



“Ideodiversity as a planetary value”

Enthusiasm for one’s own favourite political, economic or religious ideology, may inspire a total commitment to spread and make prosper this preferred ideology and, if possible, to make it obtain an absolute victory.

What may disappear in that case is the ‘ideodiversity’ which was the very precondition for conceiving and developing the now victorious ideology, and which will always be needed as a source of adjustments, correctives and alternatives when local or global conditions evolve. If ‘ideodiversity’ is accepted as a planetary value, it will be necessary to search and develop educative, administrative and legal tools to protect and promote it, just as, in the last few decades, educative, administrative and legal tools have been successfully developed to protect and promote biodiversity. The long-term perspective is that a country finds a healthy balance between cultural integrity and sufficient space for ideodiversity. Ideodiversity needs to be taught in secondary education, where its absence is most distressing. A double immediate positive result of teaching ideodiversity at secondary schools can be expected: “bullying” will be prevented and students will be less vulnerable to foundationalist radicalization. As is well known, it is difficult to engage with a radicalized individual or community (see, for instance, the experiences of the special committee for this purpose in France: www.interieur.gouv.fr/SG-CIPDR/), without to some extent entering into their worldview, speaking their language, and, when it is necessary to restrain them for the well-being of others, even to use the weapons they are using. The importance of the concept of “ideodiversity” lies herein that it allows the framing of a formula to check radicalization *from within* a tradition, without having recourse to specific judgements from outside. Otherwise, strictly from within a single tradition, it is impossible to distinguish between healthy enthusiasm for one’s tradition and dangerously radicalized fanaticism.

Here are examples of such a formula in different languages:

English: As long as we can appreciate ideodiversity, our enthusiasm is not yet fanatical.

Dutch: Zolang wij ideodiversiteit kunnen waarderen is ons enthousiasme nog niet fanatiek.

French: Tant que nous pouvons apprécier l'idéodiversité, notre enthousiasme n'est pas encore fanatique.

German: Solange wir die Ideodiversität schätzen können, ist unsere Begeisterung noch nicht fanatisch.

Spanish: Mientras podamos valorar la ideodiversidad, nuestro entusiasmo aún no es fanático.

Arabic:

بينما يمكننا تقدير التعددية الفكرية، فإن حماسنا لم يصبح متعصباً

Hebrew:

כל עוד נוכל להעריך את מגוון הדעות, ההתלהבות שלנו איננה פאנטיקה.

Turkish: İdeoçeşitliliği değerlendirebildiğimiz sürece, bu heyecanımız henüz fanatik



Russian: Пока мы можем ценить идео-разнообразие, наш энтузиазм еще не фанатичен.

Hindi: मैं आप से बहुत प्रभावित हूँ, आप मुझे बहुत कुछ सिखाए हैं।

[illegible]

Read the abstracts (in English, French, Spanish, etc.) of a recent article on Ideodiversity as a planetary value:

Ideodiversity – Summary Arabic

Ideodiversity – Summary Chinese

Ideodiversity – Summary Greek

Ideodiversity – Summary Hebrew

Ideodiversity – Summary Russian

Ideodiversity - SANGRAHA - Sanskrit

Ideodiversity – Summary Swahili

(Un grand merci à tous ceux qui nous ont aidé pour les traductions et les ajustements des traductions; corrections, suggestions for improvement and additional translations are most welcome)

Exploring the Past



Wars, rebellions, revolutions, have attracted the attention of many generations of historians. Periods of peace and progress may have left less tangible traces than major violent events, but they need to be explored as well: what were the conditions for peace and for material, cultural and intellectual progress?

Which were periods of intellectual progress and which were periods of stagnation (such as the “stagnation A” of Randall Collins, 1998, *The Sociology of Philosophies*, pp. 501-2)?

Finally, is it possible to discover principles or patterns that can be “translated” to the present and applied to analyzing and understanding modern times?

Have there been periods rich in ideodiversity or in which ideodiversity was suppressed or absent and what was the background and impact of these conditions?