

1 **The Constitution of Society: The West versus the Rest.**

2 **Introduction**

3 America, and its vassals, Western Europe, Australia, New Zealand, South Korea,
4 Canada, Japan, the Gulf monarchies, and Zionist colony Israel revert to the assassination
5 of state leaders and bureaucrats in the Middle East, Eastern Europe, the African
6 Continent, and Latin America to topple their states and destroy their societies in order to
7 balkanize countries in those regions, topple their governments, and appropriate their
8 natural resources under the auspices of American and Western neoliberal cultural,
9 economic, and political hegemony. In this work, using Mocombeian structurationism,
10 phenomenological structuralism, to understand the constitution of societies, I attempt to
11 posit why their attempts are feasible in the rest of the world, but not in the West.

12 According to Mocombe (2019), two ontological forms of how human beings
13 would evolve to reproduce their being in the material world emerged amongst the
14 species: the Vodou Ethic and the spirit of communism (communally) and the Protestant
15 Ethic and the spirit of capitalism (individually). For Mocombe (2019, 2021b), society
16 emerged through five subsystems (mode of production, language, medium of
17 communication, ideology, and ideological apparatuses), enfram'd by one of the two
18 forms of system and social integration, constituted by those, i.e., power elites, who
19 control the materials needed for survival in a material resource framework. The five
20 subsystems are used to interpellate and socialize the human species to constitute society
21 and recursively organize and reproduce the ideas, ideals, values, and norms of the power
22 elites as enfram'd by the two forms of system and social integration, forming a duality,
23 i.e., the social structure and the internalization of the rules, norms, and values of the

24 social structure by social actors to constitute their practical consciousness. This article
25 highlights how the power elites of the West, through the Weberian notion of
26 bureaucratization and routinization, were able to harness the five subsystems to function
27 as a totality and duality to constitute their societies and subjugate its citizenry, while the
28 rest of the world were/are unable—given Western meddling in their societies—to do so,
29 which is leading to the decline of their societies and civilizations as the West assassinate
30 their power elites, which continue to embody the ideals, ideas, and values of their
31 societies as charisma, as opposed to routinizing them through the iron-cage of
32 bureaucracy, routinization, and institutionalization of the five subsystems as the West has
33 done in their societies via the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism form of system
34 and social integration.

35 **Background of the Problem**

36 Sociology is the scientific study of society and human actions. Three dominant
37 figures and their sociological approaches dominate the discipline: Max Weber, symbolic
38 interactionism; Emile Durkheim, structural functionalism; and Karl Marx, conflict theory
39 (Habermas, 1987; Giddens, 1984; Ortner, 1984). All subsequent sociological theorists
40 would build on the approaches of these three men in the discipline even though their
41 approaches are unable to adequately resolve the problematic of what determines the
42 constitution of society and human actions, i.e., the institutions of society or the rational
43 potentiality of the human actor (the structure/agency problematic) (Ortner, 1984;
44 Crothers, 2003). Mocombe, in keeping with the logic of traditional structurationism in
45 their attempt to resolve the structure/agency problematic of the aforementioned theories

46 through the concepts of duality and practical consciousness, synthesizes the three
47 positions (Ortner, 1984; Giddens, 1984; Habermas, 1987; Mocombe, 2019).

48 In Mocombeian phenomenological structural sociology, all societies in recorded
49 human history have been Durkheimian mechanical solidarities or systemicities
50 constituted based on the mode of production, power, and power relations operating
51 through five subsystems, i.e., mode of production, communicative discourse, language,
52 ideology, and ideological apparatuses, to constitute society as both a dualism and duality
53 enframened by one of two forms of system or social integration, i.e., the Protestant Ethic
54 and the spirit of capitalism or the Vodou Ethic and the spirit of communism (Mocombe,
55 2016, 2019, 2025, 2025a). It is upon this theoretical assumption that all theories of
56 society and human actions must commence. This notion of Western societies, as
57 Durkheimian organic solidarities, representing a break from all primitive societies in
58 recorded history, which according to Durkheim were mechanical, according to
59 Mocombe, is an ideological (economic) myth perpetuated by the sociological
60 imaginations of Western bourgeois intellectuals such as Durkheim, Parsons, and
61 Habermas, amongst many others (Ortner, 1984; Crothers, 2003; Mocombe, 2016, 2019,
62 2021a, 2021b, 2025, 2025a).

63 Contemporary (bourgeois) sociology in the West assumes that Western (neo)
64 liberal (capitalist) democracy, which is an organic solidarity in the Durkheimian sense,
65 represents the nature of reality as such by which all human societies ought to be
66 constituted, and agential initiatives determined (the end of history thesis made famous by
67 Fukuyama). The focus in the academy, as highlighted in structuration theory, becomes
68 one of integrating the power and power relations, as highlighted by Marxian conflict

69 theorists, via identity politics and negative dialectical thinking, by which the latter
70 (Western liberal democracy) is constituted for an understanding of societal constitution
71 that focuses on how rational human beings use symbols to create meaning and interact
72 with each other in institutions in their everyday lives to recursively (re) organize and
73 reproduce society as an organic whole or solidarity where conflicts of differing interests
74 are resolved dialectically and negative dialectically, i.e., reconciling or synthesizing
75 contradictions and or conflicts, for (rational) social cohesion and total freedom (i.e., in
76 the Hegelian sense). Academically, this latter position is usually juxtaposed against so-
77 called primitive societies, which are said to be Durkheimian mechanical solidarities
78 where social actors are forced, through social norms and mores, to internalize and
79 recursively organize and reproduce the same actions and beliefs (of the collective
80 conscience) in their daily practices. On these three assumptions (conflict, social cohesion,
81 and interaction) regarding the constitution of Western liberal democratic societies, in
82 relation to so-called primitive societies, three independent major approaches or
83 paradigms in Western academia would emerge amongst bourgeois academics to dominate
84 sociological theory: structural functionalism, conflict theory, and symbolic interactionism
85 (Ortner, 1984; Crothers, 2003).

86 Symbolic interactionism is a microlevel approach that focuses on symbols and
87 how (rational) people interact with each other by recursively (re) organizing and
88 reproducing these symbols (and their meanings) in their everyday lives to constitute
89 society and social relationships based on shared meanings and understandings. Structural
90 functionalism and conflict theories are macrolevel approaches, which focus on the
91 constitution of society from the perspective of institutions. Structural functionalism

92 views society as a cohesive whole with interdependent parts, i.e., people, institutions,
93 etc., which contribute to society's functioning as an organic whole.

94 Whereas structural functionalists emphasize the social cohesiveness of society;
95 conflict theory, on the contrary, highlights competition between unequal groups (racial,
96 cultural, class, etc.) and power as the basis for the constitution and ever-changing nature
97 of societal institutions. In the West, all three perspectives, and their methodological
98 approaches (quantitative, qualitative, and mix-methods), are incorporated in the research
99 process to suggest that in the aggregate they represent the scientific and universal basis
100 upon which societal and human agential constitutions are determined, studied, and
101 understood in the field of sociology.

102 All three perspectives, whether independently or synthesized as highlighted in
103 contemporary structurationist sociology to explain the constitution of so-called primitive
104 and Western societies, are problematic from the standpoint of human social agency and
105 the constitution of society, however (Ortner, 1984; Crothers, 2003). Symbolic
106 interactionism emphasizes the actions of individuals and the meanings they attribute to
107 those actions as the basis for the constitution of society at the expense of the overarching
108 structures, i.e., institutions, social relations, etc., which stabilize and give individuals their
109 practical activities. Structural functionalism highlights the cohesiveness of the groups in
110 society at the expense of differentiating actions and conflicts amongst and between them.
111 Conversely, conflict theory emphasizes the power and power relations between and
112 amongst groups and their emerging conflicts at the expense of their social cohesion.
113 These individual problems are not resolved when synthesized as is done by Western
114 scholars to represent Western (neo) liberal democracy, against so-called primitive

115 societies, as a paragon of the sociological imagination; instead, the agency problematic,
116 just as in primitive societies, becomes more profound as it is difficult for scholars to draw
117 the distinction between where social structure is determinant versus human agency.

118 Moreover, since the 1960's with the advent of postmodern and post-structural
119 theories into the theoretical discourses of social science academics, given the shift from
120 industrial to postindustrial societies, a new struggle regarding the origins and nature of
121 agency, identity, and consciousness vis-à-vis the aforementioned (agential and societal)
122 sociological problematics regarding the constitution of society and the individual has
123 dominated social science and philosophical theories. The issue centers on several factors
124 raised by postmodern and post-structural thinkers in the likes of Michel Foucault, Jacques
125 Derrida, and Jacques Lacan against the structuralism of the sciences, 1) they question the
126 validity regarding the Cartesian rational individual, which Foucault and Derrida deny in
127 favor of their attempt to dissolve the subject altogether; 2) they question the
128 interdependency of the constitution of a stable structure and a distinct subject with
129 agency, in denying the latter they undermine the former; 3) they question the status of
130 science; 4) finally, they question the possibility of the objectivity of any language of
131 description or analysis.

132 Although these four factors raised in the writings of Jacques Lacan, Jacques
133 Derrida, and Michel Foucault, amongst many other scholars trying to understand social
134 actions in postindustrial societies, are theoretically legitimate and have posed tremendous
135 problems for the social sciences and their constitution as a science based on the notion of
136 a stable structure constituted by stable (rational) subjects with agency. These problems
137 have not adequately been addressed by Marxist social theorists in the social sciences like

138 Louis Althusser, Pierre Bourdieu, Jürgen Habermas, Anthony Giddens, and Marshall
139 Sahlin working, under the umbrella of structurationist sociology (Giddens's term), to
140 resolve this structure/agency issue by attempting to synthesize the rationality of the
141 individual with the phenomenological discourses of the former theorists, and Marxist and
142 structural Marxist philosophy.

143 Against the absurdity of postmodern and post-structural thought, which denies
144 rationality to the human subject or a stable structure, the structure/agency debate in the
145 social sciences, from a structurationist perspective, emphasize the rational origins, vis-à-
146 vis a stable structure, of the reproduced and transformed social actions of social actors
147 that constitute a social structure or society. Two questions are raised from this
148 standpoint: are social actors determined and driven by internal (rational) invariable
149 structures of the mind (Lévi-Strauss, 1963; Bell, 1985 [1982]), or are social actors
150 automats determined and driven by external relational structures of signification
151 (Parsons, 1951; Althusser, 2001 [1971]))? Thus, in the social scientific form of the
152 debate, biological determinism, i.e., innate senses of anything, as well as the Lévi-
153 Straussian sense, i.e., innate structure of the mind, were out rightly rejected. Also, the
154 idea that social actors are irreducibly situated subjects who act and react based on rational
155 calculations as they respond to particular external social processes (social structure) or
156 stimuli was for the most part dismissed. Total rationality was viewed as an impossibility
157 given the inability of social actors to either know all the choices available to them in the
158 present or know the complete future outcomes of those choices. This made rationality
159 necessarily relative to a frame of reference or structure of signification, which rejects the

160 ontology of the indeterminacy of meaning and decentered subject of postmodern/post-
161 structural theorizing.

162 Hence, the focus in the study of action and interaction in the social sciences via
163 structurationism was thus not a matter of denying or minimizing the rational potential of
164 social actors as postmodern and post-structural thinkers do, but expressed rather an
165 urgent need to understand where ‘the system’ or structure that limits their knowledge and
166 stabilizes society “comes from—how it is produced and reproduced, and how it may have
167 changed in the past or be changed in the future” (Ortner, 1984, pg. 146). In other words,
168 structurationist thinkers plagued by this debate, sought “to explain the relationship(s) that
169 obtain between human action, on the one hand, and some global entity which we may call
170 the system, [or social structure, structure, or culture] on the other” (Ortner, 1984, pg.
171 148), when the latter (i.e., the system) is not a necessary reflection of neither biology, nor
172 the structure of the mind, but an external force of socially constructed rules of conduct,
173 i.e., categorical boundaries, that stabilizes society and thereby constitute the identity of
174 social actors as argued by Talcott Parsons and Louis Althusser.

175 From roughly 1975 to the present, an enormous strand of critical writings,
176 expounding a great many strands of theoretical schools of thought, combined to challenge
177 this post-World War II structuralist matrix which denied alternative agencies, outside the
178 relational logic of a structure, system, or culture to social actors. Some were advanced by
179 rationalist thinkers seeking to preserve the idea of individuals as solitary thinkers who act
180 in a purposive rational way, while others were offered by theorists dedicated to
181 preserving the tenets of structural-functionalism and structural-Marxism (conflict theory)
182 while explicating the functional role of difference or the variability of practices amongst

183 social actors within social structure not as an invariable by-product of the mind but as an
184 external unified structure of signification or system and its differentiation. Considering
185 this action-oriented response to account for the different provinces of meaning within
186 systems or structures of signification, the term praxis or structurationist (Giddens' term)
187 theorists will serve as the dominant label for the arguments expounded in opposition to
188 the idealism of postmodernism and post-structuralism, symbolic interactionism,
189 Parsonian structural-functionalism, and variants of structural Marxism by prominent
190 theorists such as Pierre Bourdieu, Marshall Sahlins, Anthony Giddens, and Jürgen
191 Habermas (Crothers, 2003; Ortner, 1984). These arguments are complex, and to examine
192 them together is necessarily to do violence to the purity of notions advanced separately
193 by various authors. The exercise is nevertheless useful at least for revealing their main
194 and common objective, i.e., to resolve the structure/agency debate of the social sciences.

195 *The Structurationist Response and its Problems*

196 Structural-functionalists and Structural-Marxists (conflict theorists) in attempting
197 to understand social action (i.e., praxis) within social structures of signification privilege
198 social relations, structural differentiation, and reproduction via linguistic and symbolic
199 representation over biological determining elements (i.e., race, sex, etc.), for meaning,
200 human action, and consciousness constructions. In doing so, however, they fail to
201 account for the origins and nature of the different provinces of meaning, human action,
202 and consciousness existing within, but at the same time, outside the relational or
203 dialectical prescribed logic of the social structure (structural reproduction and
204 differentiation), which is of one of two types, the Vodou Ethic and the spirit of
205 communism and the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism (Mocombe, 2019). Neo-

206 structuralists or structurationists in the likes of Pierre Bourdieu (1990 [1980], 1984) with
207 his theory of practice (habitus or constructivist structuralism), Marshall Sahlins (1976,
208 1995 [1981]) through mythopraxis, Anthony Giddens (1984) through his theory of
209 structuration, and Jürgen Habermas (1987 [1981], 1984 [1981]) with his theory of
210 “communicative action,” however, attempt to do just that, “explain the relationship(s)
211 that obtain between human action, on the one hand, and some global entity which we
212 may call the system, [or social structure, structure, or culture] on the other” in order to
213 capture the nature of social action, reproduction, transformation, and differentiation
214 within structures of signification. They attempt to do so, for the most part, through “the
215 central notion of the ‘duality of structure’ which refers to ‘the essential recursiveness of
216 social life, as constituted in social practices: structure is both medium and outcome of the
217 reproduction of practices’” (Archer, 1985, pg. 60). That is, structures are not only
218 external to social actors, but are internal rules and resources (“form of consciousness”)
219 produced and reproduced by actors “unconsciously” (intuitively) in their practices. From
220 this perspective, accordingly, structure, i.e., culture or, sociological speaking, social
221 structure, “may set conditions to the historical process, but it is dissolved and
222 reformulated in material practice, so that history becomes the realization, in the form of
223 society, of the actual [(embodied rules)] resources people put into play” (Sahlins, 1995
224 [1981], pg. 7). In this understanding, the structure is not an epiphenomenon of the
225 structure of the mind but is a result of the internalization by social actors of external
226 (social structural) rules of conduct which are sanctioned, recursively (re) organized,
227 reproduced, and differentiated in material practice. Thus, social structure, human action,

228 meaning, and consciousness are mutually constituted and united together as “practical
229 consciousness,” i.e., a duality.

230 Ostensibly, like symbolic interactionism, structuralism, structural functionalism,
231 and structural Marxism, the structurationist response to account for the nature of human
232 action within structures of signification by collapsing structure with agency through the
233 notion of duality, however, is also problematic. That is, the central notion of the duality
234 of structure prevents praxis theorists from accounting for the origins and relational nature
235 of the variability of praxis or “practical consciousnesses” within a particular structure of
236 signification. That is to say, the part/whole dialectic of the “duality” concept cannot
237 account for the origins of alternative “practical consciousnesses” that arises as a result of
238 three other structuring structures: 1) the drives and sensibilities (anatomy and physiology)
239 of the body and brain, 2) the drives and impulses, phenomenal properties, qualia, of
240 embodied recycled/entangled/superimposed subatomic particles, psychions, and 3) the
241 praxes arising from the human ability to defer meaning in ego-centered communicative
242 discourse during the internalization process as suggested by postmodern and post-
243 structural theory (Mocombe, 2016). In essence, structurationists are only able to account
244 for the dialectic of 4) structural reproduction and differentiation stemming from the
245 means and mode of production of a society and their ideological apparatuses, which, as
246 previously mentioned, is of one of two types: the Vodou Ethic and the spirit of
247 communism (communally) and the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism
248 (individually) (Mocombe, 2016, 2018, 2021). According to Mocombe (2016), the power
249 elites seek to promote this duality regardless of the type of system/social integration (the

250 Vodou Ethic and the spirit of communism or the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of
251 capitalism) by which society is constituted.

252 **Theory and Method**

253 Mocombeian phenomenological structuralism (phenomenological structural
254 sociology) resolves the structurationist agential problematic. Mocombe's
255 structurationism, like traditional structurationist theory, is a sociological theory that views
256 the constitution of society, human identity, and social agency as a duality and dualism.
257 The paradigm posits that societal and agential constitution are a result of power relations,
258 interpellation, and socialization or embourgeoisement via five (sub) systems, i.e., mode
259 of production, language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative
260 discourse, which are constituted and reified within two dominant (ontological) types (the
261 Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism or the Vodou Ethic and the spirit of
262 communism) of system/social structure—or what Mocombe (2019, 2025) calls a “social
263 class language game” by persons, power elites, who control the means and modes of
264 production in a material resource framework—determined by the specie's responses to
265 the material resource framework. Culture is the characteristics placed, by those who
266 control the material resources in a particular material resource framework, on the two
267 (ontological) forms of system and social integration, which are metaphors for how the
268 human species satisfies its material needs (communally or a Hobbesian struggle of all
269 against all for individual wealth, i.e., capital) in the material framework that is the earth.
270 Once interpellated and socialized (or embourgeoisied in neoliberal capitalism) by these
271 five subsystems, which are reified as a social structure and society, social actors
272 recursively organize, reproduce, and are differentiated by the rules of conduct of the

273 social structure, which are sanctioned by the power elites (rentier oligarchs in neoliberal
274 capitalism) who control the means and modes of production, language, ideology,
275 ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse in a material resource framework.
276 Hence, societal and agential constitution are both duality and dualism: a dualism given
277 the reification of the social structure or the constitution of society via the five subsystems
278 by those who control the means and modes of production in a material resource
279 framework; and a duality given the internalization of the rules of the five subsystems,
280 which become the (structurally differentiated) agential initiatives or praxes (practical
281 consciousness) of social actors. Difference, or alternative social praxis, in Mocombe's
282 structuration theory, phenomenological structuralism, is not structural differentiation
283 revealed by praxis as articulated by traditional structurationists; instead, it is a result of
284 actions arising from the deferment of meaning and ego-centered communication given
285 the interaction of two other structuring structures (physiological drives of the body and
286 brain; and phenomenal properties of subatomic, carrier, particles that constitute the
287 human subject) during the interpellation and socialization or embourgeoisement of social
288 actors throughout their life span or cycle, which produces alternative praxis that is
289 exercised at the expense of the threat these practices may pose to the ontological security
290 of social actors in the social structure or society. These alternative praxes occur in both
291 forms of system and social integration of the human species and become structurally
292 differentiated in order to (relationally) define the norms, values, ideas, and ideals of the
293 two by their respective power elites.

294 Hence, Mocombe's theoretical (structural Marxist) framework is a universal
295 framework that makes no gender, racial, or ethnic distinctions in its application. Gender,

296 racial, and ethnic (so-called intersectional) identities are structurally differentiated serial
297 identities that do not, necessarily, offer alternative praxes (form of system and social
298 integration) to the current dominant social class language game, i.e., the Protestant Ethic
299 and the spirit of capitalism; instead, they are standpoint theories not alternative
300 ontological forms of system or social integration. To serve as a counter-hegemonic
301 different form of system and social integration, the serial identities would have to
302 experience structural differentiation within the alternative form of system and social
303 integration from which they originally were differentiated. That is, if they were
304 constituted and reified within the practices of the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of
305 capitalism, to serve as an alternative to the latter they would have to be interpellated,
306 constituted, and reified within the Vodou Ethic and the spirit of communism form of
307 system and social integration, which would make their practical consciousness
308 incommensurable with the practices of the latter. The reverse also holds true; serial
309 identities differentiated with the ontology of the Vodou Ethic and the spirit of
310 communism to serve as an alternative counterhegemonic praxis would have to be
311 interpellated, constituted, and reified within the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of
312 capitalism.

313 **Discussion and Conclusion**

314 America and the West in relation to the rest of the world attempts, through
315 military force, to prevent other civilizations from institutionalizing the five subsystems
316 within the Vodou Ethic and the spirit of communism in favor of their bureaucratization,
317 routinization, and institutionalization of them within the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of
318 capitalism, which they have successfully accomplished as a duality locally in their own

319 society's and globally through neoliberal globalization. That is to say, the West and
320 America have achieved mastery, through the concept of duality via the five subsystems,
321 and subjugating their masses to the dualism of the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of
322 capitalism, which has been reified, against any variations of the Vodou Ethic and the
323 spirit of communism, as the nature of reality as such by which individual social actors
324 should recursively organize and reproduce their being-in-the-world. In which case,
325 America, and its vassals, Western Europe, Australia, New Zealand, South Korea, Canada,
326 Japan, and zionist colony Israel revert to the assassination of state leaders and bureaucrats
327 in the Middle East, Eastern Europe, the African Continent, and Latin America to topple
328 their states and destroy their societies in order to balkanize countries in those regions,
329 homogenize them, topple their governments, and steal their natural resources.

330 This latter move of decapitation strikes by the West, contemporarily, is made
331 more viable due to the Weberian notion of societal transition from traditional societies to
332 modern industrial urban societies. Whereas the leaders of the West were able to
333 institutionalize and routinize their ideals, ideas, norms, and values through the
334 institutionalization and routinization of these ideas, ideals, norms, and values via the five
335 subsystems as bureaucracies, and achieve duality locally and globally. In the rest of the
336 world, societies, with the exceptions of Russia, China, and Iran, became stuck in the
337 Weberian charismatic stage of development, unable to institutionalize (routinize) their
338 ideals, ideas, norms, and values because of the militarization of the West. In other words,
339 through the Weberian notion of bureaucratization and routinization of the charisma of
340 their power elites, the West was able to harness and reify the five subsystems to function
341 as a totality to constitute their societies and subjugate its citizenry and achieve duality

342 (the internalization by social agents of the ideas, ideals, norms, and values of the social
343 structure as their practical consciousness), while the rest of the world were/are unable,
344 given Western meddling in their societies, to do so, which is leading to the decline of
345 their societies and civilizations as the West assassinate their power elites, which continue
346 to embody the ideals, ideas, and values of their societies in the form of charisma as
347 opposed to routinizing them through the iron-cage of bureaucracy and institutionalization
348 as the West has done through their reification of the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of
349 capitalism as the nature of reality as such by which social agents must recursively
350 organize and reproduce their being-in-the-world for their ontological security. Hence,
351 older civilizations such as Russia, China, and Iran, unlike many others, are able to avert
352 the decapitation strikes and ensure the survival of their societies given their abilities, like
353 the West, to reify and harness the five subsystems and constitute their societies as
354 dualities. In the rest of the world, the West decapitates their leaders and balkanize their
355 societies to prevent any alternative to the global routinization, institutionalization, and
356 bureaucratization of the Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism.

REFERENCES CITED

- Anderson, Tim (2020). “The Big Bang may be a Black Hole Inside Another Universe,”
retrieved from www.medium.com, accessed 27 July 2020.
- Archer, M. S. (1985). “Structuration versus Morphogenesis.” In H.J. Helle and S.N. Eisenstadt (Eds.), *Macro-Sociological Theory: Perspectives on Sociological Theory* (Volume 1) (pp. 58-88). United Kingdom: J.W. Arrowsmith Ltd.
- Blackburn, Simon (1994). *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (Richard Nice, Trans.). Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In J.E. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241–258). Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1990). *The Logic of Practice* (Richard Nice, Trans.). California: Stanford University Press.
- Chalmers, D. J. (1995). Facing up to the problem of consciousness. *J. Conscious. Stud.*, 2, 200–219.
- Chalmers, D. J. (1996). *The conscious mind: In search of a fundamental theory*. Oxford University Press.
- Chalmers, D. J. (2000). “What is a neural correlate of consciousness?,” in *Neural Correlates of Consciousness: Empirical and Conceptual Questions*, ed. T. Metzinger (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press), 17–39.

- Chalmers, D. J. (2006). "Strong and weak emergence," in *The Reemergence Of Emergence*, ed P. Clayton and P. Davies (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press), 244–255.
- Chen, Y. and Zhang, J. (2021). How Energy Supports Our Brain to Yield Consciousness: Insights From Neuroimaging Based on the Neuroenergetics Hypothesis. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, 15 (648860), doi:10.3389/fnsys.2021.648860.
- Cohen, J. (2002). *Protestantism and Capitalism: The Mechanisms of Influence*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Crothers, C. (2003). "Technical Advances in General Sociological Theory: The Potential Contribution of Post-Structurationist Sociology." *Perspectives*, 26: (3), 3-6.
- Diop, C. A. (1981). *Civilization or Barbarism: An Authentic Anthropology*. New York: Lawrence Hill Books.
- Gauthier, Richard (2020). "Big Bangs Created by Unicon Particles from a Conscious Quantum Field—Towards the Next Scientific Revolution," retrieved from <https://www.academia.edu>, accessed 1 April 2020.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1987). *The Theory of Communicative Action: Lifeworld And System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason* (Volume 2, Thomas McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the Rationalization of Society* (Volume 1, Thomas McCarthy, Trans.). Boston:

- Beacon Press.
- Hameroff, Stuart and Roger Penrose (2014). "Consciousness in the Universe: A Review of the 'Orch OR' theory." *Physics of Life Reviews*, 11: 39-78.
- Holloway, Joseph E. (ed.) (1990a). *Africanisms in American Culture*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Holloway, Joseph E. (1990b). The Origins of African-American Culture. In Joseph Holloway (Ed.), *Africanisms in American Culture* (19-33). Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Horkheimer, Max and Theodor W. Adorno (2000 [1944]). *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (John Cumming, Trans.). New York: Continuum.
- Hudson, Kenneth and Andrea Coukos (2005). The Dark Side of the Protestant Ethic: A Comparative Analysis of Welfare Reform. *Sociological Theory* 23 (1): 1-24.
- James, CLR (1986). *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L' Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*. Vintage
- Kurtz, Lester R. (2007). *Gods in the Global Village: The World's Religions in Sociological Perspective*. California: Sage Publications.
- Lukács, Georg (1971). *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics* (Rodney Livingstone, Trans.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Lukács, Georg (2000). *A Defence of History and Class Consciousness: Tailism and the Dialectic* (Esther Leslie, Trans.). London and New York: Verso.
- Marcuse, Herbert (1964). *One-Dimensional Man*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Marcuse, Herbert (1974). *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud*. Boston: Beacon Press.

- Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels (1964). *The Communist Manifesto*. London, England: Penguin Books.
- Marx, Karl (1992 [1867]). *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy* (Volume 1, Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling, Trans.). New York: International Publishers.
- Marx, Karl (1998 [1845]). *The German Ideology*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- McFadden, Johnjoe (2020). “Integrating Information in the Brain’s EM Field: the cemi Field Theory of Consciousness”, *Neuroscience of Consciousness* 6 (1): 1-13.
- McMichael, Philip (2008). *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective*. Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications.
- Mocombe, P. C. (2025). “Psychonic A Priori Truths”, *J International Neurology and Neurological Research*: 1(1) 04, DOI: IJNNR-RA-25-004.
- Mocombe, P.C. (2025a). “The Consciousness Field and the Refutation of Kantian Epistemology”, *Philosophy Study*: 15(2), 83-90, doi: 10.17265/2159 5313/2025.02.004.
- Mocombe, P. C. (2021a). Consciousness field theory. *Archives in Neurology & Neuroscience*, 9 (4), 1-6.
- Mocombe, P. C. (2021b). The consciousness field. *Advances in Bioengineering & Biomedical Science Research*, 5 (1), 11-16.
- Mocombe, Paul C. (2019). *The Theory of Phenomenological Structuralism*. United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Mocombe, Paul C. (2016). *The Vodou Ethic and the Spirit of Communism: The Practical Consciousness of the African People of Haiti*. Maryland: University Press of America.

- Mocombe, Paul C. (2009). *The Soul-less Souls of Black Folk: A Sociological Reconsideration of Black Consciousness as Du Boisian Double Consciousness*. Maryland: University Press of America.
- Ortner, S. (1984). "Theory in Anthropology Since the Sixties," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26: 126-66.
- Russell, B. (1945). *The History of Western Philosophy*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Sahlins, Marshall (1995a). *How "Natives" Think: About Captain Cook, For Example*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sahlins, Marshall (1995b). *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Sahlins, Marshall (1990). "The Political Economy of Grandeur in Hawaii from 1810 1830." In Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney (Ed.), *Culture through Time: Anthropological Approaches* (pp. 26-56). California: Stanford University Press.
- Sahlins, Marshall (1989). "Captain Cook at Hawaii," *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 98; 4: 371-423.
- Sahlins, Marshall (1985). *Islands of History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sahlins, Marshall (1982). "The Apotheosis of Captain Cook." In Michel Izard and Pierre Smith (Eds.), *Between Belief and Transgression* (pp. 73-102). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sahlins, Marshall (1976). *Culture and Practical Reason*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Thomson, G. (2004). *On Modern Philosophy*. Canada: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Van Lommel, Pim (2010). *Consciousness Beyond Life: The Science of the Near-Death*

Experience. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Weber, Max (1958 [1904-1905]). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*

(Talcott Parsons, Trans.). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN JNHST