to do whatever they feel is necessary or desired. These four phases of radicalization are:

I.   A person or group is affected by a negative development.

II.   A person or group that's inquisitive and to some degree susceptible to radical thought.
III.   A person or group that's interested in radical thought, to some degree radicalizes, and spreads this radical thought.
IV.   A person or group that further radicalizes and is willing to use undemocratic means to realize one's or their ideals.

Note that as an example to undemocratic means, violence often gets a prevalent attribution to radicalism or extremism, even though abuse of power is as much a means to an end for these people as any other.

What is extremism?

When you don't have a right to make use of the system of justice, of healthcare services, of educational institutions, or of the basic infrastructure a society is meant to provide, this also represses people, in the end leading to oppression and segregation and should as such be recognized. Extremism manifests itself in many forms.

Although something as simple as not being allowed to make use of the infrastructure may seem farfetched when you first hear of it, one of the first seemingly non-racist racist interventions in place was the use of access tunnels to the beach, that wouldn't allow buses to travel to the beach because the tunnels were to low. This meant that you had to be of a higher socioeconomic class, meaning that you could afford a car, leading to only individuals and families of particular European descent being able to go to the beach.

Another curiously current way of stigmatizing people, is through mental healthcare. It's not the first time this happens. For instance, during the days of the Soviet Union, dissidents were often locked up in mental institutions, deeming them delusional, which would often be named "querulant paranoia", which is an identifiable denominator for a psychiatric condition, but it shouldn't be attributed to healthy individuals. (Naturally any other part of the world including Europe and the United States at some point in time engaged in similar activities.)

As of this writing, for instance in the Netherlands, people can get the modern label "paranoid schizophrenia" or be attributed "paranoid delusions", for instance, when they aren't allowed to make use of the legal system. The government overgeneralizes and as such has been radicalized, by stating that all people with *verward gedrag*, meaning "confused behavior", can be locked away, even though this may be a direct result of a repressive regime.

In general, Grant Lester et al. in their treatise on querulant paranoia illustrate that no matter whether you're dealing with the mentally ill or not, you always need to have justice take its due course, meaning that you respect human rights and as such the right to a fair trial. When you encounter someone with a possible paranoid construct, they establish that trying them in bench, this actually deescalates, because they feel taken seriously, meaning that in the end no harm is done. In bench means by a representation of the full court, in some countries a committee of judges, in others all judges that preside in a particular court. This furthers safety within society.

When you apply this principle of radicalism to all of the different world views, what should we scientifically call these radical world views? How do we identify them? What do they typically oppose? All radical world views can be identified based on personal preference, polarization, and opposing poles, as illustrated in table 1. Please note that

polarized views linked to the same preference may actually be mutually exclusive, like in many cases anarchism and racism, that are both related to tribal views.

Preference	Polarization	Polar opposites
Individuality	Criminal	The "system"
Conformism	Criminal organization	The "system" & Other criminal organizations
Secular state	Outlawing religion & personal beliefs	Religions & Belief systems
Social	Socialism & Communism	Liberalism & Capitalism
Liberal	Capitalism	Socialism & Communism
Tribal	Anarchism, Discrimination & Racism	The "system", Gender & Genetical heritage
Survival	Lone-hostile	Society
Progressive	Anti-responsibility & Anti-law	Society
Conservative	Socioeconomic class system	Poor people
Existential beliefs	Anti-differing beliefs	Other belief systems & Sexual preference

Table 1 - The relationship between normal and radical world views

Hopefully this table will help people realize what their common stance is toward other people. What they should also realize is, that the lack of a particular belief system is a belief system in itself, so atheism is as much a belief system as say Christianity, the Islam, Buddhism, and so forth. The notion that any of these belief systems doesn't have a polarized version to them is misguided and uninformed.

Please note that some of the names in popular culture and even scientific treatises tend to be non-scientific, focusing on metaphors. As such in case of the often named "lone wolf" we have to opt for a scientific denominator: "lone hostile". Metaphors, like lone wolf or anarchist tend to offer too much room for interpretation leading to social stigmas and upheaval. On top of that, although extremism or radicalism can also focus on particular views, different radical views can easily be combined, especially with anti-differing beliefs, meaning that particular universal views, world views, and views of existence are outlawed.

Other than that, discrimination based on existential beliefs has been listed separately as anti-differing beliefs. Logically and scientifically it's a separate entity, because it doesn't focus on genetics. As such a distinction was necessary. In law, laws prohibiting racism and discrimination list all of these properties separately also, which is necessary.

Before more specifically defining what these different radical views entail and how they go wrong, let's first look at what it means to radicalize and how to counter radicalization in

general, focusing on countering social exclusion and providing the means to be included. To be included does have to be a personal choice. People that prefer survival over anything else should be allowed to live of the land. There's plenty of room for all of us.

Catalysts for and Countering Social Exclusion

Although those that adhere to extremist views don't necessarily have a mental disorder, the cause of extremism can often be related to mental disorders. Causes can be different types of delusional disorders and manipulative behavior or flat out lies resulting from disorders like psychopathy, among other disorders, that all relate to a lack of empathy. Those that share the delusion often unknowingly subvert facts, meaning that they also engage in manipulative behavior. The main question then becomes: can we make them realize truth or at least a lack of finding thereof?

Countering this kind of behavior aims at three stages with a possible added fourth, that counter manipulative behavior and lying:

I.   Recognize
II.   Acknowledge
III.   Name
IV.   (*when necessary*) Legal and/or therapeutic counseling

Recognizing manipulative or lying behavior means that you have to learn what signals should be attributed to this behavior. Countering lies focuses on establishing truth and truth alone. In case of manipulation it's more difficult to recognize signals at first. As such the focus of the remainder of this section is countering manipulation.

For a large part, it may be difficult to teach this at first, because any kind of manipulation already can be related to a non-manipulative correct expression of thoughts and feelings. This means that you shouldn't immediately label suspected manipulative behavior as such, when it isn't necessarily clear yet whether it really is manipulative.

Acknowledging manipulative behavior means that you research what was expressed, to establish the truth or falsehood of these expressions. When you can confirm that the expressions bend the truth in some way or simply deny it, in which case you're not dealing with manipulation at all, but flat out lies, it's important for as far as possible to document the evidence of what was expressed and to the contrary.

Once you've been able to acknowledge the behavior as manipulative or lying, when you express it to the initiator and other people adhering to these beliefs, they may already change their views immediately. As a general guideline, *formulate how you feel and don't immediately accuse people*. When you label people as criminals or extremists, they tend to want to defend themselves and their views which makes it harder to get through to them. Try to focus on how you feel certain ideas are radical, rather than saying that a person is a radical.

As a fourth stage, when people with radical views don't acknowledge and correct their views, depending on what stage of radicalization they are in, they either need legal and/or therapeutic counseling. In case of the first three stages, therapeutic counseling should suffice. In case of the fourth stage, meaning that they employ undemocratic measures, legal

counseling, including some time spent in a forensic facility, combined with therapeutic counseling to prevent further radicalization and reversing its process should be put in place.

Providing mental aid shouldn't just be issued based on a threat of or actual physical violence to oneself, another, or social deterioration of one's own person. Providing mental aid is also necessary when someone's undemocratic actions lead to the social deterioration of other groups, through social exclusion. As a society, we are all responsible for whatever effect we cause within society. No one is above the law.

In the latter case, if people refuse to cooperate with mental healthcare, in most cases it may very well be sufficient if you don't grant them a position of responsibility within a social context: governance, safety, healthcare, education, or infrastructure. As long as they can't seize power and only people that crave to be responsible, rather than in power, govern, all people should be fine. As such you shouldn't have to lock them up.

For all of these measures to be put into effect, the main question remains: "How do you recognize these signals of radicalized thoughts and expressions?"

A guiding principle of recognizing these signals is doing your research in terms of what can be established as truth and what falsehoods we can exclude as truth, leaving room for explanations of things we don't know, allowing people also to assert things labelled as that which we can't know or establish as truth.

Thus far it's possible to identify at least eight ways of manipulating people, based on past experience. In order to recognize these, there are two things we need to do. We need to establish whether we're dealing with a flat-out lie or manipulation. Once it's been established that we're not dealing with a lie, we can focus on manipulation. In order to recognize manipulation, we need to establish what manipulation means. *Manipulation means that people distort facts, thus making you do things that in hindsight you don't really want to do.*

So, what types of manipulation can be identified so far, not excluding future discoveries of how people can be or were manipulated?

I. *They play into how you feel* – Sensing you feel bad about something, just by saying exactly what you feel, people make you act out even though you better hadn't.

II. *They state the truth as if it isn't true* – They repeat what's true to make it sound like it's unimportant even though it's important.

III. *They make you focus on people's weaknesses* – Instead of letting you focus on the good about people, they make you focus on what people aren't good at, disregarding that no one can do everything.

IV. *They make you feel you need to fit in* – They make you feel you need to adhere to a code to get a higher status.

V. *They offer you protection* – They make you feel you're not safe, even though when you don't offend anyone, sometimes preferably even keeping to yourself, no one has any reason to start a fight with you.

VI. *They make you feel like you're alone* – They make you feel no one else wants to stick to the rules, even though the majority does.

VII. *They offer a bargain you can't keep* – You get something you crave, but they don't tell you up front what you have to do to keep the bargain, making you ignore what will happen if you don't.

VIII.   *They seduce you* – In expectation of or in return for sexual favors they make you do things you don't want to do.

One of the key concepts in terms of dealing with these kinds of behaviors is that you should *learn not to listen* and as such not follow the direction these people offer. Instead of listening to these people, it's important to learn to recognize this kind of behavior and as such also who to listen to. So far, it's also possible to recognize at least two guidelines in terms of *when to listen*. These guidelines are:

I.   *It's more efficient* – If you finish your chores first, you have more time to do what you want to do, than when you oppose and refuse to do what you need to do.

II.   *Future prospects are bad and you have no other option* – If you don't clean up the mess and you don't have the option to ask for help, things will spiral out of control and the future looks grim.

Next to learning people how to recognize when to listen and when not to listen, you need to consider that people may use and abuse what they have just learned. Some people will for instance actively seek to manipulate people, after having learned about manipulation, hoping or establishing that other people don't (yet) have this knowledge. Also, when they do manipulate you, your personal emotional response can be severe, but you don't want to victimize yourself. A fair warning should be in place, telling both kinds of people to "*Watch out!*"

I.   *You manipulate?* People that you manipulate can get aggressive.

II.   *They try to manipulate you?* Take a walk and contact an authority figure.

Naturally, people have a choice in terms of what authority figure they turn to. Even before contacting an authority figure, they need to establish who is trustworthy. Essentially they can think about turning to their relatives, the police, courts, a lawyer (like a human rights lawyer), teachers, the principal of their school, and so forth.

They do need to carefully consider who to turn to, while at the same time the authority figures need to realize what responsibility they have, also in reference to establishing truth and whether someone was actively manipulating anyone else, as well as establishing whether a crime was committed. Above all else, they should never forget about the responsibility they have and what the limits of their jurisdiction are.

Where Particular Radical Views Go Wrong

Referring to table 1, it mentions a lot of different interpretations of extremism. Since they are all polarized views, they tend to focus on a limited number of assets, rather than looking at the full complexity of a system. Popularized points of view tend to simplify matters to the extent that people disregard necessary assets, meaning that the system fails. *Populism*, as some people refer to it, tries to introduce one measure for all, based on gut feelings, not allowing for different views. As such populism is a radical point of view.

All points of view are necessary. All points of view matter.

Starting with *criminal* people, where do they go wrong? The notion of being a criminal is that they get what they feel they deserve, without having to work for it. They feel they are the

strong, preying on the weak. In reality, it takes strength to build up a business, a home, a relationship, it takes effort. The people that steal, maim, rape, and kill, they don't have the character nor the physical strength to do that. As such, they aren't the strong, they are the weak. The strong don't have to go to jail. Education fosters strength, as such people don't just have a right to an education, it's in the best interest of the nation to provide people with the education that meets their exact needs in terms of interests.

Although highly unethical, it has been established through experiment, that when you provide half of people with a poor background with a poor education, they tend to end up in jail, and when you provide the other half with a proper education, they tend to work their way out of their social circumstances. Education is key to improve sustenance and as such to foster the strength and cohesion of a nation and the rest of the world.

Criminal organizations offer what they see as freedoms, that no one else provides. Think of luxuries, justice without a proper trial, healthcare through for instance organ harvesting, diploma's people haven't earned, and for instance roads and railways that don't value ownership and privacy of people that previously established themselves somewhere. They don't negotiate in terms of what freedoms they take at the expense of your freedom, engaging in threats of violence and actual violence to get what they want, rather than sticking to organized society. In a free society, all people are free, not just the people that provide the "necessary" aggressive muscle.

When it comes to *outlawing religions and personal beliefs* what they fail to recognize is that most people that engage in these belief systems see it as a personal matter. They may express their feelings freely and as long as they don't do it in such a way that people are socially excluded or physical harm is done, there is no damage as a result of their views. Even with evidence that your views are correct, for instance in terms of the world being round, what harm comes of people that believe the world is flat? No harm in most cases, so people are still entitled to their beliefs.

Socialism focuses on the fact that the state governs everything in terms of equal distribution, providing people with a means to do their job, but it also focuses on the way people express themselves by commissioning art in the name of the state. Socialism doesn't allow for personal world views and limits technological advancement outside of the military apparatus as well as healthcare. What they fail to acknowledge is that these advancements are beneficial to for instance the environment. Indirectly they also benefit healthcare, the safety of people, education, the infrastructure, and equality, through natural inquisitiveness. Also, certain trades like that of artists, aren't subjected to liberal standards in terms of performance.

Communism is a particular kind of socialism, that limits the freedom of religion and imposes an even stricter regime, turning all citizens into soldiers of the state. What you typically see is that citizens have to wear state uniforms and any form of self-expression gets repressed. Even within socialism self-expression is already limited. Within communism it simply isn't allowed.

Capitalism focuses on market operations, hoping that the way the market works will actually benefit the safety, healthcare, education, and basic infrastructure of the people. What it fails to acknowledge is that in a market, you have people that win and people that lose. People pay taxes for a system that's there for all people, making sure that preferably no one loses, if solutions to particular problems exist or can be constructed. When you focus on

Capitalism, those that acquire money, which typically means being acquainted with people with money, make more money and get all the freedoms they need. People that start life with a setback will never be able to recuperate. They get the worst healthcare, education, safety measures, and infrastructure imaginable.

Anarchism assumes that all projects that we engage in should be agreed upon within a group. On top of that, a lot of so-called anarchists turn against the "system" and focus on social upheaval. The intent was never to hurt anyone and it should never become to hurt anyone. Also, it's important that people realize that sometimes a single person has this great idea that no one else sees at first, but when you engage in this idea and try it out, as long as it doesn't limit or damage the freedom of others, it often generates progression. Sometimes the idea of the one does outweigh the idea of the many, and as long as there's food on the table, why shouldn't you try it? That's the nature of liberals and the benefit of having a monetary system. As long as you're not forced to be a part of that, there's nothing wrong with having a monetary system: it's a means to an end, not an end onto itself.

Discrimination and racism as identified here focus primarily on gender and genetical heritage, assuming there's such a thing as a superior gender and a superior genetical foundation. No man, no woman can do everything. We are all good at one or more particular things, but these individual strengths make how we contribute and how we work together. You may be a jack or a jill of your own trade, but you are as much dependent on anyone else as anyone else. Without woman, there would be no man, and vice-versa. In absence of men or women they have both proven to be more than capable of completing each other's tasks. Genetical heritage doesn't discriminate in terms of how people contribute. We are all human. We are all necessary.

The *lone-hostile* tends to want to be recognized and remembered for this one big thing he or she did in her life, possibly exacting revenge on those they feel excluded them. Recognizing that all lives do matter, that we do all contribute, should be the primary focus of our own lives and the message that we communicate to one another in school, the workplace, and everywhere else. No one should be left out. As such a primary concern seems to be that people do need to realize that we are all important. Not all people will see it, but when you do your job and contribute or are just there for the people around you, you make life a little bit better for everyone else, so even though they may not always remember you in their minds, they will remember you by how good they feel.

People that are *anti-responsibility and anti-law* tend to assume that every single person is perfectly capable of making his or her own decisions and it's sufficient to get a feel for how far you can go. People, according to them, are perfectly capable of limiting themselves in how far they go, when they think about it. What they fail to understand, is that there is such a thing as bad people. What they fail to understand, is that when you try things out, but you don't know what you're trying, this automatically puts people in a position, where people go too far. Regulation should be based on science and it provides people with a framework to reason about responsibility, that allows them to decide for themselves whether they want to engage in certain action or not. Laws prescribe repercussions, that allow you to consider the consequences and are a necessary means to keep people in check or at least saver in the long run.

A *socioeconomic class system* assumes that people with more money are better than those with less or simply without. They mean to keep means to themselves and refuse to share

appropriately, even though others contribute as much and maybe even more than they do. What they fail to acknowledge, is that their riches don't mean anything, unless others attribute value to them. When they don't provide the poor with sufficient money to buy whatever it is they really need, what's the use working for these people with lots of money to begin with? You might as well move to some place where people do pay. These places and people do exist. As such, the socioeconomic oriented people are left with their riches, only to discover they can't do anything with them anymore.

The basic idea: what good is a bag with a million dollars when you're stuck in the middle of the desert without a working cellphone?

Those that exclude to some extent shouldn't be excluded, because you should provide them with a proper example. You don't want to be like them, but what was just said, does touch upon the fact that we all can be susceptible to extremist ideas. When they buy the food you offer them, they have to pay your price. In the end they'll run out of money and will have to live off of welfare or get a job. Sometimes being human skips a generation, but you do have to care for one generation, no matter how awkward, for the next to be able to exist and do good.

People that have *anti-differing beliefs* simply don't allow you to question and to reason about existence. What does it mean to exist? If your explanation is different than theirs, to them this means you might just as well not exist, because you don't grasp existence the way they see it, and to exist also means to grasp existence. What they fail to recognize is that there are lots of things we can't grasp. There are lots of things we can't envision. No person has the answer to everything. We reason based on models, but these models can only account for part of the truth, never the whole of the truth. As such, it might be worthwhile investing in realizing that it's okay not to know lots of things, and as such we might just as well enjoy life as it comes. You are entitled to your own views, but even when you prove your views or disprove someone else's, what harm is there to them having their views? Who's to argue what part of our reality is real anyway?

When it comes to sexual preference, the key concept is, whether the feeling is mutual. As long as the feeling is mutual, no harm is done. Enjoy life. Enjoy love. Give room to live. Give room to love.

In remembrance of a great philosopher, Bruce Lee, maybe it's a good idea to state the following: "Don't think, feel." Focus on empathy, rather than reason. One can't exist without the other anyway, but which of the two is more appropriate considering present circumstances?

Conclusion

Social exclusion is a major problem within global society. Society should be all-inclusive: all lives matter, all world views matter, we should all have the same rights and access to the same legal, educational, healthcare and basic infrastructural systems as present in current day society. Equality is largely a matter of education and recognition of what it means to render unequal and exclude. Hopefully this essay will help introduce a foundation for global equality, regardless of any kind of social exclusion anyone can try to envision to enforce their power.

Referenced and Recommended Literature

All books of law you can find, especially Criminal Justice & Criminal Law Procedures, but also business law (taxes & business models), union law, and so forth.

American Psychiatric Association (2013) "Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders" : fifth edition.

David J. Chalmers (1996) "The Conscious Mind: In Search of a Fundamental Theory" : Oxford University Press.

Carl B. Gacono, editor (2016) "The Clinical and Forensic Assessment of Psychopathy: A Practitioner's Guide" : second edition, Routledge, New York.

Paul Babiak, PhD & Robert D. Hare, PhD (2007) "Snakes In Suits: When Psychopaths Go To Work" : HarperCollins, New York.

Lajos Egri (2004) "The Art of Dramatic Writing: Its Basis in the Creative Interpretation of Human Motives" : Simon & Schuster, New York.

Robert D. Hare, PhD (1999) "Without Conscience: The Disturbing World of the Psychopaths Among Us" : The Guilford Press, New York.

Grant Lester M.B.B.S., M.M.E.D. "Querulous Paranoia and the Vexatious Litigant (A Search for the Querulous Spectrum)"

Paul E. Mullen, M.B.B.S., D.Sc. & Grant Lester M.B.B.S., M.M.E.D. "Vexatious Litigants and Unusually Persistent Complainants and Petitioners: From Querulous Paranoia to Querulous Behaviour"

M. Zannoni, L.P van der Varst, E.J.A. Bervoets, M. Wensveen, V.J. van Bolhuis & E.J. van der Torre (2008). "De rol van de eerstelijnswerkers bij het tegengaan van polarisatie en radicalisering. Van 'ogen en oren' naar 'het hart' van de aanpak." : COT Instituut voor Veiligheids- en Crisismanagement, Den Haag.