

# Foucault and Bourdieu at the Collège de France

**Frédéric Lebaron**

Foucault's and Bourdieu's commitment to 'work together' with a workers union, the French Democratic Confederation of Workers (CFDT), occurred at precisely the same time as the French neoliberal shift in economic and social policies, in 1981-1984. This period of intense collaboration in the intellectual field by the two leading French social scientists (at least by today's rankings and perception) was relatively short: bounded by Bourdieu's election to the Collège de France in 1981 and Foucault's death in June 1984. This article describes and analyses events during this short period, through a socio-historical analysis of their two personal trajectories in the post-68 intellectual field, based on public archives of the Collège de France and secondary literature. It offers a detailed description and interpretation of Foucault and Bourdieu's positions and viewpoints, their affiliation to and critiques of external movements as Collège de France academics between 1981 and 1984, setting this in the broader political context.

**Keywords:** intellectual field, Bourdieu, Foucault, Collège de France, commitment, symbolic capital.

Foucault's and Bourdieu's commitment to 'work together' with a workers union, the French Democratic Confederation of Workers (CFDT), occurred at precisely the same time as the French neoliberal shift in economic and social policies of 1981 to 1984. This period of intense collaboration in the intellectual field by the two leading French social scientists (at least by today's rankings and perception<sup>1</sup>) is relatively short: it happened between 1981, the year when Bourdieu was appointed at the Collège de France, and ended with Foucault's death in June 1984.

Foucault's academic trajectory was very unusual, with an election at Collège de France at the age of 44 in 1970. Whereas Bourdieu (who is 5 years younger) was 51 (7 years more senior) before he was himself elected with Foucault's support. This is still rather young, also an atypical profile, but a bit less exceptional.<sup>2</sup> As is well-known, from a purely disciplinary point of view, Foucault was a philosopher and Bourdieu a sociologist. Their research and work interests were also rather different: the history of madness, justice and prisons, power, discourse and knowledge, liberalism, sexuality on one side, vs education and culture, social classes, inequality and domination, fields of cultural production, especially literature and art, on the other.

Nevertheless there are some interesting similarities in their professorial activities at Collège de France, for example: the reflexive perspective of their inaugural lecture, an important ritual in this institution (published as *L'ordre du discours – The order of discourse* – for Foucault in 1971 and *La leçon sur la leçon – Lesson on lesson* – for Bourdieu in 1982); their intense and close intellectual relationship to the French philosopher of science Georges Canguilhem; and also their strong interest in politics and the economy and in intellectual struggles more generally.

This very short period when Foucault and Bourdieu were both professors at Collège de France clearly strengthened their visibility as public intellectuals, but it also contributed to the particular – and in a sense misleading – reputation of the Collège de France as an exclusive institution that venerates a theoretical and intellectual avant-garde. This is an institution where professors give (a small number of annual) lectures on whatever subject they want, possibly without any students and always without exams, and where they have a great deal of time available for organizing their own research activity. Yet for both, the public was numerous and the lectures were crowded (Eribon 2011). Both Bourdieu and Foucault are implicitly described in Bourdieu's *Homo Academicus* as members of the 'consecrated avant-garde', but as a group the professors at the Collège scarcely fit this label. Many lectures were given in front of a very small number of students and colleagues, and a large number of the professors were rather conservative: Marc Fumaroli, elected at 54 as professor of literature, more closely approximates the classical right-wing intellectual described in Bourdieu's work, and was certainly more representative of the majority of professors in the humanities and even the social sciences. At the Collège, then and now, the social sciences are dominated by the classical humanities, conventional treatises and 'rational choice' theory; the sciences by big laboratory leaders, today closer to the field of economics.

The first part of this article considers Bourdieu's and Foucault's trajectories in detail, analyzing particularly their relations with the intellectual and political fields after May 68 and before May 81<sup>3</sup> as these 13 years are fundamental to understand the differences between both trajectories. The article then analyzes what happened between May 81 and June 84, paying special attention to the intellectual field. In a final section, the focus is on Bourdieu's evolution after Foucault's death, showing how this implies a likely revision of his opinions on Foucault, and on Neoliberalism, after 1995.

### **Two profiles of symbolic capital accumulation**

Besides the differences already pointed out (Bourdieu was a sort of 'younger brother' in academic terms, and represented a dominated discipline in the academic field, especially at Collège de France). The main social differences between Bourdieu and Foucault relate to their two distinct profiles of symbolic capital accumulation in the intellectual world. From this perspective, Foucault can be considered to be an intermediary (historically, but also sociologically) between Sartre and Bourdieu. He clearly developed a 'strategy of succession' to Sartre's

eminence in the intellectual field (Bourdieu 1992) and Bourdieu, in a sense, did the same in relation to Foucault in the 1980s.

### **Under the shadow of Jean-Paul Sartre**

After May 68, Sartre struggled to maintain his domination over the French intellectual field that he had profoundly shaped since the ‘revolutionary moment’ of 1945 (Boschetti 1985). A ‘total intellectual’ (as Bourdieu would write in 1980), Sartre was not only publishing articles and books (philosophical, literary and political) for his peers and for a larger public but, now, was also politically hyper-active: signing petitions, going to demonstrations, in discussion with activists, participating in actions, and engaging in political discourse in the media.

His close connection with the Maoist group *Gauche Prolétarienne* (GP, the ‘Proletarian Left’) and in particular with their leader Benny Lévy (then named ‘Pierre Victor’ for security reasons) enabled him to remain at the center of public focus for a few years after May 1968. He contributed financially to the creation of a daily newspaper called *Libération*, which was from the outset situated on the extreme-left of the political space, and was involved in various kinds of more or less visible radical symbolic actions, especially around GP’s journal *La cause du Peuple*. Sartre’s strong and practical commitment, physically limited to a half-time militancy,<sup>4</sup> lasted at least until 1974 and the publication of the collective book *On a raison de se révolter* (written with Philippe Gavi and Pierre Victor). It ended around 1975, at the same moment when the last period of his life was strongly shaped by his blindness (see for example, Beauvoir, 1983).

In its new post-68 form, the social role of the ‘intellectual’ was not limited to his/her field of expertise or technical knowledge. Intellectuals tried to connect to a large set of social forces, including political radical groups, the extreme-left, feminists, lesbian, gay, trans and queer (LGBTQ), environmental activists, etc. Their aim was to change the world, and they no longer considered themselves to be at the centre of this change.

### **Foucault: Sartre’s number one challenger in the first half of the 1970s**

After May 68 Foucault was clearly one of most pro-eminent of Sartre’s challengers, on the basis of his position in the French philosophical field, dating from the 1960s (Pinto 1987). Another serious challenger was the Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser, but although the Althusserians were at that time well-represented in the Academy, they were not particularly visible in the public sphere except through some debates inside the Communist Party (they evolved a lot afterwards).

Foucault was rapidly gaining a public image as a radical intellectual, first in connection with the *Gauche Prolétarienne* (essentially following Sartre) then, more specifically, with other groups, especially the *Groupe d’information sur les prisons* (GIP, Group of information on prisons) and the *Comité Djelali*. Foucault was actually more visible through his commitment with the GIP, and various actions around the conditions of prisoners and immigrants, than he was with the Maoists (Eribon 2011). A significant number of his writings during the ’70s were political

by nature. He justified this by claiming that there is no limit to the realm of ‘politics’, especially no separation between the private and the public life, between individual commitment and collective action, between academic writing and political mobilization, etc. The topics of his lectures at Collège de France closely followed his activism: they were first centered on law, prison and justice, then broadened to become a critical analysis of scientific discourse in various fields (biology, medicine, psychiatry, etc.). His most radical period was illustrated by *Surveiller et punir* and, above all, by *La volonté de savoir* (Foucault 1976).

During the 1970s, Foucault was involved in a large number of political causes, and he actively followed the collective destiny of some of the post-Sartrian companions, especially – and in a sense curiously – some of the most ‘mediatic’ figures among the post-68 intellectuals, like Yves Montand (singer and actor) or Simone Signoret (movie actress). After 1975, he became relatively close to the ‘new philosophers’, a group who took the intellectual lead in the media in the second half of the 1970s, actively promoting a collective conversion to anti-totalitarianism (see for example Hocquenghem, 2005). This movement, launched by former Maoists of the GP (like André Glucksmann), began with support for soviet dissidents and the denunciation of Gulag,<sup>5</sup> then championed the cause of the Vietnamese boat people, becoming unequivocally critical of the consequences of revolutions as tragically illustrated by the red Khmer genocide. Sartre showed no public affiliation to this shift of focus but he had in-depth philosophical exchanges with Benny Lévy, who was part of this movement of conversion,<sup>6</sup> and with whom he was in close contact at the time.

As a pro-eminent academic – well-known since the 1960s to the broader intellectual public, (the Collège de France being first and foremost a major elite institution) – Foucault occupied a dominant position among the ‘post-Sartrian’ candidates for the succession at the end of the 1970s. This is one of the reasons why all of his causes had the potential for high impact. In 1978, his support at the start of the Iranian revolution was considered to be particularly polemical, as was his critical stand on Marx and Marxism. In 1979 he accompanied the collective mobilization for the boat people led by his friend Bernard Kouchner to which Sartre participated, though physically diminished.

By 1981 Foucault was very well-known as a philosopher of knowledge and power, and could be seen as the main successor to Sartre. He pursued a clear ‘strategy of succession’ since he occupied a similar public space, close to social movements and politics, and developed a strong media presence (in *Le nouvel observateur* for example), discussing general issues like history and neoliberalism, and intervening regularly in daily affairs.

### **Bourdieu: the choice of scientific symbolic capital accumulation**

Bourdieu, in contrast, took little part in public activism after May 68. At this time he headed a very cohesive, even charismatic, group of scholars at the Centre de sociologie européenne (which, until May 68, was led by Aron), prior to establishing his own Centre de sociologie de l’éducation et de la culture (CSEC). In May 68 he

asked the members of his group to create and disseminate their sociological analyses on cultural and educational inequalities (see Bourdieu 2002). During the 1970s, he focused on collective empirical work – which would be published under the titles *La distinction* (1979), *Homo Academicus* (1984), and *State Nobility* (1989). He wrote theoretical articles and books,<sup>7</sup> and focused on the launch of his scientific journal *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* with a group of young scholars. This journal was clearly conceived as an avant-garde journal, but it was also clearly situated at the scientific – and not the political – pole in the intellectual avant-garde space. Only a few issues directly connected with immediate political issues. Examples include the article which Bourdieu wrote with Luc Boltanski about dominant ideology in 1978 (Bourdieu & Boltanski, 1978), and a few years later (but already during the Collège de France period) about Afghanistan (“Et si on parlait de l’Afghanistan ?”). Bourdieu rarely engaged in the classical practice of petition signing, except in his commitment to the Coluche candidacy in 1980-81,<sup>8</sup> an act which does not qualify clearly his orientations, merely showing a certain ‘libertarian’ and ‘provocative’ mood right after Sartre’s death.

It is clear that Bourdieu had not yet completely entered into the intellectual field as such (especially what we have coined as the ‘Sartre’s succession’ stake). Bourdieu had accumulated scientific capital, created a school and a journal, and, when he was elected to the Collège de France, with the support of Foucault, he was already clearly recognized as a major figure of sociology in the world. But he was not really visible as politically committed, though he had actually been present earlier in the field. He had committed himself through his work on Algeria when he criticized the idealization of the revolutionary strength of the peasant class by intellectuals like Sartre and Fanon, but also through his work on social inequality and higher education with Jean-Claude Passeron (Bourdieu & Passeron 1964), and his writings on Flaubert which were first published in Sartre’s *Les temps modernes* (Bourdieu 1966). Both works presented challenges to Sartre indicating that Bourdieu, was staging what one could call an early ‘strategy of subversion’ against Sartre during the 1960s. This could not triumph, of course, but it demonstrated a strong, indirect, and complex relation to the director of *Les temps modernes*.

#### **‘To work with’ 1981-1984**

Bourdieu’s election at the Collège de France was almost coincident with two big historical events: the death of Sartre, who had dominated the French intellectual field since 1945, in April 1980; and the victory of the left in the presidential and parliamentary elections in May-June 1981 (the election of François Mitterrand from the Socialist Party (SP) in alliance with the Communist Party).

Foucault wrote very supportive texts after Mitterrand’s election and seemed to be very pleased, at least for a few months, by the success of the Socialist Party. This was clearly a rather important political shift away from his radical commitment in the first half of the 1970s. It clearly followed his disassociation from Marx and Marxism, his tough anticommunism, and his criticism of revolutionary totalitarianism. But his enthusiasm for this political change, and for an active role in the

new ruling party, may also be seen to contradict his theoretical critique of classical conceptions of power. At this point, it is necessary to recall that Foucault came from a bourgeois background and was attracted by civil service positions on various occasions. Unlike Sartre, he was generally very flexible in his relations with the institutions of power rather than consistently in opposition.

Bourdieu clearly began to have stronger 'desires' to act politically, and to go further into this direction after his appointment to the Collège de France. This is very apparent following the Polish 'normalization' led by General Jaruzelski in December 1981, less than one year after Mitterrand's victory. As Didier Eribon wrote in his biography of Foucault (Eribon 2011), Bourdieu rang Foucault after the French ministry of foreign affairs declared the affair an 'internal issue'. Bourdieu had found an occasion to intervene alongside Foucault, to appear in a sort of public duo with him, and, as Eribon mentions a little ironically, to share in his symbolic capital. They spoke against the united left (Socialist Party-Communist Party) government on an international (East-West) matter. This very clearly adopted the classical Sartrian manner of the 'total intellectual', albeit on the side of western countries rather than the soviet bloc or third world nations (but Sartre was also very critical of the Soviet Union on various occasions, especially in 1956 and 1968). In a sense, both remained Sartrian in their style of practicing intellectual intervention at that time, but had shifted away from his customary orientation, in the new 'anti-totalitarian' context.

This intervention is also interesting because it reveals the nature of the political network around Foucault at that time to be composed of personalities who mobilized and then widely publicized their views (through signatures, demonstration, etc.). Eribon lists Marguerite Duras, Bernard Kouchner, Simone Signoret and Yves Montand among his immediate circle of 'co-petitioners': a media-active, even theatrical 'post-Sartrian' group (with many ex-communists) but without the historical 'Sartrians' (for example, Simone de Beauvoir or Claude Lanzmann) and without the most famous 'new philosophers' (André Glucksmann, Bernard-Henry Lévy, etc.), who were nevertheless very close to them.

These actors were far removed from the universities (even if some well-known scientists and professors would sign the petition later), and very close to journalism and the media. They had taken a strong anti-communist stand during the second half of the 70s, a period in which they had highly contributed to the success of the 'new philosophers'. The petition was published in *Libération*, the newspaper with Maoist origins created by Sartre, but now described as 'liberal-libertarian' under the lead of Serge July, undergoing re-alignment in 1978 (see Hocquenghem 2003).

This shift to the right was complete by 1981 as the network exhibited a pro-government orientation that was clearly anti-Marxist and anti-communist, and supportive of the right-wing modernist fraction of the Socialist Party, around Michel Rocard and Jacques Delors. Jeannine Verdès-Leroux, at that time very close to Bourdieu, presented her address for the reception of the signatures.<sup>9</sup>

We should consider how Foucault and Bourdieu fit the more specific intellectual and theoretical positions prevalent within French society? Behind them, there was

the shadow of Sartre. Foucault and Bourdieu both commented on Sartre's death in rather critical terms. Foucault attacked the 'intellectual terrorism' of *Les temps modernes*, saying he oriented himself against it in the 1950-60s (in a conversation reported by Eribon), and Bourdieu criticized Sartre's conception of 'total intellectual' preferring a more scientific and modest conception based on autonomous expert-knowledge. Both were admirers and pupils of Georges Canguilhem, and theoretically poles apart from Sartre's existentialism, phenomenology and Freudo-Marxism. Their practice revealed a tension between their proximity to Sartre's model and the necessity of distancing themselves from this, on the basis of a discourse of 'scientific expertise' (Bourdieu) or 'thematic' (Foucault) specificity.

Foucault and Bourdieu also commented critically on Marx and Marxism from the second half of the 1970s. In a lately published text written by Bourdieu about Foucault (in the most recent edition of Eribon's book), Bourdieu sums up Foucault's usage and knowledge of Marx, comparing this to the use of Marx by official Marxists, whom he describes as priests. He classically insists on a critique of economic reductionism and the notion of 'exploitation', in favor of Foucault's widely broadcast micro-conception of 'power' and 'knowledge'. Interestingly, he leaves aside the issue of the relevance of (at least part) of Marxist political economy.

After the Polish episode, Bourdieu and Foucault started to collaborate with ('work with') intellectuals and leaders of the French Democratic Confederation of Workers (CFDT). This was a union which had undergone a similar political trajectory, from radical leftism after May 68 ('autogestion' – independence) to very clear 'modernist', 'reformist' and 'anti-partisan' positions after 1978 ('recentrage' – refocusing – under Edmond Maire, in 1978). Foucault went much further in that direction than Bourdieu; he even published interviews with unionists (including the leader, Edmond Maire), for example about social security. In these he does not closely espouse the Neoliberal spirit of the time (this is more evident in the discourse of his interlocutor) but maintains an original dialectical approach flexibly promoting political discussion. After Foucault's death the CFDT published a book with a chapter by Bourdieu.

Foucault rapidly cut his connections with the government, except Michel Rocard who had become the leader of the right fraction of the Party, after the Polish episode. His objective during this period was to write a collective 'white book' about political issues, but the project was never realized. He was insisting on a 'new way to govern' and on a radical critique of political parties. Together with a group of friends including André Glucksmann, he would only go on producing discourses on international issues using the byline 'académie Tarnier'.

Bourdieu himself became politically close to Rocard and remained so until the first half of the 1990s, but he moved further from the CFDT, which was close to Alain Touraine and to a journal (*Esprit*) that had violently criticized *La distinction* (and provoked a quite violent reaction: see Bourdieu, 2002). Bourdieu was rather irritated by the way a small group of intellectuals had taken over the movement concerned about the situation in Poland.

In the first semester of 1984, the ideological evolution accelerated (as shown by the programme ‘Vive la crise!’ in which Yves Montand explained that everybody should create her/his own company to solve the problem of unemployment, and should abandon the Keynesian dreams of full employment). Tensions between the Socialist Party and the Communist Party were very intense after 1982/1983 and the transformation of economic policy with the government abandoning Keynesian policies of fiscal stimulus in favour of monetary and budget orthodoxy, in line with Germany and with arguments about ‘external constraints’.<sup>10</sup> In July 1984, the Communist Party finally abandoned the government which took a stronger Neo-liberal turn under the lead of Laurent Fabius. This was an ideological triumph for Rocard but he failed to be appointed prime minister; this did not happen until 1988. Foucault, however, died in June 1984. His last lectures were a continuation of his project on the history of sexuality.

### **Bourdieu after 1984**

Now alone as an avant-garde thinker at the Collège, Bourdieu continued to try to be influential in the public space, through his connections with leaders of the SP. He became the promoter of an original intervention with the launch of a commission of reflection on the educational system, under his own impulse in 1984 at Collège de France. This was a role that corresponded more closely to his conception of the intellectual as a specialized and autonomous scientist, and also to Foucault’s notion of the ‘specific intellectual’ (one who focuses on a professional area rather than on universal problems). His first years of lectures at Collège de France were devoted to his sociological theory, including his critical analysis of political representation, which can also be read as a critique of working-class traditional organizations. Then, from 1987 to 1992, he made a significant move toward an analysis of the State, in relation with surveys about the bureaucratic field.

The period of the 1984-85 commission has been investigated in his PhD thesis by Pierre Clément (Clément, 2013), who shows how Bourdieu tried to navigate between the views of his colleagues and the reactions of his smaller ‘group’ of co-workers. En masse, the colleagues were mostly directors of laboratories and big scientific entrepreneurs and tended to support a soft neoliberal reform of the French educational system (more competition, more ‘autonomy’ for schools and universities...). In contrast, members of his own scientific group (Merllié, Lenoir and others) were much more critical and left-oriented and refused the anti-unionist rhetoric pushed by some of the professors. The result is a political synthesis, “beyond the opposition between liberalism and statism”, where competition had to be more present in the educational system, but also regulated in order to avoid a rise in inequality (see Bourdieu 2002). Beyond this, the report presented many ideas coming directly from Bourdieu’s research especially with regard to social inequality, cultural pluralism (against the heavy cultural hierarchy prevailing in the French system), and what was called rational pedagogy in the 1960s. The report was published in March 1985, one year before the parliamentary election in which



the right came back into power, so its recommendations were never applied and remained purely programmatic.

In 1988, Bourdieu strongly supported the appointment of Michel Rocard as prime minister to Mitterrand, especially through a pro-Rocard text in *Le Monde* about his action in New Caledonia (Bourdieu 1988). Bourdieu again became involved in a political endeavour with the Collège de France, leading to the Bourdieu-Gros report (1989), which was again rather lightweight politically, recommending reform. As Eribon notes, 1988 marks the reconciliation with the socialist government under Rocard, and Bernard Kouchner, the ‘French doctor’, finally became a minister.

Eribon describes this experience as very disappointing for Bourdieu. In the same period, at least since 1986, he had become gradually more critical of Neoliberalism (not yet referred to as such) and the French Socialist Party. In November-December 1986, he supported a student movement against a rise in registration fees, and criticized the ideological choices of the governing right and the earlier liberal conversion of the left. In 1989, in *State Nobility*, he criticized the resurgence of ‘grandes écoles’ as they represented a renewed domination of the intellectual pole by institutions of power (for example, the *Ecole Nationale d’Administration* and the business schools). But Bourdieu clearly appeared as a left-wing critic of the ruling socialist party in 1993 with *La misère du monde*, in which he analysed the social impact of the economic reforms. After this book, he became a more radical critic of Neoliberalism, and worked to promote a collective intellectual resistance and an independent ‘European social movement’ orientation up to his death in 2002.

The cold war was over, and Neoliberal globalization had altered the World economic system, the position of France (a declining empire), and Europe (now clearly dominated by a reunified Germany and Ordoliberalismus). The dominant economic and financial forces were constantly challenging autonomous fields: inside the State, the traditional conservative and Neoliberal forces were becoming more and more pro-eminent. New alliances were becoming necessary between intellectuals and social forces. The creation of a ‘collective intellectual’, which was an ideal pursued by both Bourdieu and Foucault, was again on the agenda. It would take various forms during the 1990s (a collective for Algerian intellectuals, another about higher education, the *Raisons d’agir* group and collection) but the critique of political parties remained central.

At the end of the 1990s, Bourdieu was asked to write about Foucault and to prevent an ideological reinterpretation by those scholars who wanted to present him as a Neoliberal ‘thinker of risk’. In 2000 Didier Eribon, a close intellectual associate of Bourdieu, organized a conference on the “‘Infréquentable’ Michel Foucault”, a phrase that translates as ‘disreputable’. The aim was to show that Foucault never identified with the radical Neoliberal ideology but developed a personalized form of resistance – a perspective which is still a matter for debate.

The historical account demonstrates that the situation was rather more ambiguous and ambivalent. Foucault and Bourdieu were, for a short period, allied to a political, mediatic and unionist network of actors that slid from radical leftism

to a libertarian-type proto-neoliberalism in the 1980s before making an even more radical U-turn in the 1980s and 1990s. Foucault and Bourdieu in different ways and with differing levels of commitment, resisted these realignments, trying to maintain after 1981 what Foucault termed a ‘logic of the left’ (‘logique de gauche’). However, by 1992 Bourdieu understood that this left-wing logic had been largely abandoned by the majority of the Socialist Party, its technocratic-modernist ruling group and their close intellectual supporters. Everything needed to be reconstructed, and no political organization was really in a position to achieve this. This left a void to be filled, paving the way for the emergence of what would become the alterglobalist movement.

Frédéric Lebaron (Laboratoire Printemps, UFR des sciences sociales, UVSQ/UPSAY, 47 boulevard Vauban, 78047 Guyancourt Cedex, Frederic.lebaron@uvsq.fr, +33(0)609963450)

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Pierre Bourdieu is cited around 420.000 times according to “google scholar” (October 2015), and Michel Foucault 579.243 times. By comparison, Joseph Stiglitz, still living, is cited 191.109 times.
- <sup>2</sup> For a study of the characteristics of professors during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, see Charle, 1988.
- <sup>3</sup> May 1981 is the date of the victory of François Mitterrand and the left at the presidential election. We base our analysis on a set of fundamental studies, such as the book of Louis Pinto, *Les philosophes entre le lycée et l’avant-garde. Les métamorphoses de la philosophie dans la France d’aujourd’hui*, Paris, L’Harmattan, 1987 and various following articles and books by the same author. About Bourdieu and Aron, Marc Joly provides material and interpretation in his *Devenir Norbert Elias. Histoire croisée d’un processus de reconnaissance scientifique: la réception française*, Paris, Fayard, 2012. We have also used the thesis of Pierre Clément about the reforms of “college” and the role of the Collège de France (Clément, 2013). Discussions with Pierre Bourdieu, Didier Eribon, Johan Heilbron, and various actors at the Centre de sociologie européenne have allowed to add various elements to the data material.
- <sup>4</sup> He was also writing his “Flaubert” during the other part of the day. See Gerassi, 2011.
- <sup>5</sup> *L’Archipel du Goulag* from A.Soljenitsyne was at the center of a very intense mediatic mobilization.
- <sup>6</sup> In Benny Lévy’s case, the conversion is to be understood literally since Lévy abandons Marxism for Judaism around 1977. His last interview with Sartre is at the origin of a polemic in the Sartrian group, with Lévy being accused of attempting to convert Sartre to Judaism (see Beauvoir, 1983).
- <sup>7</sup> The 1970s are Bourdieu’s ‘theoretical’ period, with two important theoretical articles on Max Weber and *Esquisse d’une théorie de la pratique* (Outline of a theory of practice) in 1972, *Le sens pratique* (Practical sense) in 1979.

- <sup>8</sup> Coluche was a comedian who began to campaign for the presidential election with the support of intellectuals like Bourdieu.
- <sup>9</sup> In the 1980s and 1990s, most of the members of the group have explicitly taken up conservative orientations, including tough neoliberal and pro-US views, namely: Yves Montand, who promoted Alain Minc's ideas in the TV-program "Vive la crise!" ; Bernard Kouchner, the humanitarian doctor of the 'boat people', has become a minister under Sarkozy and resigned from the Socialist Party... Most of them move towards pro-NATO and aggressive pro-war positions, toward Afghanistan to Libya and Syria.
- <sup>10</sup> This 1982-83 shift was presented at the beginning as a parenthesis.

## References

- Beauvoir de, S. 1983. *La cérémonie des adieux*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Boschetti, A. 1985. *Sartre et les Temps modernes*. Paris: Minit.
- Bourdieu, P., Passeron J.-C. 1964. *Les héritiers. Les étudiants et la culture*. Paris. Minit.
- Bourdieu, P. 1966. Champ intellectuel et projet créateur. *Les temps modernes*, 246, novembre, p. 865-906.
- Bourdieu, P., Boltanski, L. 1978. La production de l'idéologie dominante. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 2/3.
- Bourdieu, P. 1980. Sartre, tr. R. Nice, *London Review of Books*, vol. 2, 22, 20 November-3 December 1980, p. 11-12.
- Bourdieu, P. 1982. *Leçon sur la leçon*. Paris: Minit.
- Bourdieu, P. 1984. *Homo Academicus*. Paris: Minit.
- Bourdieu, P. 1985 Les intellectuels et les pouvoirs, in *Michel Foucault, une histoire de la vérité*. Paris: Syros.
- Bourdieu, P. 1989. *La noblesse d'Etat. Grandes écoles et esprit de corps*. Paris: Minit.
- Bourdieu, P. 1992. *Les règles de l'art. Genèse et structure du champ littéraire*. Paris: Seuil.
- Bourdieu, P. 2002. *Interventions. Textes présentés par F.Poupeau et T.Discepolo*, Marseille: Agone.
- Charle C. 1988. *Les professeurs du Collège de France*. Paris: CNRS.
- Clément, P. 2013. *Réformer les programmes pour changer l'école? Une sociologie historique du champ du pouvoir scolaire*. Amiens: Thèse pour le doctorat de sciences de l'éducation sous la direction de Bertrand Geay, UPJV.
- Eribon, D. 2011. *Michel Foucault*. Paris: Champs Flammarion.
- Eribon, D. (ed.) 2001. *L'infréquentable Michel Foucault*. Paris: EPEL.
- Foucault, M. 1971. *L'ordre du discours*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Foucault, M. 1976. *La volonté de savoir*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Gerassi, J. 2011. *Entretiens avec Sartre*. Paris: Grasset.

- Hocquenghem, G. 2003. *Lettre ouverte à ceux qui sont passés du col Mao au Rotary*. Marseille: Agone.
- Lebaron, F. 2001. Michel Foucault: de la critique de l'économie à l'action syndicale, in Eribon D. (ed.), *L'infréquentable Michel Foucault*. Paris: EPEL p. 157-167.
- Matonti F., Sapiro G., 'L'engagement des intellectuels' - nouvelles perspectives, *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 1/2009 (n° 176-177), p. 4-7.  
URL: [www.cairn.info/revue-actes-de-la-recherche-en-sciences-sociales-2009-1-page-4.htm](http://www.cairn.info/revue-actes-de-la-recherche-en-sciences-sociales-2009-1-page-4.htm).
- Pinto, L. 1987. *Les philosophes entre le lycée et l'avant-garde*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Sartre, J.-P., with Gavi, P., Victor, P. 1974. *On a raison de se révolter*. Paris: Gallimard.