

The Last End and Responsibility at Saint Thomas Aquinas

KAINDA KITENGE Moise¹, NKOMBA KALENGA Liliane², NGOIE KANTUMOYA Gaston³

^{1,2}Higher Education and Technical Institute of LIKASI, Basic Science Department, Kasongo Michel Road, Likasi, Democratic Republic of Congo

³Higher education and technical institute of LIKASI, Basic Science Department
Kasongo Michel Road, Likasi, Democratic Republic of Congo
espoir4kant[at]gmail.com

Abstract: *The gist of our subject lies in the vision, which still remains embarrassing and confused, of the final end which from the outset appears to be uniquely spiritual in the sole image of Christianity. Apart from that, there is abundant material around it, such as the final end of human thought, of human action, of its initiatives, etc. So at first glance, some would believe and think in the evangelical sense. Usually, human idiosyncrasies are sidelined. With that, we take courage in insisting that everyone thinks of the last end of our actions, before any implementation, with an emphasis on actions politically posed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It is this sense of irresponsibility that characterizes the Congolese, which pushes us to associate at the last end, the notion of responsibility, which can play the role of living consciousness and mental, individual projection on the outcomes of any human action in general and political in particular, which, in the end, disastrously destroys and disorients the thinking of almost all civil servants, both public and private.*

Keywords: responsibility, final end, freedom, bliss, consciousness

1. Introduction

Our article is based on the notion of last end and responsibility. Responsibility is one of the things that man admits with too much pain. He's still trying to figure out who to cast the spell at. We will no doubt give a light to this man, to tell him that responsibility is not a will, but on the contrary, a condition which, once not assumed, would imply a depreciation, a devaluation human, social discredit.

As for the last end, man cannot strive for it without freedom, as well as responsibility towards himself, others and nature in general.

2. Theoretical aspects

By complexity of freedom, we see with Emmanuel LEVINAS that to command is to act on a will which is a way of acting genuinely on what offers not only great resistance, but absolute resistance. It's not the one who works, who moves matter or the one who makes war, but the one who commands in war [1].

He goes on to say, "Responsibility has meaning for each other which later establishes the purpose of subjectivity. Being responsible does not mean protecting yourself or hiding, but on the other hand discovering yourself, because responsibility is conceivable only in relation to the subject. Something that does not exist in our great men who block development [1].

Emmanuel LÉVINAS, is not far from African thought, posed by UGIRASHEBUJA according to which "the life of the individual can only be envisaged in this living together where the person willingly renounces his individuality in

order to bond as closely as possible to clan. Leaving man alone is doomed to death. The "Cogito ergo sum" is by far the foundation of African anthropology. But the "Cognati sum ergo sum" to say that we are related or related and that is why we exist and can we call ourselves bantu, human people. Each member of the community has this duty to give bumuntu to each one to contribute to the maintenance of the prosperity of this African life" [2].

A question is addressed to Emmanuel LÉVINAS by Philippe NÉMO: others are not responsible to me? He answers: maybe, but this is his business, the intersubjective relationship is a non-symmetrical relationship. In this sense, I am responsible for others without waiting for reciprocity.

This, cost life said he, ferocity; it is his business, it is to the extent that between others and my relationship is not reciprocal that I am subject to others, and I am subject essentially in this sense. It's me who takes it all. He supports this idea with a famous phrase from DOSTOEVSKY: "we are all capable of all in front of all, and I more than others" [3]. .

Likewise, this thought is seriously supported for Martin Buber when he affirms that "the human being is essentially homo dialogus, and cannot be accomplished without communing with humanity" [4].

Not only that Martin BUBER reveals a worthless I in the absence of You, but he stipulates that "the notion of responsibility is to be brought back from the domain of an autonomous ethics, of a duty floating freely in the air, to that of life lived " [4].

Driven by the desire to live well, the ethical self becomes an all-available self. Finally, a good life is one that unfolds as it

should unfold humanly speaking. Martin Buber goes on to say, "The man to whom I say You, I have no empirical knowledge of him. But I am in relation with him in the sanctuary of the word principle I You" [4].

Hans Jonas, following Saint Thomas, will enrich our thinking by attesting that "political leaders must therefore allow the presence of men on earth in an indefinite future. Never should the existence or essence of man in his integrity be ignited in threats from the air. Act in such a way that the effects of your action are compatible with the relevance of an authentically human life on earth" [5]. Thing experienced unlike con go. Humanity is reduced to nothing, not even to plant life.

From the bliss, we will remember that it identifies with the perfect good and the happiness to which everything agrees, says Aristotle in his ethics in NICOMACHE [6].

There is a divergence when it comes to defining happiness itself. Aristotle asks himself questions: is there only one form of happiness or several? If there are several, what are they? Aristotle's answer is not dogmatic: he recognizes that everyone conceives happiness according to their own life. So many lives, so many different happinesses. In particular, there will be happiness for the crowd and rude people: this happiness will reside in pleasure.

But there will also be happiness for the elite and men of action: happiness for example. And above all these earthly pleasures, Aristotle and Saint Thomas with him, the most great and unique happiness for everyone. Like the teachers in the DRC who must abandon their differing salaries from parents, for the only one, which would come from the state as supreme good.

By choosing himself, man chooses humanity. This means that, for Sartre, we cannot choose evil, we cannot choose to be a human. What we choose is always good. Nothing can be good for us without being good for all. So the Congolese politicians, by deciding to lead, decide to satisfy all the Congolese and not themselves. This applies to any leader in different institutions of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Unlike Saint Thomas, Emmanuel LEVINAS affirms that "the will can receive the order of another will only because it finds this order in itself" [3].

Plato meanwhile, "as a chef, no chef offers and orders what is useful to himself, but what is useful to whomever he commands"[3]. To command is therefore to do the will of the one who obeys. The heteronomous appearance of command is, in reality, only autonomy, since freedom to command is not blind force, but reasonable thinking. What our authorities misunderstand. "If someone asks me what political philosophy is, I would therefore answer that it does not consist in saying what must be, nor in dreaming the experience of a first community, but in diagnosing what is wrong. and or what is better, that is to say diagnose mutilated and degraded forms of life " [7]. Which brings us back to the notion of responsibility.

To be responsible is to value the principle of one for the other or the rand for the subordinate and vice versa. Emmanuel LEVINAS goes further, to the point where he has to be responsible for even what he does not want. Jean Paul SARTRE adds that "man, being condemned to be free, carries the weight of the whole world on his shoulders; he is responsible for the world and for himself as a way of being. This way of being is null if it is without freedom" [8]. This freedom is even the source of the definitional understanding of political philosophy since its genesis according to Eric WELL who says:

"Political philosophy has been defined from its beginnings as the attempt to grasp by thought the nature of the state." [9]

3. Methodology

To better carry out our work, we opted for the critical hermeneutic method of the work: theological sum, Bliss of Saint Thomas Aquinas. Hermeneutics allowed us to read the cited work, to understand and expose the thought of our author. However, criticism as a method has been useful to us in the critical appreciation of the thought of our Saint Thomas.

4. Results

We totally agree with Saint Thomas when he evokes the body and its perfect state and the society of friends among the conditions required for bliss, because, bliss being the good par excellence, whoever wants it, will need it so much a perfect body and the help of others to get there. These are the perfect acts that he will perform that will attract his best friends for good assistance.

With him, we make our great men think that reason presents us with so many hypotheses on which we owe our choice, which must at all costs circumvent the opposite of good, in order to satisfy the community. Let us not allow the faculty which, according to Saint Thomas, differentiates us from animals to perish. Otherwise, we practically become animals. What image do we reflect around the world? Animal or human image?

He goes so far as to offer us even the elements favoring our tendency to good: the intelligence, the will, the freedom and the free will which we hold well, but which are almost not at work. To talk about freedom, we need to choose between two or more assumptions. If not we remain without freedom [10]. As we can see from the innovative questions about disagreement that men regularly entertain according to the following:

"In wars of religion and political intolerance within a certain one-sided globalization, today men kill, kill and kill each other in the name of religious ideas, convictions and political affiliations".

We are of opinion, by linking this thought to that of PAUL RICŒUR who maintains that "the ellipsis, the memeness, both working for each other" [11]. The two are still tense,

one towards the other. This is what even establishes responsibility at Saint Thomas. It is always also and simply subjectivity, in view of otherness, of intersubjectivity, therefore in view of a man included in essence.

This way must necessarily be fixed among our great men who must understand that they are leaders because the subordinates exist with a right to respect as well as to being as human.

In the same optic, Hans Jonas followed suit in terms: "the feeling of responsibility indeed precedes responsible air. It's only from the moment that I feel responsible for something that I will look responsible, careful towards it." [5].

This is lacking in today's man who finds himself without confidence and living among humans, isolated as in a forest, not knowing what to do and distrustful of all those around him, considering him dangerous, forging his own security. By this birth of hatred, sorrow and mistrust, the man has difficulties to be heard, understood and respected by his subordinate who, instead, fears him only because, finding him at the base of this birth, thinking only of himself, endangering the other and finding him fierce.

Here is what we want to bring our great men to and especially in the Democratic Republic of Congo, our country, where it seems alarming. Levinas' response was correct, because he realized that he was responsible and no one could replace him in his responsibility; we see the opposite in the DRC; our great men have resigned in the face of their responsibility. This is how much, according to the true sense of responsibility, the subject is forced to excellence. In the DRC we have to realize that nobody takes responsibility for the other, we have to take responsibility for it because we even see people even witness the dismissals of some without even taking its already initiated community projects.

Besides, the value of man as such is the reason with which he is endowed. In other words, reason and many other human faculties are only the means with which man is endowed to work for the blossoming and flowering of humanity in him.

Moreover, this conception of the exception of excellence is always stretched towards the other, from great men to subordinates and vice versa, especially insofar as man does not have to invent himself a man in him, but on the other hand, he did let him flourish in him. This means that man has within himself the possibility of being the occasion for the realization of the other as man. Any time the existing evil, thwarts it or otherwise, being a man would go without saying. The existence of evil here reflects the possibility of failure to want to be a man. Case of the Congolese great men.

Ethics leads us in a fight so that man does not yield, however, towards not being, to be what is intended for him. It's there, the crossroads of excellence between man and man. It is ultimately to live well and to be with others in justice. As soon as we think we can be men, we have to

become men, while not forgetting the availability to subordinates and vice versa.

Furthermore, we see a dimension of human responsibility, which comes from the awareness that man seemed to endanger his living environment, the earth, nuclear weapons, pollution of all kinds, the greenhouse effect, what is particularly new is that this responsibility extends over time through its own generation and that if it is not careful for future generations, will destroy it.

This innovation returns us, for example for the greenhouse effect, the image of a collective responsibility which is expressed by a multitude of individual micro choices: adjustment of the pollution rate of his car, choice of the mode of circulation, the method of heating one's home, of a product using gases, so many individual choices meaning little in the short term but whose consequences taken collectively and in the long term can be considerable for generations to come. Without forgetting the failure of SNEL (National Electricity Company) which pushes people to get everywhere, groups which also only worsen the situation including the current practice of charcoal.

Finally, it is to signify that there is no real responsibility except where there is a real responsibility to respond. However, a question arises: what should we answer? We must respond to what is happening to us and to what we are experiencing, to what we can see, hear and feel.

The response of the self is the response of availability given to the other who has three faces: the other being that of oneself, that of being close to oneself, that of being distant from oneself by several kinds of distances.

Seeing political life today, we emphasize the theory of the hunger of the other and his poverty. Faced with the nakedness of the poorest, faced with the body of the one whom hunger has made misshapen, we cannot contain ourselves with their discontent. Ethics must respond to political activity which tends to overturn normality.

We believe there is an urgent need to respond immediately with a view to strengthening the hope for effective political action. But it cannot proceed from ethics without questioning the links between them.

Availability is essential since, as soon as someone looks at me, I become responsible for it, without even having to take responsibility for it; it's my responsibility. It's a responsibility that goes beyond what I do. Usually, we are responsible for what involves us personally. On the other hand, responsibility is initially one for the other. Which means: I am responsible even for the responsibility of others [3].

Availability is based on the vigilance that has already successfully passed the test of the norm, which becomes respect for people and which subsequently takes the form of friendship which arises from the desire to love others. Reasonable beings are called people, because their nature

already designates them as ends in themselves. In other words as something that cannot be amply as a means.

In the same vein, I cannot estimate myself without valuing others like myself. In other words the other is also able to start something in the world, to air for reasons of prioritizing preferences, to estimate the goals of his action and in doing so to estimate himself as I consider myself myself. Not having achieved this goal, it is the solidarity which suffers as regards Phillippe Van Paris who affirms that "solidarity is in danger. It can only be saved if it spreads beyond what can be imagined today. Universal allowance, democratic localization, rehabilitation of patriotism, these are the central axes of thinking commensurate with the challenges of our time; a thought that retains the lessons of history and understands that of economics, without being reduced to resignation".

It is within this that what is aimed has individual and collective implications, with significant social repercussions. Indeed, the improvement of oneself and by that fact, of one's environment, with a view to total fulfillment in God indicates the stakes of this thematic. If we appealed to MOLTEMANN, it is because the requirements of a committed hope that it develops and the systematization of the foundation of acts initiated by Saint Thomas, are two mutually enriching concepts.

By evoking them, we discovered the ethics of responsibility based on eschatological hope can be a historically and socially effective reference for human existence in its various dimensions.

By giving the affirmation on the movement of beings as being conditioned, Saint Tomas wrests freedom from the man whom he considers to be dependent on God as an external force. But how do you prove human freedom? Being reasonable can certainly be in mortal danger by refusing the absurd order, but it suffices to accept death to remain free.

We say that it is real that the stars can sometimes condition human air. Human is a nature that is dependent like others. In fact: when it rains he is forced to protect himself from the rain, when it is hot or cold, there are provisions.

By giving the affirmation on the movement of beings as being conditioned, Saint Tomas wrests freedom from the man whom he considers to be dependent on God as an external force. But how do you prove human freedom? To be reasonable can certainly be in mortal danger by refusing the absurd order, but it is enough for him to accept death to remain free.

Evoking wealth and honor, and above all artificial wealth, he says, they do not reach bliss. That is to say, they reach it anyway? This is why we found it better to pronounce by saying that Saint Tomas at this level should perhaps tell us about two forms of beatitudes: terrestrial and celestial. The first, imperfect and names and less necessary, belonging to men according to their diversity and the second, perfect and necessary, which belongs to God in his unity.

We can deduce from this that, faced with the situations of our great men, they are satisfied only with the first bliss and the second does not matter for them. They totally put aside the good deed towards the subordinates.

To maintain their earthly bliss, they use their fellows to honor them honestly, applauding them all the way, even when they are hungry and naked, no matter the state of the subordinates. They don't care about the lower class, which leads to the disappearance of the middle class. Can we say they have evil possession or bad faith only? to the above, we show by this work to these great men that, it does not matter if the community does not find themselves in them, it is very naughty.

Some thinkers have made a clear distinction between freedom and free will. As for us, we want to designate one to signify the other, so as not to establish a dichotomy, because the two are the prerogative of will and reason.

In this perspective, the legal destination of an individual's responsibility, which implies the obligation to be held accountable for his actions, requires the assistance of the concept of free will. Being responsible presupposes the freedom of the individual. The attribution of all responsibility suggests that the latter, the perpetrator of the crime or offense, has his own free will.

To be responsible is to do what the other cannot for us. We take issue with him because the one who does because the other cannot do for him is under duress; however in the constraint, there is no freedom therefore no responsibility either, except in case of ethical standards.

Let us question the conscience to know, with the above conditions, if we have a rand responsible men tending to the last end which is bliss?

Whoever is responsible has the power to protect the object of disappearance. The problem of responsibility therefore lies in the feeling of responsibility? We always have the possibility of not opening our heart and not letting ourselves be affected by the weakness of an object whose existence we hold in our hands. We are thinking here of the various dead on Congolese space. According to Robert NOZICK, "small inequalities created by" fair "transactions in the sense that they are agreed to by free individuals, accumulate over time and end up leading to great inequalities and an unjust situation". [12].

Indifference is possible with a newborn baby, a person who is in financial difficulty. It is all the more so with regard to future generations. But it is a responsibility towards the men to come, therefore not yet present. To feel responsible for the existence of future humanity is ultimately to feel affirmation. The feeling of responsibility is something that man receives from being himself.

Being responsible is human intentionality, but that intentionality is a response to a call. The entry into ethics is mediated by others. Analyzing the bliss, we find that Saint

Tomas had to speak to us about the earthly bliss. It is that which is effective for man and not that in heaven which is only possible with God alone. A reflection that seems imaginary to humanity.

Saint Thomas spoke well of freedom than of responsibility. But we owed such words that the two go together that the second can be understood as not the first and the reverse is as possible as LEVINAS did. He also had to avoid banal contractions, like those on freedom, free will, will and God. So he had to talk to us in charge, taking a clear position.

But all of a sudden he takes evil as the inherent tendency of free will. Which can lead us to understand the unfortunate situation of the Congolese rand man. We are totally wrong in front of our reflector, by addressing a word to it in the sense that here: as it has already clearly committed an enormous confusion between will, intelligence; freedom as well as free will, which become one thing, their essence becomes only good, so as not to justify evil in our different actions.

If we take this affirmation in front of that of LEVINAS stipulating that the engine of command of free will which Saint Thomas calls God, is in the will. So God by nature becomes the source of evil or the sponsor. Something that Saint Thomas does not want to hear. So could he tell us why he says he doesn't accept? This is why we also criticize him for having only spoken of an end, which however is impossible for man.

We would share a possibility of other possible ends to man, apart from that unique to God, so as not to make all human life a meaningless activity. Does he want to testify to us in the manner of the Bible that everything is vanity for man? But then why do we live? For nothing? For vanity? We say after Saint Thomas, that it exists for the smallest and last ends which are accessible to humanity, which moreover motivate life or any human action.

It is the latter that must be well cared for, because they will be able to provide us with the great end last after time, from the moment when we will no longer be in our human state. It is the latter that ARISTOTE calls "Rand Happiness". Unlike Saint Thomas, the great last end is inconceivable for man, on the other hand, great happiness, yes. Any small or lesser ends are just the big one.

As for the number of men for a final end, we attest that each man at first of the least ends which prepare him for the great which is unique for all. These least evolve according to the life that each has at his level and the means.

5. Discussion and interpretations

5.1 Merits

We recognize in Saint Thomas Aquinas the idea that everything moved by others is not free and that freedom has two meanings: that of exercising and that of specification. The first is that of doing or not doing. In it we find the sovereignty of the will. As for freedom of specification, it is

that of choosing between two hypotheses. Human freedom can be conditioned by the surrounding nature.

Saint Thomas affirms that if an object is offered perfectly well in every way, the will necessarily tends to this object as long as it wants something. It cannot want the opposite because it necessarily tends towards good. Saint Thomas is absolutely right, in front of a good, you should never hesitate to realize it. Seeing the Congolese reality, the object is apparently always imperfectly proposed so that the will of great men can only tend towards evil? It is the lack of responsibility and the sense of good in their head.

Responsibility according to Saint Thomas, it is sanctioned on several levels, among other psychological, moral and spiritual. So we don't feel dependent on anything, we feel independent. Sophists show how proud a man is.

He admits that in all circumstances, he would notice and recognize his dependence as soon as he undergoes it, as he imagines himself to live habitually in independence and that he would immediately experience a contradiction in his feelings if he would exceptionally see to the to lose.

But if it was the opposite that was true, knowing that he lives constantly in a multiform dependence but considers himself free when he stops feeling the pressure of his chains due to a long addiction.

In responsibility, Saint Thomas finds there a reciprocity between being that we are, that we situate at the level of the relationship between great men and subordinates. This exchange or consideration must be effective to facilitate the best last end to man. "In a democracy, 'moralizing political life' as I hear it lately begs the question. We want to 'moralize political life' in the name of democracy to reconcile citizens with politics, because we have seen the population's disinterest in politics due to the repeated scandals caused by those who exercise public office "[13].

In the same sense, freedom goes hand in hand with responsibility to make bliss possible if only they are respected. But Saint Thomas has the merit of specifying the number of men for a last end as well as the number of last end for a man. He specifies that "all men agree in the desire for a final end which is bliss" [14]. All men meet in the desire for the last end. Because, all wish to see their own wish come true in this last end.

Saint Thomas together with MOLTMAN in the notion of eschatological hope, he proposes an ethics of responsibility starting from the commitment resulting from virtue and both develop a conception of hope in different eras and in different conceptions a comparison of their respective perspectives reveals the importance attached to temporality.

5.2 Limits

Saint Thomas, speaking of all that is moved by others is not free, expresses his first weakness in the sense that Emmanuel LEVINAS shows that "action does not only include the agent's freedom, the fact of not be influenced by something

external; it also involves an effective transition and determines something external and independent. But an external and independent reality can only be free. Freedom, however, is what precisely refuses to undergo an action" [3].

Saint Thomas admits the influence of the stars on the intellect, but he refuses that on the will. We find it puzzling because, it is always Saint Thomas who establishes an equivalence between intellect, will and freedom. If he admits the influence of the stars on the intellect, he automatically admits it also on the will he calls "free will".

Thereafter, Saint Thomas first presents the arguments which affirm that the arbitrator is a power different from the will. Free will is the cause of one's own actions. For him, the arbiter becomes the means by which man moves himself into action. It equals will to freedom.

All of a sudden, he attests that free will is not enough, he must be moved and seconded by God. Furthermore, it defines free will as a driving force. This contradiction aggravates the weaknesses of Saint Thomas, who almost lacks position.

Our author continues in this term: it does not belong to the essence of free will to be by oneself ordered or else, it only tends towards evil. This statement puts Saint Thomas in contradiction with himself, who confuses freedom, free will, will, intelligence and says that their nature is good.

According to the author, it is impossible for the will to be directed towards various objects as towards final ends. It is true, by remaining unilateral, therefore by retaining the position that there is only one final end.

6. Conclusion

In this essay, we focused on the question of man facing his freedom and the last end or bliss. In the latter, we analyzed responsibility in Saint Thomas Aquinas by demonstrating that well-ordered responsibility begins with oneself.

Thus, responsibility for oneself, included guilt, assertiveness, fault and self-respect. Responsibility, however, is not limited to oneself, but also includes others to create peace around you. We also talked about eschatological expectation.

However, bliss has the necessary conditions such as delight or vision, understanding and righteousness of the will, the body and its perfect state, external goods and a society of friends.

However, the possibility of obtaining bliss has made the game, the man in the bliss who has taken into account human acts, wealth and honor, glory and power, created goods. However, we also talked about the number of last endings for u, man, as well as the number of men for last end.

In this work, in fact, we have presented our critical appreciation by highlighting the merits and limits of Saint Thomas, affirming his thought with other thinkers on the question of the last end and responsibility. In fact, the affirmation of the essence of freedom where there is

movement caused by the outside, has given it the merits. But on the other hand, this merit has taken away freedom from the man who, according to him, is moved by God.

This freedom will be restored by the warning of Emmanuel Levinas which will justify the existence of the order of command in the very will of man. So man is free. However, he introduced a huge contradiction in his analysis of freedom which favored his weakness.

References

- [1] E.LEVINAS, *Difficile liberté, Essai sur le judaïsme*, Albin, Paris, 1973.
- [2] O. UGIRASHEBUJA, "Solidarité Africaine et Sens de Responsabilité," dans *Zaire Afrique, Economie culture vie sociale*, n° 137, Juin Juillet Aout, pp. 337- 348, dix-neuvième année.
- [3] E.LEVINAS, *Ethique et Infini, Dialogue avec PHILIPPE NEMO*, Fayard, Paris, 1982.
- [4] M. BUBER, *la vie en dialogue*, Traduit par Jean LOEWESON LAVI, Montaigne, Paris, 1982.
- [5] J. HANS, *Le principe de responsabilité, Une éthique pour civilisation technique*, traduit de l'Allemand par JEAN GREISH, Cerf, Paris, 1991.
- [6] ARISTOTE., *Ethique à NICOMACHE*, Garnier Flammarion, Paris, 1978.
- [7] Von E Delruelle, "Université de Namur," babelio.com, para.,Mai.11,2017.[Online]. Available:<http://babelio.com/philosophiepolitique/>. [Accessed: Sept. 22, 2020].
- [8] J.P. SARTRE, *L'être et le Néant, Essai Ontologique et phénoménologique*, Gallimard, Paris, 1943.
- [9] J.WEIL,2017.[Online].Available: <http://www.universalis.fr/>. [Accessed: Sept. 22, 2020].
- [10] KASHALA Ferdinand, *Propos sur le libéralisme politique et religieux. Dialogue idéaliste entre John LOCKE et Baruc SPINOZA*, Paris, Larmattan, 2014.
- [11] P. RICOEUR, *Soi-même comme un autre*, Seuil, Paris, 1990.
- [12] NOZICK ROBERT, *Anarchie, état et utopie*, Paris, PUF,2018.
- [13] NKULU O., *La démocratie surveillée par la morale*, édition academia, 2018.
- [14] Saint Thomas d'Aquin, *Somme théologique. La béatitude*. Desclée, Paris, 1981
- [15] J.P. SARTRE, *L'existence est un humanisme*, Nagel, Paris, 1970.
- [16] E. TENGA WA KASONGO, *Au croisement des enjeux actuels de la loi morale*, Saint Paul, Lubumbashi, 2012.
- [17] N. Fraser, *qu'est-ce que la justice sociale? la découverte*, Paris, 2011.
- [18] L. Althusser, *Etre marxiste en philosophie*, PUF, Paris, 2015.
- [19] A. MBEMBE, *Brutalisme*, La découverte, Paris, 2020.
- [20] Timoty Morton, *La pensée écologique*, Zulma, Paris, 2019.
- [21] Olivier NKULU, *médecine européenne, médecine chinoise, médecine traditionnelle africaine*Lubumbashie, Harmattan, Paris, 2017.

- [22] KOBA PASCAL, Oeudipe Africain : mythe ou réalité,
Presses universitaires de Lubumbashi, Lubumbashi,
2012.