

# Trans-modalities of Peace through the Humanities: Institutionalizing Contemporary Pathways of Belief

Beyi Wendgoudi Appolinaire<sup>5</sup>

## ABSTRACT

Issues related to conflicts and crises are likely to be subjects of the humanities and social sciences. A culture of peace is a scientific culture that builds peace through both conceptual and empirical tools.

Consequently, security and peace are human constructs in the short, medium, and long term, and the humanities can address them through approaches that resolve issues of cohesion and coherence within the contingencies of categories and divisions among communities, societies, and all societal processes.

The research, therefore, asks, "How can the sciences in general, and particularly the humanities and social sciences, interrogate the contingencies of peace in the deconstruction of processes that undermine peace in the minds of people?"

Within each of the humanities, examining the "trajectories of conviction" of theories allows us to identify, from a shared perspective, epistemological orientations for each variable of social action capable of fostering representations, attitudes, and behaviors that build peace within communities, nations, and so on.

**Journal:** Boston Research Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities

**Keywords:** institution, peace, organization, humanities, epistemology

**Accepted:** 19 May 2026

**Published:** 22 May 2026

**ISSN:** Online ISSN: 2834-4863 | Print ISSN: 2834-4855

**Language:** English

**Research ID:** 45ad9394-1184-4a4f-9433-b279fef1e5c8

**Type:** Peer-Reviewed Research Article (Open Access)



The authors declare that no competing interests exist. The authors contributed equally to this work.

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License as an open-access article.

CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

**Read Online:** <https://rebrand.ly/afdvhsb>

**Author:** <sup>5</sup> – Lecturer-Researcher, University of Ouahigouya, CEDRES/ERGEO Laboratory, CERLLSH and GRIL Laboratory  
beyiwend@gmail.com

## I. INTRODUCTION

All over the world, we are witnessing multiple and diverse crises in our countries: symbolic crises

reflecting the fracture of a world without science or conscience, as in Ukraine, and crises involving a thousand cultures on certain continents, such as in Africa and the Middle East.

The current crises are crises of humanity (testing human dignity), crises of values (involving the categorization of values), and breakdowns in dialogue (due to the absence of reliable reference points). We might conclude that the crisis is ultimately a crisis of the human sciences. We have a compartmentalized scientific environment, whereas human beings exist within a comprehensible lived experience that determines their unity as both subject and object of peace.

According to the 1945 UN Charter and the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, "since wars begin in the minds of men...it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed." Thus, the issue of security and peace is a human construct in the short, medium, and long term, addressing the contingencies of the construction and outbreak of violence. How can the humanities examine the contingencies of peace by deconstructing the processes that undermine peace in the minds of men?

The objective is to identify and describe the fundamentals or "units of conviction" of the humanities in addressing the contingencies of sustainable peace in our societies in crisis.

Through a conceptual approach to the epistemology of the humanities, we can identify the "pathways of conviction" within these disciplines that can provide strategic and operational guidance for peacebuilding. Note that a "path of conviction" of a discipline, for us, is a substantial orientation in terms of its contribution to our problem of building an environment that guarantees peace in the minds of people.

By centering the concept on the "minds of people," we engage in a dialogue with the humanities, including disciplines such as history, anthropology, ethnology, linguistics, psychology, sociology, and economics, without delving into the complexity of their subdisciplines. In addressing the question of the mind, we cannot overlook the question of how knowledge of the mind is constructed through education and philosophy, which can offer a comprehensive understanding of underlying principles.

By identifying the modalities and trans-modalities of the constraints or contingencies of the humanities on the processes by which crises emerge in people's minds or in the

formation of communities, this paper aims to reflect on variables of social and societal action that could foster peace-building attitudes and behaviors within communities, nations, continents, the world, and beyond.

Our study does not claim to provide an exhaustive account of the paths to conviction for sustainable peace, but rather to serve as a tool for understanding a complex phenomenon that peace practitioners often approach with theoretical concepts that are more specialized (as their field requires) than systemic (as the social system itself demands); it is therefore a matter of examining a few examples to understand or achieve the whole.

## II. FROM EPISTEMOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO A MODEL OF REFLECTION FOR A PEACE INSTITUTION

For a reflection that addresses a number of pathways within the paradigms of the humanities, we believe that an approach drawn from epistemology can lead us to better conclusions. We agree with R. Harre (1984) that "epistemology is the theory of knowledge." However, we highlight a new axis of alignment—the ethical and utilitarian dimension of knowledge construction as a reference point alongside the axis of the dimension of true knowledge.

The analysis of structures (formalizing analysis method) and that of their genesis (historical method) leads us to a direct (deductive-constructive) method of analysis. This approach is therefore useful in the sense that the criteria to which true knowledge should conform lie in "ubiquity"—simultaneity in time, omnipresence in space, and the duality of its tools that bridge the real and the virtual. Thus, the ultimate goal is to evaluate a postulate regarding the construction of "human dignity" or the construction of healthy interactions defined within increasingly vast relevant spaces through paradigms of the human sciences, alongside a social and technological civilization that is reflective of its overall functionality.

It should therefore be noted that this is a normative, rather than descriptive, scientific approach; a kind of systems theory that draws its categories from the "trajectories of belief" within the humanities—in their respective times and spaces—as meaningful subsystems within a

constructed, relevant system, in the sense of a normative prediction. Thus, we have preferred “formal” statements that are true in the history of science rather than empirical ones that are difficult to grasp. Because it is justified that the true applies or is constructed following the example of (true) theorems for (real) architecture, and what is observable—such as the history (or other sciences) of a war—already has consequences, as exemplified by what can be established through the findings of history, anthropology, ethnology, linguistics, psychology, sociology, and the economics of the war in Ukraine (historical and assessable). We seek an approach to scientific normative prediction (formalized from factual findings) drawing on the experience (historical or of genesis) of the “trajectories” of the humanities.

If we agree with A. Chalmers (1999) and L. Soler (2000) that epistemology is a reflexive and critical discipline specializing in the validity of knowledge, we propose here a premise for updating the principles or methods of validating knowledge in the humanities in order to build an environment of peaceful interaction for the human person.

This reflection serves as a framework for strategic monitoring in the humanities in the sense of Strategic Anticipatory Monitoring–Collective Intelligence for global security and peace. This

concept is explained by H. Lesca (2003): “Strategic Anticipatory Monitoring–Collective Intelligence (SAM–CI) is the collective, proactive, and continuous process by which a group of individuals proactively tracks and utilizes relevant information concerning their external environment and the changes that may occur therein (including disruptions) with the aim of creating business opportunities, innovating, and reducing risks and uncertainty in general.” Can we thus reduce uncertainties regarding peace in various spaces of social and technological interaction through an epistemological innovation in the humanities?

### III. FROM DOCUMENTARY DATA ON THE HISTORY OF CONFLICTS TO THE SOCIOLOGY OF CONSTRUCTING A NEW ORDER FOR PEACE

By using the attached documentary data for critical reflection on the sources of conflict alongside the history of sociological concepts and models for understanding or designing an order that prescribes peace in our societies, we adopt a practical approach within our critical study. The following two tables provide an overview for a comprehensive and critical sociological analysis.

Table 1: Cycle of institutionalization in the history of the sources of conflict

Inspiring Authors and Historical Thoughts			
Authors	Period	Central themes	Converging or symbolic key ideas
	<b>Antiquity</b>		
Herodotus		Account of cultural contacts and interethnic conflicts	Interactions between major ancient civilizations: social exchanges and military confrontation as a primitive form of globalization
Thucydides		Wars as a driving force of political transformation	The resonance of the struggles for power and domination between Athens and Sparta in global conflicts
	<b>Middle Ages</b>		
Ibn Khaldun		Dynastic cycles and economic interactions	The emergence of globalization through trade and migration
	<b>Modern era</b>		
Fernand		The World	Conflicts between empires as struggles for control of

Braudel		Economy Over Time	trade routes and markets
Immanuel Wallerstein		The capitalist world-system	Conflicts as tensions between the global economic system and its center, periphery, and semi-periphery
	<b>The 20th Century</b>		
Samuel Huntington		Clash of Civilizations	Modern conflicts stem from cultural and civilizational differences (the West, Islam, China) rather than economic or ideological rivalries
Francis Fukuyama		The End of History	The end of ideological conflicts is a consequence of economic globalization and the widespread adoption of liberalism
Zygmunt Bauman		Globalization as a fluid process	New types of conflicts are linked to chaotic globalization, characterized by economic inequalities, migration, and other uncertainties
Thomas Piketty		Economic inequalities as a source of geopolitical tensions	Conflicts are fueled by globalization exacerbated by capitalism
Joseph Stiglitz		Critique of neoliberal globalization	Global institutions (IMF, World Bank) are sources of local and global conflicts through the worsening of inequalities

Source: our summary of the authors and content of their historical works that have shaped the concept of conflict

By tracing the history of conflicts through these seminal authors, we observe that the organization of peace involves an opportunity for cooperation within a globalization marked by tensions rooted in inequality, cultural clashes, or power dynamics.

Theories of globalization highlight in their analysis of these processes that the world is becoming increasingly interconnected. On multiple levels, globalization entails various adjustments.

From an economic perspective, there is the division of labor and its benefits (Adam Smith, David Ricardo), as well as the inevitable consequences of the capitalist expansion of globalization and its exploitative effects (Karl Marx).

From a sociological perspective, transcendence is evident at the level of national borders, altering cultural identities and social relations through the redefinitions of human interactions and the intensification of social relations across geographical distances (Anthony Giddens), alongside the interaction of local cultures and globalization (Roland Robertson).

From a political perspective, the influence of state sovereignty and the global balance of power, within a world system shaped by capitalism, highlights inequalities between the center (rich countries) and the periphery (poor countries).

From critical and environmental perspectives, the risks associated with global overconsumption and the excesses of global neoliberalism (Naomi Klein and Joseph Stiglitz), with political, social, environmental, and other consequences.

In understanding the challenges of globalization, the technological dimension of the digital revolution and innovation, and the cultural dimension of cultural homogenization and the resurgence of particularisms, as well as the rise of international organizations, inspire us to reflect on reorganization to foster world peace

Table 2: Framework for understanding social changes or upheavals through sociology

<b>Inspiring sociological authors and ideas throughout history</b>		
<b>Authors</b>	<b>Central Themes</b>	<b>Converging or symbolic key ideas</b>
Émile Durkheim	Social cohesion	Social cohesion is based on specific forms of solidarity depending on the type of society (mechanical solidarity with punitive law in traditional societies and organic solidarity with restorative law in modern societies)
Max Weber	Power relations and conflict between social groups	With a comprehensive approach that defines power as a social relationship, social conflict is determined by social stratification, in contrast to Karl Marx's economic view.
Karl Marx	Power struggles and class struggle	Class struggle is a natural dynamic of capitalism, and the end of these struggles heralds the end of history
George Simmel	Conflict influences social relations	Conflict, as a structuring force in social relations, is based on differences between individuals, values, and interests, which stimulate change, innovation, and social progress
Theodor W. Adorno	A critical examination of the world through negative dialectics	An approach to negative dialectics that consists of not reconciling tensions in order to reveal the fractures in reality. It criticizes "the culture industry" as a source of mass manipulation.
Herbert Marcuse	Structures of Domination in Modern Society	Modern societies allow for superficial opposition while making fundamental change impossible through the creation of artificial needs by industrial societies and the media, technologies, and consumer cultures that defuse rebellions
Norbert Elias	Dynamics of Conflict and Social Transformation	The processes of civilization and mechanisms of pacification in societies—through the state's monopolization of violence and gradual pacification via norms of civility and institutional mechanisms—offer opportunities to reduce violent conflicts through complex interdependencies.

Source: our summary of the authors and content of their sociological works that have shaped the concept of conflict

Social, political, economic, and cultural dynamics constitute fields of exploration for sociology in the organization and institutionalization of peace.

The origins of sociology reflect the social upheavals between the Industrial Revolution and the political revolutions of the 19th century.

Sociology provides theoretical and practical foundations for understanding the sources of conflict in order to contribute to peaceful solutions.

Fundamentally, according to Émile Durkheim, social cohesion is strengthened by institutions (family, school, religion, the state, etc.) and shared

norms capable of creating a sense of belonging and collective morality. In this regard, the framework for organizing global peace must be able to build this universe of social cohesion. Anomie—or the ambiguous state of global norms and institutions—constitutes today the threats to peace described by Durkheim.

Max Weber's comprehensive perspective on social conflict within social relations introduces a social, identity-based dimension into the construction of a peaceful environment. We believe that human identity (with practical applications) must be able to prescribe this order of substantive

identity-based values to ensure social cohesion in the world.

While Karl Marx locates the end of history in class struggle, the perspective of human identity could translate the meaning of conflict into the question of social recognition within the Weberian framework rather than focusing solely on economic aspects. There is therefore a shared order of meaning to be built into new models of global leadership.

For us, fostering a better human cultural industry is a source of cohesion, not a means of manipulating the masses, insofar as it is grounded in human values and norms.

Norbert Elias’s contribution to our understanding of peacebuilding lies in the fact that a strong supranational institution of the world’s states is capable of managing the complexities of natural interdependencies ranging from the individual to the international level. And the transfer of the monopoly on violence from the community level to the global level, via the continental levels, can bring a peaceful global civility to this world of intense violent contradiction.

First and foremost, when addressing epistemology, we can include reflection on integral philosophy, which considers three realms of reality: the internal (individual consciousness), the intersubjective (collective consciousness), and the external (matter and life-time, space, energy, or external interface). Since these realms are evolving from this perspective, we believe that this field of science can provide a unifying vision of these realms by offering coherent directions in the evolution of things. Language and communication are relevant vectors for disseminating coherent visions in the external realm. Psychology, through the imagination and representations, can convey the foundations of these visions within the internal and intersubjective universes. This can improve systems of human relations toward more relevant approaches to peace. By creating a sound structure for the worldview, these fields of science can advance the cultural dimension of humanity by implementing value systems that are relevant and inclusive of large human groups. The philosophical approach will prioritize, for example, themes of human sensitivity, ecology, and the search for harmony and consensus through openness. This is how reflection on peace brings together several disciplines of the humanities.

#### IV. FROM INTEGRAL PHILOSOPHY TO MASTERING COMPLEXITY IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF PEACE INSTITUTIONS

Table 3: Pathways of Integral Philosophy

Examples of facilitating relevant belief pathways	Authors	References and works
Guiding a hyperbolic morality in the spirit of “de-bourgeoisifying a revolution” with a responsibility not to others but to God, the law, and authority (which enlists the thought of the world for the world)	Emmanuel Levinas (1978)	Other than being or beyond essence
Facilitating the fullness of man’s natural sociability and not that of a social being (which excludes the biases of communal divisions)	Thomas Hobbes (1651)	Leviathan
Consolidating the presence of positive inclinations: the tranquility of order and the harmony of justice (which allows for the institutionalization of an order based on the organization of peace through the mastery of specific epistemological biases)	Saint Augustine (413)	The City of God, Book XIX

Freeing oneself from the fact that “since wars arise in the minds of men...it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be raised” (which reinforces perceptions of justice and fairness in the transactions and transformations of future generations)	UN (1945)	1945 Constitution
--	-----------	-------------------

Sources: our summary, January 2024

Within this framework of “paths of conviction” that can encompass a comprehensive understanding of peace, we propose that the epistemology of the humanities can reveal an intellectual or partisan construction of the contingencies of a lasting peace. According to E. Levinas (1978), peace is rooted in a negation of the self so that ethics may endure: “the recurrence of the self in responsibility for oth , a persecutory obsession, runs counter to intentionality, so that responsibility for others can never signify altruistic will, an instinct of natural benevolence, or love. ” (p.177). In the construction of peace, this “hyperbolic” form of benevolence is a rigid, integrative perception of the complex dynamics of life in society and in the construction of social order. If this conception appears supernatural or utopian, it can be tempered by other, less idealistic conceptions. With T. Hobbes (1651), one can understand that man is not naturally social (a natural disposition to live in society); rather, he undergoes the process of constructing a society that takes into account spaces of complex constructivist interactions: a natural sociability. Christian doctrine, as articulated by Saint Augustine (413), envisions peace through an approach of individual self-mastery, self-discipline, or an order within the components of the self (body, soul, etc.) leading to order within the family and in one’s increasingly expanded environment, following the same framework. To arrive at a level of the concept of peace aligned with the UN’s ambition, as enshrined in its 1945 founding principles within the constitution, we believe that our reflection can fundamentally and epistemologically interrogate the disciplines of the humanities, which are connected to the construction of contingencies within the minds of people.

**V. FROM THE DECONSTRUCTION TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIOLOGICAL SOLIDARITY IN THE INSTITUTION OF BONDS**

In sociology, solidarity or social cohesion provides a framework conducive to reflecting on the direction of one of the human sciences, in order to chart the epistemological path—the course of conviction—that this field of study can adopt to construct an environment of “thought” on the question of peace. While E. Durkheim (1888) explored the concept, he situated it within a contingent environment between a mechanical model—which fosters an environment of similarity among actors and their functions—and an organic model within an environment of diversified social functions. While E. Durkheim’s (1888) perspective holds true in these specific contexts, our global context of diversification within the unity of functions may necessitate the construction of a solidarity of bodies or categories (subsystem) capable of ensuring the balance of the mechanical format within each body, and a human or global solidarity (system) capable of ensuring regulation with the organic format between bodies in order to establish lasting bonds. This mechanical and organic solidarity enables the development of perspectives through the rational pooling of resources on both sides to avoid conflicts—most of which are linked to the sharing of energy and vital resources . Even if the familial, social, or intergenerational form is a level of humanizing “bond,” the civic (legal) form must remain the concept of the universal “bond” between humans in a modern world: this must enable a mobile citizen, capable of upholding universally acceptable values. The deconstructed format of practices generates the conceptual form of global solidarity with criteria for evaluating the levels of achievement of groups, nations, continents, and the world. Thus, reciprocity is an objective of solidarity.

Sociology, in this sense, will reveal the best systems of “cultural control” (T. Parsons, 1951). From a constructivist perspective, subsystems will have criteria for the formulation of global systems.

Table 4: The Path of Sociology

Examples of relevant belief-based learning activities	Authors	References and works
Human interaction must be viewed as “unsociable sociability”	Immanuel Kant (1947)	The Philosophy of History
Constructing dialogue through language resolves unsociable sociability; “an agreement reached through communication has a rational content” p.297	Jürgen Habermas (1962) and (1987)	-The Public Sphere -The Theory of Communicative Action
Freeing oneself from the decline of cultural, philosophical, or political reality, as exemplified by “the decline of the Roman trinity of religion, tradition, and authority”	Hannah Arendt (1961)	The Crisis of Culture
Concluding historical institutionalism and the actor’s dependence within the system of action according to the principle of “path dependency”	Sven Steinmo, Kathleen Thelen, and Frank Longstreth (1992)	Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis

Sources: our summary, January 2024

In a Kantian approach (E. Kant, 1947), conflict or the nature of an unsociable interaction remains the agent of change and transformation within the natural order of things. It is only after navigating the complexities of conflict that interactions become peaceful. From a sociological perspective, this philosophical viewpoint highlights the constructive contributions that the sciences in general—and the humanities in particular—can make to the pursuit of peace, fostering a minimal degree of unsociability within the sociability of social environments at every level. Following J. Habermas (1962), it is possible to reframe the perspective of unsociable interactions within a concept of dialogue that constitutes a construction of sociability. By emphasizing that “public life... takes place in the marketplace, the agora, but it is not in any way dependent on this place: the public sphere is constituted within dialogue ” (J. Habermas, 1962, p. 15), he frames this dialogue in terms of communication within communicative action (J. Habermas, 1987) in the context of carrying out fundamentally egocentric instrumental acts and acts of mutual understanding aimed at achieving success. In its comprehensible form of dialogue in the sense of mutual understanding, the sociological reflection on the “bond” leads to conceptualizing the contingencies of interactions in the clarification of roles and statuses in collective action and in the collective space. Here, it is no longer the assignment of democratic roles that appears important, but the

clarification of the fairness and the acquired tranquility of the order and nature of the bonds in a form of harmony of organizational or institutional justice at every level of social interaction. Our sociopolitical perspective can approach current political crises as issues of multiple interests, egocentric power plays by proxy of the collective in matters of state, and above all, dysfunctions inherent in crises of belief or faith in God manifested by the absence of love for one’s neighbor. The separation of philosophy from the state (since the break with human concepts of authority), as well as the absence of wisdom in politics—just as the separation of Church and state (1905) with secularism as an amputation of love in certain sensitive social interactions (secular public institutions) are, among others, pertinent issues of the day. The amputation of institutions of faith or beliefs that consolidate love in the field of education—specifically within the family and school—or the predominance of these institutions of faith over other forms of institutions constitutes the foundation of risks to peace in the minds of men. If H. Arendt (1961) views today’s global crisis with suspicion as a crisis of culture—likely the “decline of the Roman trinity of religion, tradition, and authority”—this stems from the fundamental deconstruction of the frameworks of positive emotions, mutual understanding, and the relevant mechanisms governing social interactions. The call for sound philosophical currents in political action or collective action remains outdated.

The principle of “path dependency” in political science during the 1990s explains current choices by reference to past choices made through political institutions. By reflecting on an institutional approach to action with authors such as S. Steinmo, K. Thelen, and Longstreth (1992), we can acknowledge, in line with historical institutionalism, that sociopolitical phenomena depend on contextual factors—external to the actors and highly institutional in nature—such that, in principle, a humanities-based culture, through a comprehensive understanding of these factors, can foster mutual understanding to prevent conflicts and crises of all kinds. It is therefore through the performance within the institution of awareness of the choices made by the present-day, on the path of the past, that a distance can be created from choices likely to lead to a conflictual order. Models of shared political institutions remain important for defending the common space of peace, through political concepts universally acceptable via dialogue.

## VI. FROM A MODEL OF FIDELITY TO HISTORY OR TO A HISTORY AS A MODEL FOR ESTABLISHING THE INSTITUTION OF PEACE IN COGNITION

Fidelity to history constitutes a source of reflection on the framework and dimensions of constructing an environment capable of reflecting the perspectives of reciprocity. The crisis in the Middle East has revealed, as P. Masson-Oursel (1949) noted, the existence of the homeland of Israel in “pure duration” without the influence of contingencies or chance. This allows us to conceive of society within a universal framework that inscribes a “pure duration” of specific moments, capable of enlisting people in a “pure social bond.” The search for a world of “pure social bond” can also stem from the experience of this phenomenon of category construction at the level of its internal foundations, even if this fuels divisions in its external social bonds, which are rife with crises and conflict.

The reconciliation of primary bonds (between individuals), secondary bonds (between categories or peoples), and then at the third level (global) requires the transfer of the lived history of different categories into a collective human memory so that subsequent generations can step outside of categories to assess facts within their contexts without being bound by those contexts, ensuring that this does not become a source of

categorization or manifest itself in other contexts. Interpretations of the past—particularly of conflicts—taken out of context fuel the crises of these categories through history and within history.

Following P. Ricœur (2000), it is important to distinguish between the misuse of historical memory—which is constructed similarly to collective history—and the model of history-making by the individual in the first instance: “More precisely, what appears as a paradox in historical experience—namely, too much memory here, not enough memory there—can be reinterpreted in terms of resistance and the compulsion to repeat, and is ultimately subjected to the test of the difficult work of remembrance” (P. Ricœur, 2000, p. 96)

Second, the perspective consists in moving beyond the level of selective subjectivity to enter into a reparative consciousness by transcending “the selective function of narrative, which offers manipulation the opportunity and the means for a cunning strategy that consists from the outset in a strategy of forgetting as much as of remembrance” (P. Ricœur, 2000, p.103). The abuse of ideology and the state’s control of memory through official commemorations and reenactments—such as national anthems—constitute fields of historical expression that must be reconstructed within a context more in harmony with the human values of tolerance and acceptance.

By reconstructing a global environment and adopting a global perspective, we can place the history of humanity within a “pure duration” from the perspective of the universal right to “human dignity.”

Table 5: Historical Journey

Examples of relevant belief-based educational activities	Authors	References and works
Deconstructing the idea that “war is reduced to the gods, heroes, Zeus, and Achilles”	Homer (Antiquity)	Book I, opening lines, trans. R. Flacelière, La Pléiade
Building the citizen by breaking free from the concepts of peace and war: “peace is the end of war... a physical end to the Greek City-State.” What model of survival for the citizen?	Aristotle (384–322 B.C.E.)	Nicomachean Ethics,
“War is the father of all good things; war is also the father of good prose!” or “All becoming arises from the struggle of opposites”	With Heraclitus/ Friedrich Nietzsche	-The Gay Science -The Fragments
Peace is a political and legal practice; better yet, a plan of nature	Immanuel Kant (1788)	Critique of Practical Reason, Analytic

Sources: our summary, January 2024

The trajectory of successive convictions explains here that war and peace exist independently of their construction in the human mind. It is therefore a concept that has been long established, maintained in the minds of elites, and possesses a constancy in “pure duration.” It is in this respect that these trajectories raise epistemological issues to be resolved on a sociological plane that is profoundly historical. In the ancient world, there existed a political philosophy—whether that of a philosopher or a tribal leader—that consistently established an order of peace and war, which an epistemological paradigm can deconstruct in the minds of people who “drink deeply” from this social culture.

## VII. FROM LANGUAGE TO COMMUNICATION AS VECTORS OF POSITIVE INTERDEPENDENCE

Regarding the question of language in the construction of meaning or in its existence at the level of the social institution, we can compare, on the one hand, the reflection posed by E. Ortigues: “It is quite clear that, wherever a human society is found, language is already there. Society takes shape in the language it gives itself” (E. Ortigues, 1962, p. 25) and, on the other hand, the position of C. Lévi-Strauss (1950), who locates the symbolic origin of the social at this level and not the social origin of the symbolic. With the various linguistic

interfaces—from text translation to the mode of instant-translated dialogue (Artificial Intelligence tools)—the comfort—e of language in reducing crises of meaning or symbol lies in positing the perspective of a symbolic origin of the social, which allows for the transcendence of social boundaries, rather than perpetuating these boundaries through the social origins of the symbolic. If this is understood correctly, the best approach is therefore the establishment of artificial language as a mode of producing unifying symbols and social institutions that ensure the impersonal and universal dimension of intersubjective environments. This presupposes that different linguistic communities perceive the digital tool as a means of integration into a universal civilization, rather than as a tool of Western civilization.

Linguistic integration as a social expansion of intersubjectivity, rather than an ethnocentric stance. The perspective of linguistic research would therefore no longer be to catalog the structures or symbols of languages, but rather to seek a comprehensive and integrative linguistic perspective—a way to break down the boundaries of subjectivity and intersubjectivity in order to finally ensure an objective, borderless environment for linguistic mediation: functional language and social, cultural, educational, professional, and economic integration, as well as international institutions.

Communication in the age of digital technology and artificial intelligence provides a

standard model for integrating human institutions with APIs, webhooks, and SnapLogic Snaps used by organizations. This improves the integration of systems (both subsystems and overall systems). The current perspective on the integration of ICT in education is focused on users and practices (academic, professional, etc.); it must also shed light on a paradigm regarding its social and human function beyond the social boundaries of these practices.

The concern at this level is not to frame the perspective of “computer-mediated communication” in the production of knowledge in the sense of A.I. Goldman (1999, p.165), but rather in the search for ways to reduce social, cultural, educational, professional, economic, and other tensions. Thus, the social interactionist perspective appears critical, because there is rather a need to focus on the “sharing” of best practices and systems capable of integrating a mechanical form of interaction in order to ergonomically reduce areas of tension.

A.I. Goldman (1999, p.161) identifies the dissemination function (informants transmit established knowledge to learners) and the collaborative acquisition function (informants co-construct new knowledge) in the acquisition of knowledge through communication. The first function deserves emphasis in this effective perspective of shared (true) knowledge to facilitate a fluid and objective intersubjective space.

By agreeing with Sperber (1996) that the inter-individual or relational process in knowledge production involves public production based on a succession of internal and external states, we believe that ICTs help consolidate the external dimension, allowing the human dimensions of the relationship—namely, conviviality—to flourish in the inter-individual sphere.

From a humanities perspective, it is pertinent to note, as L. Bouzidi and S. Boulesnane (2017, p. 27) do, that “by abolishing spatiotemporal boundaries, digital media crystallize social relations and establish modes of operation and logics centered on collective intelligence.” Defining withdrawal policies in this environment of sharing and communion at the level of a country, a continent, or any other jurisdiction constitutes a marginalization of peoples within these humanities. “The challenges of the digital humanities lie first and foremost in redefining rules and codes and integrating new social frameworks consistent with current values” (L. Bouzidi and S. Boulesnane, p. 37); and it is through the institutionalization of peace, with contributions from the sciences, that our human environment can build this “communion” of peoples.

Table 6: Communication Pathways

Examples of facilitating relevant belief journeys	Authors	References and works
The function of dissemination in the acquisition of knowledge through communication	Alvin Goldman (1999)	Knowledge in a Social World
The collaborative acquisition function in knowledge acquisition through communication	Alvin Goldman (1999)	Knowledge in a Social World
The Inter-individual or Relational Process in Knowledge Production	Sperber (1996)	The Contagion of Ideas
The contribution of the digital humanities through community building, collective intelligence, and interaction with the environment	Laïd Bouzidi and Sabrina Boulesnane (2017)	Digital Humanities: Changing Uses and Practices

Sources: our summary, January 2024

The key themes lie in the social integration or social inclusion of these information and communication technologies within institutions that are increasingly integrating human spaces. It is therefore a matter of restoring communication's role as a means of knowledge transmission within global social epistemology, in order to make knowledge true and to ensure that sociological relationships—or “bonds”—flow smoothly. It is a matter of defining the paradigm of a unifying function for communication at every level of human interaction, because, as B. Conein notes in social epistemology, “listening to multiple witnesses does not guarantee that they are telling the truth, but it makes it more likely” (B. Conein, 2007, p. 152): the acceptance of certain ICT tools as a means of stabilizing dissemination in shared spaces, without censoring the ubiquity (duplication) of the function of collaborative knowledge acquisition along dialectical lines with other specified tools.

**VIII. WHAT ETHNOLOGY TELLS US ABOUT OURSELVES WITHOUT THE OTHERS: HOW TO REDUCE THE OTHERNESS OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION**

Originating from European interests in Afro-Asian and Amerindian civilizations, ethnology

established itself as a descriptive science of life, encompassing collected facts or theories about cultural phenomena. The classifications of superior and inferior civilizations in this research— and the civilizations rejected by E. Durkheim (1888)—deserve our attention here. If the approach aims to go beyond the habits and daily life of each community, it is merely a methodological strategy to arrive at a shared civilization designated as “modern”—the result of a multifaceted convergence of various cultures across multiple civilizations to pool what appears objective and relevant. The distinction between digital culture and community culture in their daily experiences will, in principle, reduce the tension at every level stemming from the necessity of reciprocity.

The (empirical) studies of H. Garfinkel (1967, p. 51) address the mundane activities of daily life through practical sociological reasoning. Contemporary ethnology will require the support of ethnomethodology, in the sense of H. Garfinkel's approach, to understand the social and societal reserves in the appropriation of emerging phenomena related to ICT use. This provides the means to deconstruct barriers to the integrative environment of ICTs in daily life, ensuring a better understanding of the meaning people ascribe to their actions, as well as enhancing reciprocity among people.

Table 7: Pathways in Ethnology

Examples of facilitating relevant belief-based pathways	Authors	References and works
Conceiving of a societal structure as a “singularity that merges with a generality during the transformation of a transformed society” (as opposed to the generic)	Tryggvi Örn Úlfsson, (2018)	Singularity, universality, genericity, and generality in Alain Badiou
Conceiving the same societal structure as a “universality through a power of being indifferent to any particular situation” (as opposed to indexed generality)	Tryggvi Örn Úlfsson, (2018)	Singularity, Universality, Genericity, and Generality in Alain Badiou
Building an integrated social environment in the image of “technological singularity” that governs human purpose in globalization and universalization	John Von Neumann, Ray Kurzweil, and Vernor Vinge (1958)	The Singularity
Finally, consider a scenario of the “death of this object of otherness” (or their transfer to museums) in ethnology to bring a scenario of “life” to anthropology.	Our present study	Modalities of institutionalizing peace with the humanities

Sources: our synthesis, January 2024

Social and cultural distances, given current conditions of subjectivity and emotionality—for example, between states with capitalist ideologies and those with socialist ideologies—constitute an additional challenge, acting as a “pollution” in the understanding of the other within a form of updated reciprocity. The spaces of symbolic networks and identity create such a diverse object of ethnology, whereas for peace, one must envision a scenario of the “death of this object of otherness” (or their relegation to museums) to foster a scenario of “life” for anthropology. This is by no means a call for the death of human civilization’s identity, but rather a “resurrection” of consensual values from a deconstructed human space into spaces of reciprocity; a sort of reconquest of human identity within a broader human civilization, creating consensual institutions against the aberrations of patriotism, nationalism, and “-isms” that humiliate human dignity. To this ideological debate that may arise, there is a symbolic response that allows for mutual understanding of the approach.

If we accept that ethnology and its object is a generic space for naming human singularity, as defined by A. Badiou (2000), its disappearance is synonymous with a culture of full sharing of common values—as socialism defines this value—and the surrender to an otherness centered on the worthless object that is capital constitutes a social compromise leading to the reintegration of human culture into the global village. This is the search for the universal “ethnicity” of humanity. Within this universal humanity, we can construct schemes of singularity and universality (A. Badiou, 2000) in a newly constructed environment.

Singularity carries the essence of a “thinkable” subject for political action (A. Badiou, 2012) and is not a medium for the reproduction of a social structure as posited by Althusser (1965), but rather the reduction of a complex asymmetry resulting from ethnocentrism or its habitus “as a system of regulated dispositions” (P. Bourdieu, 1972) in societies. By admitting this subject, “everything that exists is thus both itself and itself according to its place” (A. Badiou, 1982, p.26); however, this structural being emerges in an increasingly universal space, both in the dismantling of class perception and of the relationship to class and category, in order to perceive others in full reciprocity. In its complex nature, singularity possesses a relativity that can only be described as singular in relation to a given structure (Ú. Tryggvi,

2018); thus, the process of integration into a planetary structure must necessarily take this into account.

## IX. ON THE EXPANSION OF CONSCIOUSNESS THROUGH TRANSPERSONAL PSYCHOLOGY

There are phenomena that are understandable at the psychological level and must therefore be addressed. Consciousness is the totality of the individual’s apprehension at the subjective, intersubjective, and objective levels, as described by integral theory with the philosopher K. Wilber. According to integral theory, evolution is dynamic at the level of the inner universe through consciousness and culture (with meanings, values, and feelings) and at the external level through its relationship with time, space, matter, energy, and life.

The perspective of psychology is to focus its research on the foundations of a culture, meanings, and an ethic of love that are capable of being universally accepted and integrated to foster greater reciprocity.

While agreeing that “sense” is “the faculty of experiencing the world through sensations,” for us, “sense” carries “a connotation of value judgments, of ethical and/or epistemological significance, which leads us to deem a particular fact or action good or bad, sensible or senseless” (Y. Barel, 1990) and it “also refers to a construct in which the individual’s subjectivity is not only composed of cognitions or reflections, but also of all other sensory perceptions” (K.E. Weick, 1995). From this perspective, we understand that crises or conflicts are inherent to a crisis of meaning or values, and that the dynamics of psychological research can provide meaning by creating a shared environment of perceptions that are as coherent as possible: establishing coherence between the values of Western societies—such as freedom, equality, justice, and progress, and the values of Asia with their technocratic governance and societal conservatism, for example. And it is also about giving meaning to certain things so that we do not have to strive to understand, for example, the liberalism of mores rejected by Russia and Ukraine, with a socialization that is more vertical (family) than horizontal (broader social perspective) and a nationalism displayed in these two countries, yet in crisis between the project of a unified Russian

empire on the one hand and a strengthening of its independence on the Ukrainian side. How can we reconcile the vertical socialization of one part of the world with the horizontal socialization of the other, so that humanity can regain ethical and practical human dignity? We believe that if psychological research had provided or harmonized a consensus on the meanings of relevant values in the context of globalization and internationalization, crises and

conflicts would have less reason to exist. By delving into the meaning of the expression at the heart of this stage of our debate: "Meaning-making does not happen on its own; meaning is not simply given: one must seek it out and construct it" (H. Laroche, 1996, p. 226). By fostering a shift from "generic subjectivity" to relevant "intersubjectivity," the sources of conflict are, in principle, resolved through shared meaning.

Table 8: Psychology track

Examples of facilitating relevant belief pathways	Authors	References and works
Promoting a transpersonal approach from Ken Wilber’s perspective because “Borders carry political and technological power, but also conflict and alienation” and “A line is not a boundary; it unites two realities”	Ken Wilber (1979)	No Boundary
Facilitating the elevation of the need for fulfillment to a non-therapeutic phase of “transcendence” of egos from the grassroots to the ruling elite and vice versa, like the spirit that has driven Westerners on the climate issue with the SDGs.	Abraham Maslow (1954)	Motivation and Personality
Guiding civilizations toward a humanistic conception of the person with an integral humanistic culture within a universe of shared values	Emmanuel Mounier (1935)	Personalist and communal revolution
Moving beyond the culture of the person as a legal entity to establish them as a member of the community without falling into a socialist ideological conception: a new society within humanity and a new humanity within a new society open to transcendence.	The Person from the Perspective of Emmanuel Mounier (1936)	Manifesto in the Service of Personalism

Sources: our synthesis, January 2024

In the development of beliefs in psychology, it is interesting to note the synthesis of theories from various disciplines into four types of territories from K. Wilber’s perspective: the inner territory of the individual, the inner territory of the collective, the outer territory of the individual, and the outer territory of the collective. These developmental paths of belief are significant because the integral perspective connects the inner universe with the outer universe.

Recognizing that internal evolution is possible through consciousness and culture- specifically, knowledge of the inner world regarding meaning (the significance of things), values, and love-the institutionalization approach aims to consolidate human consciousness and a universal culture through the of shared meanings and values, thereby enriching the perspective of boundless love.

From a perspective of “transcendence”-not specifically in a therapeutic sense, as proposed by A. Maslow (1954)-to foster a longing to experience a sense of unity, and thereby the unity of humanity, a culture of psychological science promotes unconditional love among every world leader or at levels of governance, adopting as a principle a transcendence capable of dispelling “egos” in the planet’s collective action on issues of security, peace, the environment, etc. On the climate issue, we have practical experience in defining the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This model of transcendence has the potential to reduce areas of tension and erase dividing lines to draw unifying ones. By excluding egos from governance at the global and other levels, we also create a world of sages and heroes of humanity.

Following E. Mounier (1936), the perspective of eliminating violence stems from a culture that has diminished the transpersonal; a humanistic conception of the world capable of integrating civilizations with the human sciences—and particularly here with psychology—as tools for building instruments of personal fulfillment (one’s functioning and integration into the broader social organization) within a shared civilization.

**X. WHAT BECOMES OF THE “BOND” WITH THE OTHER FROM AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE,**

By reflecting on daily life within an increasingly expansive identity space from the perspective of integration and the breaking down of barriers through the decompartmentalization of categories, reciprocity takes on a formal shape. We can explain this necessity for evolution by noting that, from the perspective of this evolution, reciprocity—which “presupposes the interchangeability of terms against a backdrop of homogeneity of register”—Remarkably expressed by a child’s statement: “my father looks like me,” the relationship of reciprocity is severed from the problem of the Third and stages two interchangeable pawns...’ shifts toward a less vertical, more horizontal perspective: ‘in contemporary contractualist ideology, reciprocity thus understood has become a political value through the discourse of the subject- King; it tends to undo any staging of the principle of otherness, the foundation of the gap and the limit for the subject’ (P. Legendre, 1994, p. 81).

Following M. Mauss (1931), we can draw on a metaphor stating that “children will be to the

children of others as their parents were to the parents of others” to convey the anthropological consequence of indirect reciprocity in its expression “children will do for their children what their parents did for them.”

Aware that the driving force of social action is the economy and its social structuring, we believe that the realm of the international market economy should be left to Adam Smith’s theory of the invisible hand. The central question at this level might be: how to manage spatial dispersions in a virtual environment of interactions with expertise distributed across the globe? Lévi-Strauss had identified this need for togetherness in the economy, but he highlights the tensions by studying the Nambikwara of Brazil:

*“The small nomadic bands of the Nambikwara Indians of western Brazil usually fear and avoid one another; yet at the same time they desire contact, because this provides them with the only means of engaging in exchange and thus obtaining the goods or items they lack. There is a link, a continuity, between hostile relations and the provision of reciprocal services: exchanges are wars peacefully resolved, wars are the result of unfortunate transactions” (C. Lévi-Strauss, 1967, p.78)*

This principle of reciprocity offers yet another opportunity to reflect on our fundamentally human world in terms of living together, yet one in perpetual evolution regarding the concept of socialization within a reciprocity acceptable to all.

Table 9 : A Journey Through Anthropology

Examples of relevant belief-based learning activities	Authors	References and works
From the perspective of an evolutionary theory updated by Morgan, civilization achieves effective sociocultural development through “technical inventions and discoveries,” “the concept of government,” “the concept of the family,” and “the concept of property”; and it is on the basis of these criteria for comprehensive sociocultural development that every institution must function	Lewis H. Morgan (1877)	Ancient Society, or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization

<p>With Tylor, the transition from barbarism to civilization following the savage state involves monotheism; we believe that relevant monotheism is horizontal with science (rationality) and vertical with God (faith), and it is through these orthogonal connections that we can trace positive evolution in the reversal of front lines into lines of unification.</p>	<p>Edward Burnett Tylor (1871) James George Fazer (1908)</p>	<p>-Primitive Civilization -The Golden Bough</p>
<p>Anthropology must be able to shed light in order to create intersubjectivity regarding the objective phenomena of different social structures.</p>	<p>The basis of our current reflection</p>	
<p>The anthropological perspective here would be to bring together all the sciences that study humanity in order to unify their subject matter with a social environment within the context of globalization and universalization, thereby encompassing the whole human person.</p>		

Sources: our synthesis, January 2024

Pathways of conviction are situated within a cross-construction of perspectives on otherness in the evolution of cultural intersubjectivity along ideological lines or those likely to establish boundaries such as religion (faith), politics (interpersonal, intergroup, or international power dynamics), etc.

While medium-sized cities in China serve a social function of ethnic integration (Huang Fengxian's speech, 1993, according to Bernard Hours' report) by integrating ethnic groups into the market and the city to achieve national integration, the fact remains that economic motives justify the rationale for social inclusion. This model remains more a form of symbolic integration than a source of resources for the individual's genuine fulfillment. Elsewhere, in the West for example, it is the individual's fulfillment that serves as a social function. It should be noted that the question of the effective integration of the human person is far removed from the concerns of social, cultural, and political anthropology, etc. It appears important that ideological vectors cannot build substantial reciprocity to integrate the human being into their human function beyond the simple social function that is valued or sublimated.

Our anthropological reflection invites us to understand these same social realities through a holistic (monographic) approach, certainly involving a qualitative and exhaustive analysis capable of leading to solutions that transform lines of conflict into lines of unity—that is, creating intersubjectivity regarding the objective phenomena of various social structures.

One aim would therefore be to describe general patterns within the complex networks of culture in communities, and to objectively identify models of institutions in human history capable of engaging the greatest number of people in intersubjectivity and healthy reciprocity.

To rebuild a healthy environment, ethnomethodology—in its understanding of otherness— offers a perspective for approaching anthropological currents as a source of meaning-making, from the functionalist perspective (Bronislaw Malinowski) to the ambitions of structuralism (C. Lévi-Strauss). This return to the roots of anthropology does not call into question its evolutionary thinking (H. L. Morgan, J. G. Frazer, E. Tylor, etc.), its inspiration from culturalism (M. Mead, R. Benedict, etc.), or from diffusionism (F. Ratzel, L. Frobenius, etc.). However, to better address the most problematic aspect of this trend—namely, its framing of the differential question in terms of positive and negative values—we believe that anthropology, from its evolutionary perspective, deserves special attention here.

The theory of the sociocultural evolution of humankind determines an internal dynamic. This enriches the lines of diversity and the risks of multiplying fronts against the best processes of integral acculturation: by creating civilized groups and leaving others behind, we trace lines of cultural diversity without mutual understanding; by remaining in cultural stances that run counter to progress and development, we hide within an egocentrism equally resistant to any form of mutual understanding.

While, according to E. Tylor, the transition from barbarism to civilization after the savage state involves monotheism, according to Morgan, civilization proceeds through effective sociocultural development involving “technical inventions and discoveries,” “the idea of government,” “the idea of the family,” and “the idea of property.” Furthermore, if J.G. Fazer placed the stage of “science” at the pinnacle of evolution following the “magical” stage (the failure of control through magic) and the “religious” stage (the arbitrariness of divine will), it is because he reminds us of our capacity to act upon fate (through scientific thought and technical applications).

The rational man in a theory of choice as rational for humanity can conclude that civilization would be the capacity to establish within this evolution a level of ethical culture capable of reaching the most promising level to erase the lines of division and replace them with lines of unification at all levels of sociocultural intersection.

## **XI. FROM ONE GENERATION TO THE NEXT, EDUCATION IN ACCULTURATION PROCESSES**

Finally, we focus on education for effective acculturation to explore more shared space by putting the TPACK model (M.J. Koehler and P. Mishra 2008, P. Mishra and M.J. Koehler 2006), which explores the intersection of three domains: technology (ICTs), pedagogy (models, strategies, techniques, and methods), and content (knowledge to be transmitted). The primary concern here is to articulate a pedagogy of transnational, continental, and global knowledge sharing, taking into account the virtual environment for transmitting this knowledge and the level of mastery of this knowledge. By emphasizing the globalization of education at a strategic level, it is clear that we can create spaces for the pooling of a global governance of sharing. The school will thus occupy a middle ground between the global sphere on the one hand and the family sphere and the local school institution on the other.

C. Ponsot addressed the current tensions in education in these terms:

How do children and young people engage with digital technology? How do they navigate the imaginary and the virtual? How do they deal with multiple, multifaceted identities?

What are the consequences for living together? For respect for freedoms (private and public spheres), individual rights, and equality for all?

What contribution does this make to understanding the world, personal fulfillment, and empowerment? How can we support children and young people in acquiring knowledge, skills, and the social relationships that stem from them? (C. Ponsot, 2012, p. 58)

These various tensions raised by this issue are resolved through inclusive education, overseen by global education strategists and experts via –an international linguistic platform that incorporates values from each scientific field identified here, for example–in order to foster behaviors socially adapted to the digital space of sharing. Should we, as with the separation of church and state in 1905, enact a law to separate endogenous practices from digitized universal knowledge? Or simply draw a metaphor from E. Durkheim (1912) to say that we should “synthesize the best of each religion (knowledge) to form a secular religion (universal knowledge).” Thus, we must socialize the younger generation–not necessarily through the older generation–but within a constructivist framework of a society free from the whims of tensions and crises (a perspective rooted in a scientific ethic). This is not a centralized approach to education as seen in communist, socialist, or capitalist ideologies; rather, it is a mediation of learning within a shared space facilitated by ICTs.

We take a different stance regarding the theory of the evolution of religion as articulated by E. Durkheim (1887) in his essay “On the Irreligion of the Future,” in which he emphasizes the necessity for religion to disappear as a totalizing authority over various forms of social life, thereby making way for science as the system for explaining the world. Here, making no claim to eliminate religion (it is only right to restore its vertical stature between humanity and God), we believe that the era of globalization is an era of integration and universalization (horizontal faith, in humanity, in its rationality bestowed by God and expressed through science) that can foster aspirations for a global and universal human culture through a digital culture, with ICT users in spaces of interaction to break down barriers. This means fostering a culture of understanding others through international and intercultural program content, etc., in response to

the existence of borders, to forge bonds with other generations.

It is no longer a matter of inventing rules, imposing one's own rules, or interpreting rules, but of jointly constructing rules of connection within a perspective of globalization so that human dignity may endure. People once lived well without traffic laws, but as society has evolved, we have all accepted common signs and signals to navigate our way; it is therefore possible to find common rules to preserve "humanity" within these connections.

In a form of spiritual leadership, each discipline of the humanities can, based on its own values, advocate for the elevation of peace in the minds of men. From the League of Nations to the United Nations, the spirit of achieving peace persists in the thoughts, and then places great expectations on human institutions—from socialization through education to the exercise of the right to a human or more humane citizenship.

## XII. REFERENCES

1. ALTHUSSER Louis, 1965, *For Marx*, Paris, La Découverte, 1996. DOI: 10.3917/dec.althu.2005.01
2. ARENDT, Hannah, 1961, *The Crisis of Culture: Eight Exercises in Political Thought*. Trans. Patrick Lévy, Paris, Gallimard, 1989
3. Aristotle, 1979, *Second Analytics*, trans. J. Tricot, Paris: Vrin
4. ARISTOTLE, 2014, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. (1959) J. Tricot, Ed. Les Échos du Maquis, 1(0)
5. BADIOU, Alain, 1975, *Theory of Contradiction, The Red Years*, Paris, Les Prairies ordinaires, 2012,
6. BADIOU, Alain, 1982, *Theory of the Subject*, Paris, Le Seuil
7. BADIOU, Alain, 1988, *Being and Event*, Paris, Le Seuil
8. BADIOU, Alain, 2000, *Eight Theses on the Universal, Universal, Singular, Subject*, ed. J. Sumic, Paris, Kimé, pp. 11–20
9. BAREL, Yves, 1990, "The Great Integrator," *\*Connexions\** 56, pp. 85–100
10. BOURDIEU, Pierre, 1972, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, preceded by *Three Studies in Kabyle Ethnology*, Droz, Ed. Seuil, 2000
11. BOUVIER, Alban, and CONEIN, Bernard (Eds.), 2007, *Social Epistemology: A Social Theory of Knowledge*, Paris, École des hautes études en sciences sociales
12. BOUZIDI Laïd and BOULESNANE Sabrina, 2017, *Digital Humanities: The Evolution of Uses and Practices*, *Les cahiers du numérique* 3 (13), pp. 19–38
13. CHALMERS, Alan, 1999, *\*What Is This Thing Called Science?\** (3rd ed.), Maidenhead, Open University Press
14. DAMOUR Franck, 2020, *Vernor Vinge and the Invention of the Singularity*, *Transhumanism: An Anthology*, pp. 153–169
15. DURKHEIM Émile, 1887, "On the Irreligion of the Future," *Revue philosophique* no. 23, pp. 299–311.
16. DURKHEIM Émile, 1888, *Introduction to the Sociology of the Family*, *Annals of the Faculty of Letters of Bordeaux*
17. FRAZER James George, 1908, *The Golden Bough*, trans. R. Strébel and J. Toutain, vol. II, Paris, Schleicher frères
18. GARFINKEL, Harold, 1967, *Research in Ethnomethodology*, Paris, PUF, 2007
19. GOLDMAN, Alvin I., 1999, *Knowledge in a Social World*. New York, Oxford University Press.
20. GOLMAN, Alvin I., 1999, *\*Knowledge in a Social World\**, Oxford, Clarendon Press
21. HABERMAS, Jürgen, 1962, *The Public Sphere: An Archaeology of Publicity as a Constitutive Dimension of Bourgeois Society*, Paris, Payot, reprinted 1988
22. HABERMAS, Jürgen, 1987, *Theory of Communicative Action*, coll. *The Space of the Political*, Fayard, Paris, 2 vols. Vol. I: *Rationality of Action and Rationalization of Society*, Vol. II: *Toward a Critique of Functionalist Reason*
23. HARRE Rom, 1984, *The Philosophies of Science: An Introductory Survey*, Oxford University Press
24. HERACLITUS, 1987, *Fragments*, ed. M. Conche, Paris: P.U.F
25. HOBBS, Thomas, 1651, *Leviathan*, trans. G. Mairet, Folio-Gallimard, Paris, 2000
26. HOMER, 1955, *The Iliad and The Odyssey*, Vol. 115, ed. J. Bérard and R. Flacelière
27. HOURS Bernard, 1993, *The Development of Anthropology in China: Direction, Results, Problems*. In: *Journal des anthropologues*, no. 53–55, *The Ethnologist in Social Hierarchies*, edited by Tiphaine Barthelemy and Monique Sélim. pp. 233–236
28. KANT, Emmanuel, 1947, *The Philosophy of History (Opuscles)*, translated by St. Piobetta, Paris, Aubier
29. KANT, Immanuel, 1985, *Critique of Practical Reason*, Paris, Gallimard

30. LAROCHE, Hervé & WEICK, Karl E., 1995, Sensemaking in Organizations, Sage, Thousand Oaks, California. In: *Sociologie du travail*, Vol. 38, No. 2, April–June 1996, pp. 225–232, <https://doi.org/10.3406/sotra.1996.2274>
31. LEGENDRE Pierre, (1994), *Lessons III, God in the Mirror. A Study of the Institution of Images*, Fayard, Paris.
32. LESCA Humbert, 2003, *Strategic Monitoring: The L.E.SCAning Method*, Paris, Editions EMS–management et société. <http://www.veille-strategique.org>
33. LEVINAS Emmanuel, 1978, *Beyond Being or Beyond Essence*, Paris, Le livre de poche
34. LEVI-STRAUSS Claude, 1947, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin– New York, 1967
35. LEVI-STRAUSS, Claude, 1950, "Introduction," in Marcel Mauss, *Sociology and Anthropology*, Paris, PUF
36. LEWIS H. Morgan, 1877, *Ancient Society or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization*, Ed. Bharti Library, Booksellers and Publishers, Calcutta, 1944, in Jacques Lévesque, *Introduction*, 1985
37. MASLOW Abraham, 1954, *Motivation and Personality*, Third Ed., New York, Addison–Wesley, 1987
38. MASSON–OURSEL Paul, 1949, *Thought in the East*, Paris, Colin
39. MAUSS Marcel, 1931, *Social Cohesion in Multisegmental Societies*, Paper presented at the French Institute of Sociology. Excerpt from the *Bulletin of the French Institute of Sociology*, I
40. MISHRA Punya & KOEHLER Matthew J., (2006), *Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: A Framework for Integrating Technology into Teachers' al Knowledge*.
41. MISHRA Punya & KOEHLER Matthew J., 2008, *Introducing Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge*. s.l.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City
42. MOUNIER Emmanuel, 1935, *The Personalist and Community Revolution*, Paris, Editions Montaigne
43. MOUNIER Emmanuel, 1936, *Manifesto in the Service of Personalism*, Paris, Editions Montaigne
44. NIETZSCHE Friedrich, 1882/1887, *The Gay Science*, trans. P. Klossowski, Paris, 1982
45. NIETZSCHE, Friedrich, 1994, *The Pre–Platonic Philosophers*, ed. P. D'lorio, N. Ferrand, F. Fronterotta, Combas: L'Éclat
46. ORTIGUES, Edmond, 1962, *Discourse and Symbol*, Paris, Aubier
47. PARSON Talcott, 1951, *The Social System*, New York, Free Press
48. PONSOT Cécile, 2012, "Educating in the Digital Age?" *Cahiers de l'action* no. 35, Éditions Institut national de la jeunesse et de l'éducation populaire, pp. 57–60, DOI 10.3917/cact.035.0057
49. pp. 9–96
50. RICOEUR Paul, 2000, *Memory, History, and Forgetting*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil
51. SAINT Augustine, 413, *The City of God. Books XIX–XXII: The Triumph of the Celestial City*, trans. Gustave Combès, 4th ed., 1960
52. SOLER Léna, 2000, *Introduction to Epistemology*, Paris, Ellipes
53. SPERBER, Dan, 1996, *The Contagion of Ideas*, Paris, Odile Jacob
54. STEINMO Sven, THELEN Kathleen & LONGSTRETH Frank, 1992, *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
55. TRYGGVI Örn Úlfsson, 2018, "Singularity, Universality, Genericity, and Generality in Alain Badiou," *Tracés. Revue de Sciences humaines*, no. 34, pp. 197–207
56. TYLOR, Edward Burnett, 1873, *Primitive Civilization. Volume One*, Trans. 2nd ed. Pauline Brunet, 1920
57. WALSH Roger & VAUGHAN Frances, 1993, *Paths Beyond the Ego: The Transpersonal Vision*, Tarcher Perigee, Los Angeles
58. WEICK Karl E., 1995, *Sensemaking in Organizations*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, California
59. WILBER Ken, 1979, *No Boundary*, Shambhala, Boston

*This page is intentionally left blank*