Psihologia Socială, nr. 51(I)/2023, pp. 109-121

Ideologies, political violence, the Open Science's redeeming potential, and ethics

Cătălin Mamali[1]

Abstract : *The analysis started as a review inspired by a few excellent studies focused on ideologies nurturing political violence, on right-wing, left wing, and religious extremism, and on Open Science. The range of the themes is wide. Nonetheless across these themes are series of questions that seems to be more connected than is usually recognized. First political violence, especially when it is comprehensive and enduring, some times over one hundred years, is inspired, supported, justified and guided by ideologies that claim to be based in the scientific approach of social reality. The omission of the relation between the communist ideology and the political violence is a costly error. Second, as democratic institutions, laws, the affirmation of human rights and the practice of civil resistance are developing the individual and collective social actors that have violent orientation and aspire to have a positive social image resort to tacit political violence. Tacit political violence resorts to a wide variety of means such as : economic marginalization and depreciation, financial constraints, cultural repression, non-declared denial of crimes against humanity, an imposed unjust motivational balance in social relations (those in the dominant positions are satisfying mainly self-actualization needs, and those in the dominated positions the survival needs), distortion of religious and moral value, and social isolation of the targeted individuals and social categories. Within the global context of the increased importance and influence of science, and of social sciences the state of the Open Science is extremely important. There are obvious remarkable achievements in the last few decades of the trend toward Open Science. The studies strongly suggest that the responsibilities, skills and resources of the researchers and reproducibility are, among other factors, essential. Within the context of scientific network the Open Science approach rightly indicates that the major „players" of this orientation are researchers, students, faculties, universities, libraries, journals, and funders. However, there is still missing a major player : the insiders, the participants, the subjects. I consider that the process of the Open Science should be inclusive in relation to the insiders and correct the structural epistemic, social and moral asymmetry between experts and insiders. The present short analysis cannot do justice to a wide range of ideas generated by researchers mentioned in the final thank you note, but it is deeply indebted to them.*

The political questions and especially issues of extremism, terrorism and, in general, of political violence do attract more research resources and outstanding researchers. This

1. Independent Scholar, POROI, University of Iowa, USA. catalin.mamali@loras.edu.

trend is justified not only by epistemic reasons but also by moral and political reasons due to the existential consequences of various forms of violence that are nurtured by ideologies.

From a wide range of excellent studies in this field the present review will focus just on a few outstanding contributions that explore ideology and political violence, political violence by left-wing, right-wing, and Islamist extremists. At the same time it will discuss a possible bridge between these topics and the theoretical and practical potential that if provided by the perspective of open science.

Types of political violence and their possible ideological roots

Recently I read with great interest the excellent study *Ideologies that justify political violence* co-authored by D. Webber, A. Kruglanski, E. Molinario & K. Jasko (*Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences 2020, 34 : 107-111)*. This inspiring study identifies in a systematic and convincing mode „*a variety of tactics that are often employed by ideologies to promote and/or justify political violence*". This review, actually an original synthesis that also suggests new areas of inquiry in this field, advances the work on a social psychological framework that identifies important existential and epistemic needs (as defined in previous works by Kruglanski) that „motivate individuals to become ideological extremists". The focus of this study on motivation is highly instructive and efficient. Many social representations and theoretical models suggest that political violence serves human needs of certain groups without inquiring what kind of human needs and with what short-term and long-term costs are satisfied by political violence.

Indeed, as the authors argue „Throughout history, all manners of ideologies have promoted and justified acts of political violence perpetrated by non-state actors". This happened with a wide range of religious ideologies as well as with „non-religious ideologies on both the left and the right of the political spectrum, for example, fascist beliefs held by white nationalist extremists and the environmentalist views held by eco-terrorists" (p. 107). However, it is surprising that the communist ideology, starting with its political algorithm (*Manifesto of the Communist Party – MCP*), in its various forms and with its wide range of brutal methods, is not even mentioned not only in the article discussed here but by many other outstanding social psychologists. The avoidance of the tragic consequences of communist ideology and the lethal outcomes of its political algorithm (MCP) covers a wider and an older area of social psychological research. For instance, it is visible in the groundbreaking study on political conservatism and patterns of social cognition (Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003), which due to its theoretical and methodological merits has a seminal influence on our field. This study (Glaser et al.) advances in significant way the understanding of the dogmatic representations. Despite this the study does not take into account the dogmatic character of the Marxian ideology. Besides its explicit violent and dogmatic ideas, as those that are at the core of MCP, the violent side of Marxian ideology had many ramifications. For instance, the so-called communist re-education (Makarenko's violent method – 1929, 1963 – developed under Stalin) is still well alive. This exemplar communist pedagogy of violence is associated with the horrific crimes known as Holodomor. Why is the violence of the communist ideology not, at least, mentioned? Why this omission? This question seems to be relevant also because the departure point of the excellent article is the well-grounded view according to which

political ideology includes a set of beliefs about the just social order and the means to achieve it (as suggested by R.S. Erikson & K.L. Tedin, 2003). This definition clearly applies to the communist ideology and MCP that prescribes an algorithm to achieve a just society. The political algorithm of the MCP includes explicitly violent means (bloody revolution, dictatorship, one party rule, abolition of private ownership…). Communist political structures are, unfortunately, still a large presence at the global level. It seems to me that this approach might include the violence justified by the communist ideology and, as such, has the resources to improve our understanding of political violence associated with different ideologies.

In the cases of political violence ideologically grounded most of the time both a part of the goals (the instrumental ones) and the means are violent and other times it implies the social illusion according to which good goals can be reached by violent means.

One of the core ideas of the discussed article, which has been advanced in prior studies (Kruglanski et al., 2017), suggests that „Extremism results from a motivational imbalance". This idea has great explanatory power and exploratory potential. In more specific terms this means that : „Unlike moderate individuals whose behavior is constrained by trying to simultaneously fulfill multiple need states, political extremists are singularly focused on achieving one need. Thus, extremists' behavior is directed toward means that can potently fulfill a dominant need, regardless of whether those means might undermine other concerns, as these other concerns have receded in importance and no longer constrain behavioral options".

The view advanced by D. Webber, A. Kruglanski, E. Molinario & K. Jasko according to which „Political extremists think in absolutist, dogmatic, and certainty affording ways" is in tune with a long line of impressive and accurate research tradition and also warns about the nowadays cognitive and motivational profile of many types of political extremists. I dare to make the prediction that this perspective will inspire many researchers to mine Big Data stored by Internet that are revealing this way of thinking, its frequency in the case of many individual and collective actors from different locations on earth.

I think that the construct of „motivational imbalance" could be placed within a wider theoretical framework. First of all, in some cases non-violent exemplars across history self-restricted very much both their motivational range (variety) and the level of satisfaction of their needs that implied also great personal sacrifices. In any case such moral exemplars (Thoreau, Gandhi, Mandela, Martin Luther King, Palach, Ky in recent history) have not been violent and have been supporters of non-violent worldviews and actions. Secondly, motivational imbalance has at least two dimensions : it is intra-individual and it emerges also at inter-individual and inter-group levels. As such it might be useful to consider the theoretical construct of *motivational balance* that has two extreme poles : *mutual motivational regression* on one side and *motivational co-development* on the other side (Mamali 1981 ; Mamali & Păun, 1986). It seems reasonable to assume that one of the causes of structural political violence at global level (Galtung, 1980 – *The true worlds : A transnational perspective* ; Galtung, 1992 – *The way is the goal : Gandhi* ; Chua, 2004 – World *on fire : How exporting free market democracy breeds ethnic hatred and global instability* or Mann's *The dark side of democracy*) might be related with a multi-level disequilibrium between the societal needs that are satisfied by powerful collective actors and the societal needs satisfied within the same interaction by weak (poor) collective actors.

The general framework and the conclusion of this excellent review invite in a well-informed way to further research. In addition, the article suggests „that through understanding

the various psychological needs that are pertinent to those engaging in extreme forms of political violence it is possible to understand how ideologies can appeal to these needs through their motivational substructure (p. 110). I think that the notion „review" used by the authors has the meaning and substance of powerful synthesis that advances an innovative perspective on ideologies and political violence.

This synthesis covers the wide forms of political violence as it is stated explicitly : „Throughout history, all manners of ideologies have promoted and justified acts of political violence perpetrated by non-state actors. Religious ideologies such as Christianity (e.g. the Crusaders), Islam (e.g. al Qaeda or ISIS), Judaism (e.g. the Zealots of the 1st Century), Buddhism (e.g. 969 Movement in Myanmar), and even Odinism (e.g. right-wing terrorism, including the 2011 Norway attacks), for instance, have been used as justification. The same is true of non-religious ideologies on both the left and the right of the political spectrum, for example, fascist beliefs held by white nationalist extremists and the environmentalist views held by ecoterrorists (p. 107, italics added)". It seems evident that the perspective advanced by the authors enhances the understanding on this issue and opens new pathways of investigation that might include other forms of political violence, as that specific to the communist ideology.

Tacit political violence and the diversity of political extremism

The issues of violence are approached across the political spectrum and religious orientations by the study *A comparison of political violence by left-wing, right-wing, and Islamist extremists in the United States and the world* by K. Jasko, G. LaFreeb, J. Piazzac, & M. H. Beckerd (PNAAS – PSYCHOLOGICAL AND COGNITIVE SCIENCES- Edited by Susan Fiske, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ ; 2022) that uses in an excellent mode its reliable theoretical and methodological assets to explore a question of vital importance for the stability and well-being of societies.

The findings of this complex research are extremely important and also challenging from practical and theoretical perspectives. The authors state : „we find that radical acts perpetrated by individuals associated with left-wing causes are less likely to be violent. In the United States, we find no difference between the level of violence perpetrated by right-wing and Islamist extremists. However, differences in violence emerge on the global level, with *Islamist extremists being more likely than right-wing extremists to engage in more violent acts*" (italics added). There is almost no systematic information on the way in which mainstream media report violence acts committed by various social categories. For instance, we have still a lot to learn on the promptitude of main stream media ability of reporting the profile of the perpetrators, i.e., the temporal distance between a specific violent event and the presentation by mass media of the ideological belonging of the perpetrators. This is important because the delay of public presentation of such data might influence the emergence of the non-violent preemptive actions. It seems that this area is a need of more research.

Indeed, historically speaking, as the discussed research and previous studies show the „*political violence has been perpetrated on behalf of a wide range of political ideologies*".

In consonance with the purpose of this research the major „predictor was a mutually exclusive categorical variable and included individuals who were identified as committed to Islamist, right-wing, or left-wing causes".

The study mentions that „the finding that rightwing and Islamist cases are more violent than left-wing cases may have special relevance for the current time period". The danger posed by the rightwing extremism is still a persistent reason that asks for further inquiry especially when this trend comes into a mutually stimulating cycle with left-wing extremism and with other forms of violence. Also, taking into account the various forms of political ideologies and their violent consequences as is underscored along the study, it seems useful to expand this research both geographically and ideologically.

Political violence might be active in other forms that are less visible as such, mainly because they are based on decisions carried out beyond the access of the public knowledge. It seems to me that one of these forms is the tacit denial of horrific violence, as crimes against humanity, genocides, and war crimes. If public opinion, and research activity can approach rather quickly the open denial of such violent actions the tacit denial poses more challenges. For instance, there are still some collective and individual actors that are in denial of *Holocaust*, and of its singularity, despite the fact that Holocaust/Final Solution „Of all of many cases [murderous ethnic cleansing], this one fits least well into my [Mann] theses. It was the most statist and the most premeditated, with the most coherent, least destabilized state. Its unchallenged dictator travelled the least distance between his Plans" as Mann posits (2004, p. 211).

Among the many forms of tacit denial, which might support in various ways political violence, there is the tacit denial of crimes against humanity. This is the case of the Armenian genocide and of Holodomor that are still tacitly denied by many powerful political actors. From all the countries that are members of UN only 33 recognized the *Armenian Genocide* and only 21 recognized genocide through the use of famine – the Holodomor. Both genocides have roots in political ideologies. It is still more surprising that from all the countries that recognized the Armenian genocide only 33.3% recognized also the Holodomor. The situation is almost similar for the countries that recognized Holodomor; only 42.8% recognized also the Armenian Genocide. It is politically and morally bewildering that formal political bodies that recognized one genocide are remaining silent about a different one. Not all horrific events get the same treatment. Much more, there are voices in one camp that explicitly asks for the punishment of those who recognize one form of genocide. This denial of the right of recognition for the Armenian genocide has been even expressed by an official Ukrainian representative, while other Ukrainian officials asked, without success, for the recognition of the Armenian genocide. There are various forms of tacit denial across history. For instance, the violence against the Australian and Tasmanian native population is one of such forms that have been ignored for a long time Sangher (2023, pp. 150-151).

It seems that the forms of tacit political violence, which most of the time are ideologically rooted need to become a persistent research target. For this area Ribot's innovative theoretical construct of *logic of sentiments* (1920) is extremely useful because for many social areas (from interpersonal level to macro-social and global levels) within which the affective logic is functional the specific political conflicts can be assumed as having a significant influence on the emergence, persistence and consequences of this logic applied to political (and moral) issues. I think that among the many forms of affective logic what can be called the logic of political sentiments is relatively more wide-spread, powerful and has devastating consequences.

Open Science Project and the inclusion of the insiders (participants, subjects) as epistemic and ethical means to correct a basic inquiry assymtery of social sciences

The study of political violence seems to have implications for a wider and more substantial engagement of common people (some being former „subjects") in the production and application of scientific knowledge. Is the engagement of participants a possible resource for reducing painful societal issues, including political violence? Due to my own interests in the area of participatory research I read with great interest the article „*Promoting Open Science : A Holistic Approach to Changing Behaviour*" by S.G. Robson, M.A. Baum, J.L. Beaudry, J. Beitner, H. Brohmer, J.M. Chin, K. Jasko, C.D. Kouros, R.E. Laukkonen, D. Moreau, R.A. Searston, H.A. Slagter, N.K. Steffens, J.M. Tangen, A. Thomas – *Collabra : Psychology Vol. 7, Issue 1, 2021)*. There is no doubt that the „reproducibility crisis" prompted a series of excellent studies (in medicine, psychology etc.) which at the same time aimed to advance ways of approaching the specific sides of this issue. As such the reproductibility crisis stimulated the inquiry into the profile, and requirements of the „open science". The approach of the Open Science issues is in great part motivated by the vital interest of scientific institutions to ensure the „credibility" of science (Vazire, 2018). This interest is associated with the search of efficient ways to develop this perspective as, for instance the type of rewards that can be used to develop the transparency of the scientific process (Gernsbacher, 2018). The comprehensive study on Open Science, which is discussed here, deals in a constructive and creative way with the challenging task of developing the „transparency and rigour of the scientific research".

Based on valid criteria and observations the study suggests a *holistic perspective* that regards „Practices across the scientific community determine the quality of the research that is generated and disseminated. A holistic approach to improving the infrastructure, norms, and reward structures is needed to shift to a culture of Open Science".

The complex, useful and feasible approach developed in this study presents the unified challenges (such as : *target behaviors, researcher actions, and general resources*), for researchers, students, departments (faculties), universities, libraries, journals, and funders. The approach includes „two behaviour change frameworks – EAST and the Pyramid of Culture Change – to ground these recommendations. In essence, these frameworks propose that, for behaviours to be adopted, they ought to be made „easy, social, and attractive". The comprehensive, richness and accuracy of this approach serve in an exemplar mode the *culture of Open Science* across disciplinary borders. The study is focused on the responsibilities, skills and resources of the researchers within the context of scientific network with its entire major „players" that are *researchers, students, faculties, universities, libraries, journals, and funders*.

This complex approach of the issues of Open Science comes to the right time after a long and rich critical inquiry of the epistemic and ethic dimensions of scientific practice.

Since quite a long time there is a growing concern for improving the scientific practices that might increase both the intrinsic value of scientific research (for instance through an increased reproducibility) as well as the social value of scientific application, findings and conceptual framework that are assessed as valid. The growing debates for an Open Science have been, in the recent years, stimulated by a series of negative events (fabrication of data for instance) and by an older challenge of social and medical research :

research replication, which is essential for the inter--subjective verification of scientific facts and theories. A series of crucial studies (Clyde, 1991 ; Ioannidis, 2005 ; Ioannidis, Fanelli, Drake Dunne, & Goodman, 2015 ; Giner-Sorrola, 2012, among many others) underscored the need for reforms related to transparency, methods and training, ways of preserving, reporting and dissemination of data/findings, the system of peer review and even exploring new types of incentives. It is interesting to remind the differences between younger and older social scientists regarding their expectations in relation to the open science : the younger researchers have both higher hopes and fears toward open science in comparisons with the older researchers in the case of some members of the German Psychological Association (Abele-Brehm, Gollwitzer, Steinberg, & Schönbrodt, 2019).

These approaches are essential for improving the epistemic health of the scientific research. At the same time it has almost automatic positive consequences on the ethic of scientific process even if not always the concern for replication and transparency has been explicitly connected to the ethical issues of the scientific process (experimentation, especially) and of scientific applications. However, the two trends – the concern for Open Science and that for the ethic dimension (mainly the protection of the well-being of participants) have many things in common that facilitate their dialogue and merger. It is universally accepted that the neglect of the ethic dimensions of the scientific process can lead to terrible consequences suffered by the „subjects' and also by the social standing of science and scientists. This has been approached for assessing critical events in biomedical research and in social sciences. The Tuskegee case Guttmann & Moreno, 2021, pp. 188-191) and the older studies (Beecher, 1966 ; Jonsen & Toulmin 1988 ; Jonsen, 1998 ; Beauchamp & Childress, 2012) are just a few examples that ask for a humane treatment of human subjects, and for animals too, that are exposed to experimentation and other scientific methods. Because some of the crucial social experiments are marked by unexpected findings and even consequences of the experimental process the researcher's skill, responsibility and care for the well-being of the participants (subjects) is irreplaceable. The researcher is the first one who can decide to stop an experiment that produces negative side effects on the participants. This is exemplified by the crucial Stanford experiment which, due to Zimbardo's exemplar moral decision, was terminated long before its planned date. This action has been called „Zimbardo's limit" for identifying both the responsibility and the decision of the experimenter to stop an experiment that provides sings of unexpected harmful consequences for the wellbeing of the participants (Mamali, 2004). This limit cannot be pre-established because the nature of scientific imagination and of unexpected results. Zimbardo's limit remains to be identified in each case and followed by the decision of the researcher.

More specifically the field of bioethics can inform the field of Open Science in many ways. One element is that of moving away from what in bio and medical sciences and practices have been called as „medical paternalism (Gutmann & Moreno, 2021, p. 269). As argued by a series of previous researchers Beauchamp & Childress, 2012)) at the core of bioethics are justice questions. Gutmann and Moreno observed that in the USA (and for sure in many other countries, I can add) „justice is the least successful of the principles of bioethics, and the most urgent to attend" (p. 47). The two authors argue that this goal that implies life and death questions „has become not just a question of health care professionals' or judges' but *everybody's business to answer*" (p. 51, italics added). The issue of the patient's, subjects' autonomy that is opposed to the medical (in general expert) paternalism is not limited to medical sciences. This question is valid for all social sciences especially when the asymmetry between the researcher and the subjects (participants)

is leading to manipulations during the research and after the research process. Because in principle every human being (experimenter or subject, expert or non-expert in a given social research field) *has a dual cognitive status (observer and observed, knower and to be known) it is justified to stimulate the two sides of this epistemic condition of very person during the social research process*. The democratization of the social research process is nurtured by the stimulation of the dual cognitive status of all the participants, that of observer an observed that is potentially similar to that of the researcher's dual cognitive status (Mamali, 1982). In consequence, these are some basic reasons that ask for a greater inclusion within the Open Science project of the cognitive potential of the participants that should have greater chances to be engaged in all the stages of the social research process. Within the wider context of what Masuzzo (2019) called „inclusive science", an orientation supported by Fox, Pearce, Massanari,, Riles, Szulc, Ranjit, Trevisan, Soriano,Vitak, Arora, Ahn, Alper,Gambino, Gonzalez, Lynch, Williamson, & Gonzales (2021) who are focused on „the needs of marginalized scholars". It seems obvious that what is intended to become in social and medical sciences the Open Sconce or Inclusive Science must have at its core the scientific researchers, scientific institutions, practices, principles and rules, which are the major force of the process and to include the participants, the subjects, the insiders in all the stages of this process from conception to applications. Open Science achieved by whom and for what goals? The achievement of such a process is dependent first of all on scientists, scientific institutions, and practices but it is also significantly influenced by the degree of inclusion of the insiders (subjects) at all the levels and in all the stages of the scientific research.. The cooperation between these two sides is with a high probability strongly dependent on the quality of ethical principles that are respected in order to serve the social justice.

The open and systematic inclusion of the subjects (participants, insiders) within the research process that is centered on them has been suggested by monographic social researches, as that of Gusti's school. At the same time this process has deep epistemic questions that have been explored by the research focused on the social psychology of the „psychological experiment in particular and of any social research in general as suggested by the landmark concept of demand characteristics advanced by Orne (1962). Recently (2023), Corneille and Lush through their innovative theoretical model for „*subjective experiences elicited by demand characteristics*" identify three major levels that must be considered: a) relation of the subjects to the hypothesis, that refers to the subject's knowledge of the hypothesis; b) motivation of the participants, which can vary between those who support, who are compliant to the research goals and those who „actively sabotage the experiment"; c) strategy of the participants who „may consciously fake an effect", participants who imagine effects and „elicit genuine experiences",, and the phenomenological control through which participants produce genuine effects (pp. 87-88).

It seems that the ideal is to achieve a structural relationship between experts and subjects in which the insiders are genuine, honest, and fully engaged partners of the researcher. The productive approach of the socio-cognitive relationships between researchers and subjects (participants, insiders) has a rich history. The anthropological approach of scientific activity as that carried out by Knorr-Cetina (1981, 1999) during her participative exploration of scientists' work in the labs is just one major example. This question is approached also in other landmark studies as that on *Pasteurization of France* (Latour, 1989). An engaged relationship between researcher and subject is time consuming and asks o social imagination. For instance, such a relationship is achieved in Azevedo's

research (2011) on „lines of practice" are considered highly relevant for realizing an inclusive orientation of the Open Science. Such studies suggest that the relationship researcher subject is not only a feature of the social nature of the social psychological studies (Orne, 1962 ; Corneille & Lush, 2023) but it is also an epistemic resource that enhances creativity of both sides. The theoretical construct of „lines of practice", advanced by Azevedo, captures „long-term continuities in the person's pursuits of ad open-ended practice, such as a hobby" that can evolve (p.163). The researcher is a participant observer that engages in dialogues with the insiders and, in tune with the researcher's status, uses a set of heuristic principles in order to increase the precision of inferences regarding a person's preferences and the conditions of practice". One of these principles shows clearly that the inclusive approach is not reduced to the „focal subject" but is open to all the insiders. This is the principle of *corroborating informants* : Data provided by people other than a focal subject may help shed light on the subject's orientation towards his/her practice" (Azevedo, 2011, p. 170).

The transparent, accepted, and rigorous inclusion of the participants in all the stages of the research process is both an epistemic resource and an ethical need. If Goodall (1971, 1986) could achieve a close, non-violent, and mutually observing relationship with the chimpanzees – using emotional cues and empathic capacities – why it is too frequently so difficult for outstanding researchers to have a more inclusive relationship with the participants ?

I consider useful to remind that Thoreau, the modern founder of non-violent political action based on high moral principles, argued for a non-obtrusive, friendly relation between the research practice and its objects.

There is a wide agreement that the explicit corrections and reforms provided by the Open Science approach as well as by the research of the moral features of the scientific practice are vital. At the same time it seems that these studies are centered mainly on scientific process and the values, on the behaviors of scientists and the specific institutions with which they relate most commonly (universities, libraries, funders etc.). This well justified orientation invites a question : can Open Science reach its goals if the subjects' (participants) state, cognitive potential, engagement in the research process, and their representations on the consequences of the research are not explicitly considered ?

I think that the Open Science project that is becoming a reality needs to include a participatory orientation that stimulates, uses and develops the inquiring potential of the participants (subjects, insiders) at all levels as stages of the research process.

From the perspective of my own experience I read with great profit this study and many of the previous articles published on this topic. Inspired by the holistic approach practiced in this article I wonder if, within the specific cases of human/social sciences, a more balanced relationship between researcher's one side and the insiders („subjects", „participants", „objects", „investigated communities") on the other side might not be meaningful for reaching the goals of Open science. From an open epistemic view point it is essential to take into account that „subjects", „participants", „guinea pigs", objects of observations and experimental changes are learning at individual level and at group level (including at transgenerational level) from these experience. This learning might lead to important changes of their attitudes toward the research process and during the research process. In a way there is an evolving interknowledge process between „experts" (mainly social scientists, and medical researchers) and participants (subjects) which might challenge the established asymmetry between the experts and the subjects. One of the

ways of expressing this challenge is the increased interrogative potential of the insiders (participants, which, unfortunately, is many times neglected by the experts. Is the transparency toward the insiders a factor that might contribute to the spirit of the Open Science? Is the participation of the insiders at different stages and levels of the scientific projects focused on their reality a factor (a resource) that is meaningful for Open Science? Is the interrogative potential of the insiders useful for the way in which Open Science is approached?

We know that the practice and findings of participative research in many areas and across different cultures enriched our knowledge. In a way this trend is associated with the democratization of social/human research that needs also to be marked by transparency and rigor.

It seems to me that the research of the open science practices offers a great chance to develop also the relationships between experts (researchers) on one side and insiders (subjects, participants) on the other side.

Rezumat: Analiza a pornit ca o recenzie inspirată de câteva studii excelente centrate asupra ideologiilor care alimentează violenţa politică, asupra extremismului de dreapta, de stânga şi cel religios, precum şi asupra Ştiinţei Deschise. Evident, orizontul tematic este larg, dar o serie de întrebări comune se impun. In primul rând, violenţa politică, mai ales atunci când este comprehensivă şi de durată, este inspirată, sprijinită, justificată şi ghidată de ideologii care pretind a se baza pe studiul ştiinţific al realităţii sociale. Omiterea relaţiei dintre ideologia comunistă şi violenţa politică este o eroare costisitoare. În al doilear rând, pe măsură ce instituţiile, legile, protejarea drepturilor omului şi practica rezistenţei civile se dezvoltă, actorii individuali şi colectivi cu orientare violentă recurg din ce în ce mai frecvent la violenţa politică tacită. Violenţa politică tacită se manifestă printr-o largă varietate de mijoace: marginalizarea şi deprecierea economică, constrângeri financiare, represiune culturală, negare nedeclarată a crimelor împortiva umanităţii, impunerea în relaţiile sociale a unei balanţe motivaţionale injuste (actorii dominanţi îşi satisfac cu prioritate trebuinţele de auto-realizare, iar cei dominaţi doar trebuinţe de supravieţuire), distorsionarea valorilor morale şi religioase, izolarea socială a indivizilor şi categoriilor sociale incomode. În contextul global al creşterii importanţei şi influenţei ştiinţei, starea Ştiinţei Deschise este extrem de importantă. Studiile sugerează clar că responsabilitatea, abilităţiie şi resursele cercetătorilor sunt, printre alţi factori, esenţiale. Perspectiva Ştiinţei Deschise sugerează că „jucătorii majori" sunt cercetătorii, studenţii, facultăţile, universităţile, bibliotecile, revistele şi sponsorii. Cu toate acestea, se observă lipsa unui jucător major: cei din interior, participanţii, subiecţii. Consider că procesul de realizare a Ştiinţei Deschise trebuie să fie inclusiv în relaţie cu cei din interior şi să corecteze asimetria structural-epistemică, socială şi morală, dintre experţi şi subiecţi. Această sumară analiză nu poate face dreptate unui spectru larg de idei generate de cecetătorii doar amintiţi în nota finală, dar este profund îndatorată acestora.

Résumé: Au début, nous avons envisagé un compte rendu de plusieurs excellentes études sur les idéologies se trouvant à l'origine de la violence politique, d'extrême droite, d'extrême gauche, mais aussi religieux, ainsi que sur la Science Ouverte. Malgré la diversité thématique, plusieurs questions communes s'imposent. D'abord, la violence politique, surtout quand elle est acceptée sur le long terme, parfois plus d'un siècle, elle est inspirée, appuyée, justifiée et orientée par des idéologies qui prétendent être fondées par l'étude scientifique de la réalité sociale. Ignorer le lien entre l'idéologie communiste et la violence politique c'est avéré fort couteux. Deuxièmement, au fur et à mesure que les institutions, les lois, la protection des droits humains et la pratique de la résistance civile se développent, les acteurs individuels et collectifs orientés vers la violence font souvent appel à des formes de violence dissimulée. Celle-ci prend de nombreuses formes, comme l'exclusion économique, les contraintes financières, les persécutions culturelles, le déni inavoué des crimes

contre l'humanité, l'imposition de relations sociales injustes (les dominants satisfaits de leur auto-réalisation, les dominés réduits aux seuls moyens de survie), la distorsion des valeurs morales et religieuses, l'isolement des catégories sociales qui dérangent. Dans le contexte global actuel, avec l'importance et l'influence accrues de la science, la Science Ouverte est devenue de grande importance. Les études présentées ici indiquent clairement que la responsabilité, les dispositions et les ressources des chercheurs jouent ici un grand rôle. Les chercheurs, les étudiants, les facultés, les universités, les bibliothèques, les revues, les bailleurs de fonds,,, sont les „joueurs majeurs". Pourtant il y a une catégorie qui est absente : le public, les sujets. Je considère que le processus de mise en œuvre de la Science Ouverte doit les prendre en compte et corriger l'asymétrie épistémique structurelle, sociale et morale, entre sujets et experts. Notre brève analyse ne peut pas épuiser la richesse des idées des chercheurs évoqués dans la note finale et auxquels je suis profondément reconnaissant.

I express my gratitude to scientists and institutions that offered the chance to better grasp some of the issues succinctly discussed here. I had the chance to learn from members of Gusti's school or researchers close to his ideas – especially from M. Botez, L. Constante, M. Constantinescu, R. Cressin, M. Golu, T. Herseni, V. Krasnaseski, M. Maliţa, O. Neamţu, V. Pavelcu, H. H. Stahl and Gh Zapan, and to encounter researchers with landmark contributions in social psychology and sociology (mentioned in the chronological order of the encounters) G. C. Homans, P. F. Lazarsfeld, J. Galtung, A-N. Perret-Clermont, H. Heckhausen, H. H. Kelley, R. A. Hinde, H. Tajfel, J. Sidanius, M. Billig, J. Goody, and S. Schwartz. I am grateful to Loras College, to the Department of Communication Studies and to POROI – both from University of Iowa.

Bibliography

Azevedo, F.S. (2011) Lines of Practice : A Practice-Centered Theory of Interest Relationships, *Cognition and Instruction*, 29, 2, pp. 147-184.

Abele-Brehm, A.E., Gollwitzer, M., Steinberg, U., & Schönbrodt, F. D. (2019). Attitudes toward Open Science and public data sharing : A survey among members of the German Psychological Society. *Social Psychology, 50*(4), 252-260. https : //doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000384

Beauchamp, T.I. & Childress, J.F. (2012). *Principles of biomedical ethics*. New York : Oxford University Press.

Beecher, H.K. (1966). Ethics and clinical research. *New England Journal of Medicines* 274, 1354-1360.

Chua, A. (2003). *World on fire : How exporting free market democracy breeds ethnic hatred and global innstability*. New York : Doubleday.

Clyde, H. (1991). „Replication, Strict Replications, and Conceptual Replications : Are They Important ? ", *Neuliep*, 41-49.

Corneille, O. & Lush, P. (2023). Sixty years after Orne's *American Psychologist* article : A conceptual framework for subjective experiences elicited by demand charactersitics. *Personality and Social Psyhcology Review*, vol. 27 (1), pp. 83-101.

Fox, J., Pearce, K.E., Massanari, A.L., Riles, J M., Szulc, Ł., Ranjit, Y. S., Trevisan, F., Soriano, C.R.R., Vitak, J., Arora, P., Ahn, S.J. (Grace), Alper, M., Gambino, A., Gonzalez, C., Lynch, T., Williamson, L.D., & Gonzales, A.L. (2021). Open Science, Closed Doors ? Countering marginalization through an agenda for ethical, Inclusive research in communication. *Journal of Communication*. https : //doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqab029

Gernsbacher, M.A. (2018). Rewarding research transparency. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *22*(11), 953–956.

Giner-Sorolla, R. (2012). „Science or Art ? How Aesthetic Standards Grease the Way Through the Publication Bottleneck but Undermine Science", *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(6) : 562-571. doi : 10.1177/1745691612457576.

Goodall, J. (1971). *In the shadow of man*. Boston : Houghton Mifflin.

Goodall, J. (1986). *The Chimpanzees of Gombe : Patterns of behavior.* Boston : Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press.

Gusti, D. (1968). *Opere*, (Vol. 1, 2). Bucureşti : Editura Academiei R.S.R.

Gutmann, A. & Moreno, J.D. (2021). Everybody wants to go to heaven but nobody wants to die. Bioethics and the transformation of health care in America. New York : Liveright Publishing Corporation.

Ioannidis, J.P.A. (2005). Why Most Published Research Findings Are False, *PLoS Medicine*, 2(8) : e124. doi : 10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124.

Ioannidis, J.P.A., Fanelli, D., Drake Dunne, D. & Goodman, S.N.(2015). Meta-Research : Evaluation and Improvement of Research Methods and Practices, *PLOS Biology*, 13(10) : e1002264. doi : 10.1371/journal.pbio.1002264.

Jasko, K, LaFreeb, G.. Piazzac, J. & Beckerd, M. H. (2022). A comparison of political violence by left-wing, right-wing, and Islamist extremists in the United States and the world. PNAAS ĂPSYCHOLOGICAL AND COGNITIVE SCIENCES- Edited by Susan Fiske, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ ; 2022)

Jonsen, A.R. (1998). *The birth of bioethics*. New York : Oxford Uiversity Press.

Jonsen, A.R. & Toulmin, S. (1988). *The abuse of casuistry : A history of moral reasoning*. Berkeley : University of California Press.

Jost, T.J, Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A.W. & Sulloway, F.J. (2003a). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 129, no. 3, 339-375.

Jost, T.J, Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A.W. & Sulloway, F.J. (2003b). Exceptions that prove the rule : Reply. *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 129, No. 3, 383-393.

Knorr-Cetina, K. (1981). *The manufacture of knowledge*. Oxford : Pergamon Press.

Knorr-Cetina, K. (1999). *Epistemic cultures. How the sciences make knowledge*. Cambridge, Massachusetts : Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. (1989). *The Pasteurization of France*. Cambridge : Harvard University Press.

Makarenko, A.S. (1963). *Opere pedagogice alese (Pedagogical works),* Vol. 1 & 2. Bucureşti : Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică.

Makarenko, A.S. (1929/1973). *The road to life : An epic in education*. Translation with an Introduction by P. Lichtenberg. New York : Oriole Editions.

Mamali, C. (1981). *Balanţa motivaţională şi coevoluţie (Motivational Balance and Coevolution)*. Bucureşti : Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică. (It has a summary in English).

Mamali, C. (1982). Democratization of the social research process. In P. Stringer (Ed.) *Confronting social issues : Application of social psychology,* vol. 2. London, New York : Academic Press, 27-44.

Mamali, C. (2004). Lessons from the epistemic, moral and social richness of Stanford prison experiment. 22-24, *Dialogue*, Vol. 19, No. 1, Spring.

Mamali, C. & Păun (1986) Classification and Hierarchization in Motivational Fields : Co-Evolution Vectors. In Carlos A. Mallmann and Oscar Nudler (Eds.) *Human Development in its Social Context : A Collective Exploration*. London, Toronto : Hodder and Stoughton, pp. 93-111.

Mann, M. (2004). *The dark side of democracy. Explaining ethnic cleansing* Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Masuzzo, P. (2019, October 25). *From Open Science to Inclusive Science*, Webinar. Zenodo. https : // zenodo.org/record/3518951

Orne, M.T. (1962). On the social psychology of the psychological experiment : With the particular reference to demand characteristics and their implications. *American Psyhcologist,17(11)*, pp. 776-783.

Robson, S.G., Baum, M.A., Beaudry, L.L., Beitner, J., Brohmer, H., Chin, J.M., Jasko, K., Kouros, C.D., Laukkonen, E., Moreau, D., Searston, R.A., Slagter, H.A., Steffens, N.K.,

Tangen, J.M. & Thomas, A. (2021). Promoting Open Science : A Holistic Approach to Changing Behaviour – *Collabra : Psychology*, Vol. 7, Issue 1, 2021.

Sanghera, S. (2023). *Empireland. How imperialism has shaped modern Britain*. New York : Pantheon Books.

Thoreau, H.D. (1949). *The Journal of Henry D. Thoreau*. Edited by B. Torrey and F. Allen.Boston : Houghton Mifflin, 14 vols.

Thoreau, H.D. (1958). *The correspondence of Henry David Thoreau*. Edited by W. Harding & C. Bode. New York : New York University Press.

Thoreau, H.D. (1967). *The Variorum, Civil Disobedience.* Annotated and with an Introduction by Walter Harding. New York : Tayn Publishers.

Thoreau, H.D. (1970). *The annotated Walden. Walden ; or Life in the forest by Henry D. Thoreau together with „Civil Disobedience" a detailed chronology and various pieces about its author the writing and publishing of the book*. Edited, with an introduction, notes and bibliography by Philip Van Doren Stern. New York : Clarkson N. Potter, Inc.

Thoreau, H.D. (1973). *The reform papers*. Edited by W. Glick. Princeton : Princeton University Press.

Vazire, S. (2018). Implications of the credibility revolution for productivity, creativity, and progress. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *13*(4), 411-417.

Webber, D., Kruglanski, A., Molinario, E. & Jasko, K. (2020). Ideologies that justify political violence. Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences 2020, 34, 107-111, March 2023 Dubuque – Iowa –USA.