Abstract
Words are not neutral, so we should be aware about the indiscriminate use of notions moving comfortably in academic environments. It is true that the term "transdiscipline" does not cause intellectual constipation in many people who would rather sit in the calm waters of methodology manuals. It is positive that everywhere people talk normally about "transdiscipline". Problems begin when one inquires into what is meant by that. Confusion and misunderstanding are obvious. There is not only a diversity of approaches behind the use of this term (which is entirely natural and inevitable) but also a basic misunderstanding prevails about the epistemological spirit of a transdisciplinary view of knowledge. It is precisely in this direction that this essay aims at: to ensure the demarcation of the different meanings of the idea of "transdiscipline" to clearly outline the contents of a particular epistemological stance. It is not a chronicle of the trajectory of this concept but a placement of its precise role within a matrix of thought that is, at the same time, deconstructionist-archaeological- genealogical-complex-transdisciplinar-postmodern. It is by taking seriously this intermingling of cognitive strategies that we can regain a distinctive sense of the transdisciplinary category. This is not at all obvious at first. It requires a certain road-clearing work, a delimitation of fields, the development of substantial content. What follows is a brief review of the problems having more impact on the characterization of what can be properly called a transdisciplinary look at knowledge.
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