A GENEALOGY OF THE FRENCH *COLLÈGE*: THE EMERGENCE OF AN INSTITUTION OF DELEUZEAN CONTROL

Samuel John Matuszewski, BA(Hons), MA

Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
June 2018

Abstract

This thesis constitutes the first analysis of the development of the French education system and the emergence of the French *collège* in relation to Gilles Deleuze's assertion that, in the post-war period, the disciplinary societies described by Michel Foucault have entered into crisis and that a new 'control society' is emerging. The first chapter of the thesis establishes the theoretical framework to be applied, elucidating the connections between Foucault's concepts of power and *dispositif* and Deleuze's concepts of desire and *agencement*, before considering how historical change emerges through the intensification of strategies of power. The rest of the chapter outlines the abstract traits of discipline and then control and considers how these strategies of power might be actualised in the institution of the school. The second chapter applies this framework to the development of the education system established under the Third Republic, which is found to consist of three separate disciplinary *dispositifs* of education that actualise distinct logics of education. The third chapter traces the intensification of strategies of power responding to the logics of the three institutions identified in the previous chapter and the transformations of the education system that this provokes before showing the emergence of the *collège* from the confluence of these intensified logics, which establishes it as an institution of control traversed by a modulation of disciplinary logics. The *collège* is then also shown to develop governance structures that promote modulation as the local negotiation of the institution. The thesis argues that the emergence of the *collège* marks the beginning of a shift from discipline to control in the French education system.

Acknowledgements

I would like to offer my most sincere thanks to my PhD supervisors at the University of Nottingham, Dr John Marks and the late Professor Chris Johnson, whose encouragement, support and measured critiques have helped me over many years of study and learning. I am extremely grateful for their patience and support. I hope that this thesis will make Chris proud.

I would like to also thank my examiners, Professor Jeremy Ahearne and Dr Jeremy Lane for their comments and patience. I hope to have fulfilled your requests and apologise for any overzealous response to your comments.

I would also like to thank all the staff and postgraduate students in the French department and elsewhere at the University of Nottingham – both past and present – for their friendship, feedback and encouragement. My special thanks go to all those in the postgraduate office who have encouraged my cake habit and to those who have offered me some support and encouragement during the difficult times.

I am especially grateful to Perdie Alder, Dr Martien Williams, Paul Holmes, Dr Adam Horsley, Ben Taylor, Isha Pearce, Sam Wilkinson, Sarah Tang, Pauline Zéo, Francis Mikus, Toby Ryan, Bethan Keogh, Clare Greenhalgh, and Sebouh Kouyoumjian for their support and kindness.

This thesis could not have been completed without generous funding awarded to me by the Arts and Humanities Research Council. I am also grateful to the AHRC, the Graduate School, the School of Cultures, Languages and Area Studies, the SFS and SSFH for funding that has enabled me to make several research trips to Paris, as well as attend conferences in Australia and the USA. I would like to offer warm thanks to Professor Mort Guiney for his encouragement and mentorship.

My greatest thanks go to my parents, John and Elaine, and my brother, Tom, who have supported me through some particularly trying times in the last few years. I am in their debt.

Finally, I would like to thank Katie, who, although she may be far away for now, has been with me all the way.

S.J.M.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....1

1. Discipline, Control and Education: Theoretical Foundations.....10

I - Foucault and Deleuze: Power, *dispositif* and history.....14

Foucault and Deleuze: Power and desire, *dispositif* and *agencement*.....18

Historical change and *dispositif*/*agencement*.....40

II - Discipline and the Disciplinary Society.....49

Foucault's concept of discipline.....49

Deleuze's description of disciplinary society.....57

III - The Decline of Discipline.....61

The *crise d'enfermement*.....61

A "liberation" of the individual.....70

IV - Beyond Disciplinary Enclosure.....73

A new mode of norm and subjectivity creation.....73

From fixed *mots d'ordre* to mobile *mots de passe*.....77

V- Control.....79

The *assujettissement* in the *asservissement*.....79

Horizontal surveillance and social validation.....82

Une rivalité inexpiable.....85

The modulation of control.....88

Axiomatic dynamism and the dividual subjectivity.....94

‘Rivalité inexpiable’ and control as secret organisation.....96

Capitalism and control.....102

VI - The abstract machine of control.....109

VII - Control and the school.....111

Conclusion.....116

2. The disciplinary prehistory of the *collège*.....122

I - The community-centred logic and *l’enseignement primaire*.....126

The disciplinary *dispositif* of *l’enseignement primaire*.....149

II - The individual-centred logic and *l’enseignement secondaire*.....155

The development of *l’enseignement secondaire* under the Third Republic 167

The disciplinary *dispositif* of *l’enseignement secondaire*.....181

III - The economy-centred logic and *l’enseignement technique et professionnel*.....196

The disciplinary *dispositif* of *l’enseignement technique*.....199

IV - A case study of distinct disciplinary enclosure: *L’enseignement primaire supérieur*.....210

Conclusion.....229

3. The emergence of the *collège* as an institution of control.....233

I - The intensification of the three disciplines of education and the emergence of the *collège*.....240

Pre-war and inter-war periods: Identifying the limits of discipline and developing strategies of intensification 250

1944-1958: The emergence of a consensus for reform.....304

Disciplinary educational reform in the early Fifth Republic: the 1959 Berthoin reform, the 1963 Fouchet-Capelle reform, and the consolidation of an integrated disciplinary *dispositif*.....337

The limits of the Fouchet-Capelle reform and intensified demands leading to the 1975 *loi Haby* and the *collège unique*.....395

II - *Le collège*: An institution of control. 499

'Un moulage auto-déformant qui changerait continûment, d'un instant à l'autre': The *collège* as a dividual institution of control.....501

'[U]ne entreprise qui n'a plus que des gestionnaires': modulatory governance and the *collège*.....506

Conclusion 510

Conclusion 512

Bibliography 522

Laws and regulatory texts cited 561

Abbreviations.....579

Introduction

In 1975, Michel Foucault published perhaps his most influential work, *Surveiller et punir*,[1] in which he depicted the emergence, by the middle of the nineteenth century, of a disciplinary society based upon the generalisation of the strategy of discipline, exemplified in the ideal model of the panopticon prison designed by Jeremy Bentham. This strategy of discipline was enacted in an enclosed space, coded for the subjection of individuals to a specified set of norms, and achieved this subjection through the techniques of hierarchical surveillance, normalising sanction and the examination. Although this text focused on the development of the prison, Foucault also drew upon other examples of disciplinary institution, including the school, to illustrate many aspects of the strategy of discipline. As Marks (2010a: 55) notes, however, in writing this 'histoire du présent' (SP: 40) Foucault was merely showing us what we had inherited from the disciplinary model and were in the process of moving away from.

Towards the end of the 1980s, after the death of his old friend Foucault, Gilles Deleuze (2003a: 240-247)[2] began to argue that we were no longer living in a disciplinary society, but were rather entering a new type of society that, taking inspiration from William S. Burroughs, he named a society of control.[3]

[1] References to this text (Foucault 1975) are hereafter indicated by the abbreviation SP.
[2] References to this text (Deleuze 2003a) are hereafter indicated by the abbreviation PP.
[3] Both Deleuze and Foucault presented at a conference organised at Columbia University in New York in November 1975, where they also heard William S. Burroughs give a presentation entitled 'The Impasses of Control'. It would seem that this is where Deleuze picked the name control from, which is not to say that there were no other reasons for choosing this word. See Lotringer (2013: 23; 2013b); Lotringer and Morris (2013); Burroughs (2013a; 2013b); and, for a consideration of the naming of concepts, Deleuze and Guattari (2005: 13). For more on the relationship between Deleuze and Burroughs' concepts of control, see Moore (2007). For some

This new society of control was emerging, for Deleuze, from a crisis of disciplinary enclosures, such as the school, that began in earnest in the post-war period. In place of the separate 'moulages distincts' of the disciplinary society, the society of control would see the development of a single modulation, 'comme un moulage auto-déformant qui changerait continûment' (PP: 242). Shorn of their enclosures in this control society, the disciplinary institutions would no longer be able to function and enact their individual programmes of disciplinary subjection and would, instead, function through the modulations of a limitless 'contrôle continu'.

In the same year that Foucault published *Surveiller et punir*, *Loi 75-620 du 11 juillet 1975 relative à l'éducation*, known as the *Loi Haby* after René Haby who was the *ministre de l'Éducation* from 28 May 1974 to 5 April 1978, completed the unification and systematisation of French education, which had previously been composed of a number of separate courses, by introducing a single middle school for all French pupils aged 11 to 15: the *collège*, or what is often referred to as the *collège unique*, which would welcome its first pupils at the *rentrée* of 1977. Although the realisation of the long project seeking the creation of an *école unique* for all pupils since the First World War, this institution would soon be the target of intense debate and polemical attacks.

Barely four years after welcoming their first classes, the *collèges* were already experiencing difficulties accommodating some pupils in the newly heterogeneous classes and so the new *ministre de l'Éducation nationale*, Alain Savary, commissioned a report on the possible adaptations that could be made to solve these problems. This report, entitled *Pour un collège démocratique*,

---

of Burroughs's literary treatments of themes of control, see Burroughs (1998; 2008; 2010a; 2010b; 2010c; 2010d).

was returned to the minister by its author, Louis Legrand, in 1982 before it was published in 1983. This report suggested a number of reforms to both pedagogical practices and school governance and thereby provoked a vicious "anti-pédagogiste" backlash from traditionalists and conservatives (Trouvé 2013: 195).

The *collège*, at the forefront of the democratisation of education to all pupils, therefore became a favoured topic in the recurrent and polarised debates over an apparent "crise scolaire" between so-called *pédagogues* or reformers, who are generally in favour of adapting pedagogy and the school to the needs of pupils, and the so-called *républicains* or *anti-pédagogues* who, convinced of the parlous decline of modern education and full of nostalgia for a mythical golden age of the Third Republic school created by Jules Ferry, are attached to the idea of a traditional emphasis on disciplinary knowledge and are thoroughly disdainful of any attempts to undermine, as they see it, the transmission of this knowledge through any pedagogical sophistry (see Bulle 2012b; Fabre 2002; Trouvé 2013). The *collège* has continued to be the subject of reports, intense debates and polemical publications[4] as these polemical divisions continue to flare up and concerns over a "crise scolaire" have continued to grow. Indeed, the latest attempt to reform the *collège*, introduced by the previous *ministre de l'Éducation nationale*, Najat Vallaud-Belkacem, to take effect at the *rentrée* of 2016, was, again, the subject of strong debate and division.

This thesis seeks to bring these two crises, the schools crisis and the crisis of disciplinary enclosure, into relation by analysing the emergence and

[4] See, for example, Demailly (1991); Paty (1997); Dubet et al. (1999); Dubet and Duru-Bellat (2000); Kuntz and Meirieu (2009); HCE (2010); and Castellanet (2011).

development of the *collège* as a *dispositif* of power through the lens of Deleuze's argument that we are seeing the emergence of a new society of control in the post-war era.

This thesis takes its place in a growing English-language literature that explores the work of Gilles Deleuze and educational issues (Bonta 2013; Cole 2011; 2013; Thompson and Cook 2012; 2014; Semetsky and Masny 2013; Semetsky 2008; Wallin 2010; Webb 2009; 2011) and in an already large and still growing literature that examines issues of education with relation to Foucault, in which field perhaps Stephen J. Ball (1990; 2013) is the leading light (see also Peters et al. 2009). It differs from much of this literature, however, in its diagnostic orientation and focus on the development of the school as a *dispositif* in relation to Deleuze's theory of control. Much of the literature regarding Foucault and education and Deleuze and education falls into the category of critical pedagogy studies with a more practical orientation. Only Webb (2011) and Thompson and Cook (2012) have focused on the development of educational *dispositifs* in relation to Deleuze's concept of control, in Canada and Australia respectively, although they, too, both have a more practical goal. This thesis is also the first English-language study to examine the French case with regard to Deleuze's theory of control.

There is very little French-language literature on this particular analytical approach to institutions of education, as Dubet (2014) recently noted with regard to the lack of any applications of Foucault to the study of French education. One possible exception to this underemployment is the recent study by Laval et al. (2011) where Foucault's ideas of governmentality are employed. However, this text is much more oriented by a Marxian political

economy approach, which this thesis seeks to avoid, and argues that the French school is now dominated by the demands of the neoliberal capitalist economy, which, again, is not a position that this thesis supports.

Deleuze's thought has also received limited application to the questions of the concrete institutions of education in French language. Boudinet (2012) and Charbonnier (2009) have written about Deleuze's pedagogical thought but do not offer analyses of the actual education system. Stiegler (2008) approaches some elements of Deleuze's theory of control with his study but focuses on the questions of communicational technologies and their effect on young people in education. Such questions of technology will be largely absent from this thesis as they tend not to play a significant role in the organisation of the *collège dispositif* examined. Dutercq (2000) refers to rhizomatic networks within education in reference to Deleuze but, here again, there is no reference to his concepts of the control society and no wider engagement with Deleuze's thought. This lack of engagement with Deleuze's theory of the society of control in France is perhaps surprising given the frequent references to schools in his discussions of the society of control, which will be highlighted later.

This will also be the first study of the development of the French education system and the *collège* as *dispositifs* from this deleuzo-foucauldian perspective. Other sustained examinations of the *collège* (Delahaye 2006; Demailly 1991; Derouet 2003; Dutercq and Derouet 2004; Paty 1997) do not examine the *dispositif* of the *collège* as a whole from this perspective and there is no history of the French education sytem that adopts this perspective.

The thesis takes as its principal object the emergence of the *collège* for a number of reasons. Firstly, it is a new institution of education that emerges

during the post-war period identified by Deleuze as that in which disciplinary enclosures are entering into crisis and so is an interesting case study for Deleuze's theory. Secondly, it is an institution attended by all French pupils. Thirdly, its fairly controversial status makes it an interesting case. Often derided as the *maillon faible* of the education system, it is also, as Jacquet-Francillon (2010a: 33) notes, the 'maillon central' of the French education system and therefore, as Delahaye 2006: 17) notes, 'le maillon révélateur des problèmes de l'ensemble du système éducatif'.[5]

This thesis traces the emergence of the *collège* as a *dispositif* of control through a progressive intensification of the exercise of power in service of the distinct disciplinary community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education that had previously been actualised in separate, hierarchically organised, disciplinary *dispositifs*. The *collège*, in simultaneously actualising all three of these logics in one space, will be seen to be traversed by a modulation of different disciplinary logics indicative of the control society described by Deleuze. Additionally, through the attempted intensification of its disciplinary function by an adaptation to local feedback, it will be argued that the *collège* comes to be further modulated by its stakeholders as *gestionnaires* which, as will be seen, is also indicative of the emergence of control. This new local modulation also has implications for totalising and centralised understandings of school reform.

Secondarily, this thesis will also show how the *dispositifs* that make up the education system develop and change as a product of the intensification of the exercise of power in service of its given aims, a process identified by

[5] Indeed, Delahaye (2007) also suggests that the *collège* acts as a 'miroir grossissant des difficultés de gouverner l'éducation.'

Nealon (2008: 38) as the 'primary mechanism' that can account for historical change in Foucault's account of *dispositifs* of power. The thesis will show that the education system of the Third Republic developed as a tripartite system of separate disciplinary, centralised *dispositifs*, each actualising a distinct normative logic, before continuing efforts to intensify the exercise of power in service of these logics produce the shifts and transformations of these *dispositifs* of education into the twentieth century.

Thirdly, by analysing the actualisation of a *dispositif* of control in a school, I hope to demonstrate that the emergence of a system of control need not rely on neoliberal capitalism nor on digital technologies, as some have suggested (see Hardt and Negri 2000; and Savat 2013 respectively). The concrete practices of neoliberal capitalism and functions of digital technologies will rather be seen as specific concrete actualisations of a broader abstract diagram of control.

The first chapter is devoted to the elaboration of the theory of the control society. It will first consider Foucault's concept of the *dispositif* of power before examining the idea of historical change emerging from the intensification of strategies of power. Next, the *dispositifs* of discipline will be considered to establish the abstract traits of disciplinary *dispositifs*, before the same is done for the society of control through the examination of a range of sociological texts that highlight certain functions and of Deleuze's previous works to further elaborate certain concepts. The abstract nature of the control machine beyond its actualisations in particular contexts, such as those of digital technology and neoliberal capitalism, will be emphasised. This chapter will end with a consideration of the ways that a system of control might be

actualised in a school and the identification of certain key traits for both disciplinary and control power.

The second chapter traces the intensifications of the exercise of power in response to three distinct strategic objectives that led to the emergence and consolidation of the tripartite, disciplinary system of education of the Third Republic from which the institution of the *collège* would eventually emerge in the twentieth century. Three orders of education will be identified each with their own normative orientation or disciplinary logic: the primary order of education that actualised a community-centred logic of education, the secondary order of education that actualised an individual-centred logic of education, and the technical or professional order of education that actualised an economy-centred logic of education. Each of these orders of education will be shown to have developed their own separate, hierarchically organised and centralised disciplinary *dispositifs* and the strict separation of each of these logics will be shown through a case study of the institutions of *l'enseignement primaire supérieure.*

The third chapter will then proceed to show the emergence of the *collège* as a *dispositif* of control from the continued intensification of the exercise of power through the various *dispositifs* of education in service of the community-, individual- and economy-centred logics. This process of intensification will be shown to be an iterative process of the identification of limitations and the development of proposals and practices to respond to these limits that will eventually lead, first, to an integration of the separate disciplinary enclosures of the tripartite Third Republic education system in a single disciplinary *dispositif* before these enclosures themselves were

identified as a limitation on the intensification of the exercise of power and a growing consensus for the elimination of these enclosures led to the emergence of the *collège* at the confluence of the divergent community-, individual- and economy-centred logics. We will complete this chapter by analysing a number of ways in which the *collège* presents a *dispositif* of control that departs from the exercise of disciplinary power. It will be argued, with reference to the founding texts of this institution and its subsequent development, that the *collège* constitutes a dividual institution of control that is durably marked by the modulation of the three divergent disciplinary logics it actualises and departs therefore from the disciplinary model of an institution that acts as a distinct mould in reponse to one logic. The continued effort to intensify the operation of power through the *collège* will then be shown to lead to a decentralisation of certain powers and the development of a quasi-market of education, which suggests the decline of the disciplinary, hierarchical determination of the institution and the emergence instead of a system of immanent constitution of the *collège* with all of its stake-holders that is indicative of control.

It will be hoped that this thesis may be able to inform further study on the function of other aspects of the French education system, or other education systems, from a deleuzo-foucauldian approach, and further study of Deleuze's thought informed by this empirical aspect.

1. Discipline, Control and Education: Theoretical Foundations

In order to examine the relation of the French school, in the form of the *collège*, to the social shift from a disciplinary society to a control society posited by Deleuze, we must first establish what is meant by the key terms discipline and control, how they have been seen to manifest themselves in contemporary society, and, also, how they have been related to education and the institution of the school as an object of analysis.

To discuss the disciplinary we can draw upon the clear description of the disciplinary society, disciplinary institutions and the practice of discipline Foucault provides in his 1975 text *Suveiller et punir* and supplements in his lectures at the Collège de France and later texts, which are built upon the discussion of concrete historical cases.[6] Deleuze's conception of control and the control society, on the other hand, is less well documented in his writings, and the highly abstract, more ontological character and language of his work constitutes an obstacle to developing a more concrete image of control.

Post-scriptum sur les sociétés de contrôle (PP: 240-247), first published in 1990,[7] is the only text written by Deleuze specifically and explicitly upon the subject of control and the society and subjectivities through which it works, but, beyond the clarity of Deleuze's statement that, towards the end of the twentieth century, we are no longer in disciplinary societies, little is immediately clear in this text. However, following the courses that he dedicated to Foucault's work at the University of Paris 8 - Vincennes in 1985-

[6] This approach reflects Foucault's methodological concern for beginning from a consideration of concrete practices, see Foucault (1976: 121-135; 2004b: 4-5). This is reflected in his particular understanding of power that will be discussed later.

[7] Hereafter referred to in the text as the *Post-scriptum*.

86 after Foucault's death in 1984,[8] Deleuze briefly discusses the concept of control and a control society in a small number of other works in the 1980s.[9] Additionally, both John Protevi (2001: 194) and Eugene Holland (1998: 71) have claimed, with some justification given the number of important related concepts that find their origin in this text, that the society of control is already the object of analysis in *Mille plateaux*, written by Deleuze with Félix Guattari and published in 1980. Indeed, as will be seen, Deleuze's work on the control society also refers back to work completed with Guattari earlier in the 1970s, notably *L'Anti-Œdipe* (1972), the first volume of their *Capitalisme et schizophrénie* series completed by *Mille plateaux*.[10] It is through a reading of these earlier texts written by Deleuze, and by Deleuze & Guattari, which both directly, and indirectly, address the control society, and through reference to authors cited by Deleuze, as well as relevant texts from other disciplines, that we will unpack the dense concept of control to produce a hopefully clearer and more detailed image of this society that Deleuze claims is displacing the disciplinary society and how it might manifest itself in relation to education and to the case of the *collège*.

We will first outline the concept of power mobilised by Foucault and how this allows for the emergence of certain strategies of power in strategically oriented *dispositifs*, before considering the question of periodisations of forms of society by their dominant strategies of power and,

[8] For an account of the, at times strained, relationship between Deleuze and Foucault, see Dosse (2009: 364-393).

[9] There is explicit mention of control in: 'Lettre à Serge Daney: Optimisme, Pessimisme et Voyage', (PP: 97-112), which was originally published in 1986; 'Qu'est-ce qu'un acte de creation?', a lecture that was delivered in 1987 (Deleuze 2003b : 291-302; 1987); 'Qu'est-ce qu'un dispositif?', which was Deleuze's final public lecture in 1988 (2003b: 316-325); and in Deleuze's 1990 interview with Antonio Negri, 'Contrôle et devenir' (PP: 229-239).

[10] References to these texts will hereafter be indicated by the abbreviations A-O (Deleuze and Guattari 1972) and MP (Deleuze and Guattari 1980).

drawing upon the work of Nealon (2008), how the process of intensification allows for the development of novel strategies and historical change. Having then presented Foucault's theory of discipline and the disciplinary and shown how this relates to the institution of the school, we will show how Deleuze re-conceptualises Foucault's disciplinary society in order to better understand how it differs from his concept of the society of control, which we will then expound alongside considering how this society concretely manifests itself. The often overemphasised relation of the control society to neo-liberal capitalism and to digital technologies will be somewhat clarified and the position of disciplinary institutions, such as the school, within a society marked by the crisis of such institutions will then be discussed before, finally, existing treatments of the concept of the control society in relation to education and the school are examined.

Whilst the power of discipline, as analysed by Foucault, functions according to a principle of individuality and strict organisation to mould stable individual subjectivities by subjecting individuals to fixed and prescribed norms through the hierarchical surveillance and normalising sanction of their actions in a series of temporally, spatially and normatively finite sites (disciplinary institutions), the power of control discussed by Deleuze functions according to a universal modulation which inaugurates the principle of open and shifting individuation, what Deleuze would call dividuality, which entails a profound shift in the prevalent nature of normativity, subjectivity, the mode by which these are formed, and how power is exercised.

The crisis of disciplinary enclosure posited by Deleuze, and which he claims heralds the emergence of the society of control, is the key element of

this shift. This crisis of enclosure, which can be seen to relate to the inherent development of disciplinary logics, the emergence of digital technologies, the neo-liberal mutations of capitalism and the postmodern cultural shift, identified by Jean-François Lyotard (1979) and examined by Gilles Lipovetsky (1993), does not indicate the end of discipline per se, but rather indicates how the principle of individuation, the distinct and enduring enclosure of a single, unitary entity upon which the exercise of this power rests, becomes untenable as the various, previously separate disciplines with their own distinct norms spill out from their institutions to cover all social space, overlapping and interfering with the long-term subjection of individuals to a particular pre-established norm through a meticulous disciplining of their actions.

This decline of disciplinary enclosure implies a decline in the ability of disciplinary institutions to durably individuate, i.e. separate and enclose, a single mass of subjects within a space dedicated to the elaboration of a single disciplinary programme based upon clearly individuated, set norms, and to further individuate subjects and their actions within this mass. As different disciplinary logics of separate institutions, aided by advances in technology and mutations in the discourses relevant to these disciplines, begin to overlap and infiltrate each other's enclosures, institutions can no longer enclose a mass to subject it to its own system of norms; these masses are also subjected to the norms of other disciplines which have penetrated the walls of the enclosing institution.

The confluence of the action of each of these disciplines results in a confusion of norms within these institutions and the decline of the normalising hierarchical structure of the disciplinary institutions. As the newly permeable

walls of the institution allow the disciplinary gazes of other institutions to enter, the norms of the institution in question coexist and compete with the norms carried by other gazes. Based upon the legitimacy of the norms to which individuals are to be subjected, the authority of the hierarchy that enacts normalising surveillance within any given institution is challenged by these competing disciplinary logics, further undermining the capacity of an institution to ensure the disciplinary subjection of a mass of individuals and their actions to a given set of norms.

It is on the basis of this crisis of disciplinary enclosure, to be understood broadly as a crisis of durable individuation, that the mechanisms of control develop, indeed intensify the productive exercise of power seen in the biopolitical practices of discipline, and contribute to the emergence of a society of control based on modulation and what, following Deleuze, we call dividuality.

I - Foucault and Deleuze: Power, *dispositif* and history

As Deleuze himself noted (PP: 117), the philosophies of Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze share some significant affinities despite the differences in method, aim or terminology that might appear between their respective work.[11] Indeed, despite some disagreements between the two

[11] In their introduction to a special issue of *Foucault Studies* dedicated to Foucault and Deleuze, Morar, Nail and Smith (2014) assert that there has been surprisingly little focused critical attention given to examining the relations between the philosophies of these two thinkers. A conference entitled 'Between Deleuze and Foucault' was held at Purdue University in November 2012 as part of a project at that university seeking to provide English translations of the recordings of Deleuze's 1985-1986 course at the University of Paris 8-Vincennes on Foucault, which are now available online through the Bibliothèque nationale de France's (BNF) *Gallica* website, but yet to be fully transcribed in French. This project, the conference,

thinkers, which contributed to a period of estrangement between them, these two friends and colleagues publicly expressed their admiration for each other's work and acknowledged the influence of the other in their published texts.[12] As

---

and both the aforementioned special issue of *Foucault Studies* and a forthcoming book developed from the conference are intended to begin to redress this perceived oversight and prompt further comparative discussion of their work. Unfortunately the articles in the special issue bear on elements of Deleuze and Foucault's philosophies that are not directly relevant to the present discussion of *dispositifs*/*agencements* of discipline and control. One notable exception to this assertion of a lack of critical attention to the connections between Deleuze and Foucault is perhaps the collection of essays written by Olivier Razac (2008). Due to their incomplete transcription and the existence of Deleuze's book (1986), which was produced from these lectures, I have chosen not to refer to the recordings of Deleuze's lectures on Foucault for this thesis, but these will hopefully be able to enrich the present analysis in future.

[12] This period of estrangement which extended from 1977 until Foucault's death in 1984 appears to have stemmed partly from differing opinions between Foucault and Deleuze on a series of issues, including the Baader-Meinhof Group, the so-called "nouveaux philosophes", the Israel-Palestine conflict, the election of François Mitterrand in 1981, and the response of this government to the anti-*Solidarność* coup d'état in Poland that same year. However, it also developed from philosophical disagreements regarding the concept of desire that became particularly contentious following Foucault's publication of the first volume of his *Histoire de la sexualité*, *La Volonté de savoir*, in 1976, in which Foucault critiques the Reichian programme of the liberation of desire for perpetuating and partaking in the erroneous repressive hypothesis of psychoanalysis regarding desire (1976: 107-120, 173). In so doing Foucault seems to be targeting the movement of which Deleuze and Guattari's 1972 text, *L'Anti-Œdipe*, in which they drew upon the ideas of Wilhelm Reich, could be considered a key part (Goodchild 1996: 133). The text thus expresses Foucault's objection to Deleuze's use of the term desire (*désir*), which, for him, always implied the psychoanalytic conception of desire as a lack or something repressed. Deleuze relates Foucault's objection to his use of the term desire in a letter Deleuze addressed to Foucault through the intermediary of François Ewald in 1977 after the publication of *La volonté de savoir*, which was later published in 1994. In this letter Deleuze also outlines his objection to Foucault's preference for the term pleasure (*plaisir*), which he sees as a transcendent category that interrupts 'le procès immanent du désir', as well as his concerns for the future direction of Foucaut's work particularly in response to the resurgence of truth as a theme in *La volonté de savoir* (Deleuze 2003b: 112-122). It should be noted, however, that, previous to this period of estrangement, Deleuze and Foucault had a relatively close relationship, both participating in the actions of the pressure group *Groupe d'information sur les prisons* (GIP) which lead to the publication of a 'conversation' between the two entitled 'Les intellectuels et le pouvoir' in 1972, and one of Foucault's last wishes is reported to have been to reconcile with Deleuze, who eventually gave the eulogy at Foucault's funeral on 29 June 1984 upon the invitation of Foucault's partner Daniel Defert. Indeed, following Foucault's death, Deleuze dedicated a course to Foucault at Paris 8-Vincennes university in the academic year 1985-1986 and published a book on his work, *Foucault*, in 1986. The interviews that Deleuze gave in 1986 on Foucault and his book on Foucault evidence a genuine affection for his old friend (PP: 115-161) and, despite his intense dislike for colloquia, Deleuze took part in an international conference dedicated to Foucault's work in 1988 to give what would be his last public lecture (see Deleuze 2003b: 316-325). The first two chapters of Deleuze's study of Foucault (1986: 11-51) reproduced expanded versions of laudatory reviews of Foucault's texts *L'archéologie du savoir* (1969) and *Surveiller et punir* (1975) that he had published in the journal *Critique* in 1970 and 1975 respectively. Also in 1970, the same journal had published Foucault's article 'Theatrum Philosophicum' in which he reviewed Deleuze's texts *Différence et répétition* (1968) and *Logique du sens* (1969), praising Deleuze's novel contribution to philosophy and stating that 'un jour, peut-être, le siècle sera deleuzien' (1970: 885), a statement later dismissed by Deleuze as something of a private joke between them (PP: 122). Judith Revel (1996) argues that Foucault's reading of Deleuze constituted a decisive turning point for him that was

John Marks notes, 'Deleuze is frequently present, discreetly, often silently, in some of Foucault's most important and celebrated work', and the same can perhaps be said of Foucault in Deleuze's work (1998: 111, 181). Substantive points of convergence between the two thinkers' works are perhaps most evident in the concepts of power (*pouvoir*) and *dispositif* that Foucault had developed in *Surveiller et punir* (1975) and Deleuze's concepts of desire and assemblage (*agencement*), which he had created with Félix Guattari in *L'Anti-Œdipe* (1972), *Kafka: Pour une littérature mineure* (1975) and *Mille Plateaux* (1980).[13] Examining these corresponding sets of concepts will provide a

---

reflected in his subsequent work and, indeed, a footnote towards the beginning of the *Surveiller et punir* indicates the great debt that this text owes to Deleuze and the work that he was undertaking with Guattari at the time (32). Also, despite having privately expressed his dislike for the text and critiquing, as mentioned above, the liberationist movement that it helped to inspire, Foucault provided the preface to the English translation of Deleuze and Guattari's *L'Anti-Œdipe* that was published in 1977, in which he lauded it as a work of ethics that might be called 'an *Introduction to the Non-fascist Life*' (a perhaps critical reference to how 'being anti-oedipal has become a life style' remains, however) (Foucault 2004c: xv-xvi). The influence of Foucault's thought on Deleuze's own is evidenced not only by his work on Foucault in the 1980s and his development of the concept of the society of control, but also in the frequent references to Foucault's work throughout Deleuze's collaborative works of the 1970s (A-O: 58-59, 110-111, 157, 233, 251, 323, 356, 361, 383-384, 430; Deleuze and Guattari 1975: 44, 103; Deleuze and Parnet 1996: 17-18, 32-33, 102-103, 106, 156-157; MP: 86-87, 111, 145, 174-176, 265, 274, 287, 467, 480). For more on the relationship between Deleuze and Foucault and their work see Marks (1998: 108-122; 2010b) and Dosse (2009: 364-393) from which much of the detail above was drawn. For a consideration of the relationship between the thought of Foucault and that of Guattari, including Foucault's relatively short association with Guattari's CERFI (*Centre d'études, de recherches et de formation institutionnelles*), see Taga (2014).

[13] The original French terms will be retained where possible due to the particularities of these terms that are obscured by their common English translations. Bussolini (2010) points out that the active, ontological and economic implications of *dispositif* are obscured by the common translation of the term as "apparatus", which implies a more static entity put into action as part of a *dispositif*, and is more closely related to the French word *appareil* that Foucault uses separately to *dispositif*. Bussolini suggests translating the term simply as "dispositive". The concept of *agencement* developed by Deleuze and Guattari (1975; 1980) tends to be translated as "assemblage" (see Deleuze and Gattari 2004b) or, less often, as "arrangement", but, as Wise (2011) notes, the French term, again, has more of an active sense and, indeed, describes the action of assembling, arranging or putting together rather than just the assemblage or arrangement that results. Like a *dispositif*, an *agencement* indicates an active process. Indeed, it could also be noted that *agencement* contains within itself the French word *agence*, meaning agency. However, perhaps surprisingly, there is no etymological link between *agencement* and *agence*, which are both derived from different sources (*Le Grand Robert)*. Tangentially, it would perhaps be interesting to consider the relationship between these terms and their usage and Claude Lévi-Strauss's concept of *bricolage* (see Johnson 2012), especially given its recurrent use by Deleuze and Guattari in *L'Anti-Œdipe* (7, 13, 280, 385). However, this is, of course, beyond the scope of the current thesis.

clearer sense of what Foucault and Deleuze mean when they discuss the disciplinary society and what exactly is at stake in the shift towards a control society. This will enable a clearer analysis in the following chapters of the emergence and development of the *collège*, which, like all institutions, will be seen to constitute a *dispositif* of power or *agencement* of desire, in relation to this shift.

Through a presentation of Foucault's concepts of power and *dispositif* (usually translated as apparatus) and of Deleuze's concepts of desire and *agencement* (usually translated as assemblage or arrangement), it will be seen that these concepts fulfil similar functions in their respective work and can thus be employed concurrently to consider the shift from discipline to control posited by Deleuze as it relates to the French *collège*. Both desire and power will be seen to refer to an impersonal and productive immanent force that constitutes and organises heterogeneous elements to construct the social world or reality. The various configurations of a multiplicity of elements that make up this world are what Deleuze would refer to as an *agencement* and Foucault would call a *dispositif* and consist, for each thinker, of not only the discourses and objects that compose it but also the nature of the relations between these elements and the way by which it functions, the effects and affects that it produces and the way in which these are produced, the tactics and strategies employed. This ensemble of the functional or strategic traits of an *agencement* or *dispositif* are what is indicated by the terms discipline and control. These concepts refer to an abstracted *dispositif*, a *diagramme*, of particular strategic and relational traits, what Deleuze would call an abstract machine, that can be actualised in a number of different concrete *dispositifs* or *agencements*. The

terms of discipline or control refer, then, to particular types of abstract machines or diagrams of distinctive traits, or relations and strategies. In positing the emergence of a society of control in place of the disciplinary society, Deleuze is asserting the decline of the *diagramme* of discipline and the generalisation of a new and distinct abstract machine of control throughout society.

Building upon this theoretical foundation, the task of the following sections of this chapter will be to detail the distinctive traits of discipline as an abstract strategy of power, first as understood by Foucault and then as interpreted by Deleuze, before considering how these abstract traits are challenged in the post-war period and outlining the distinctive features of the abstract machine of control as described by Deleuze. Where possible this analysis will be related to educational institutions and existing literature that examines schools from this perspective. It is these ideal and abstract models of discipline and control which will be employed to assess Deleuze's argument of a shift from the former to the latter in relation to the French school in the analysis of the development of the *collège* in the rest of this thesis.

Foucault and Deleuze: Power and desire, *dispositif* and *agencement*

In *Surveiller et punir* Foucault is primarily concerned with an examination of the emergence from the seventeenth century of a new power of discipline, as represented in the rise of the corrective penal institution of the prison. Foucault's analysis shows that, having displaced the previous dominance of sovereign power, this power of discipline comes to be the

principal mode of power in society by the end of the nineteenth century, marking the transition to a new disciplinary society characterised by the organisation of a series of closed institutions, in which the power of discipline is deployed to subject individuals to norms of action which seek to maximise the force they produce and its utility.

Foucault's analysis relies, however, upon his new theory of power and its expression in *dispositifs*, which maintains that power (*pouvoir*), whether sovereign, disciplinary or otherwise, 's'exerce plutôt qu'il ne se possède' and must be understood as 'un réseau de relations toujours tendues, toujours en activité plutôt qu'un privilege qu'on pourrait détenir' (SP: 35).[14] Indeed, the active nature of this power is emphasised in Foucault's use of the term *pouvoir*, which, as well as indicating power in the sense of an actual or legally defined authority or capacity to carry out certain acts, is also a verb meaning 'to be able to', instead of the more static or passive noun *puissance*, which indicates power as a potential or virtual force that can be applied or produced (*Le Grand Robert*). Foucault succinctly outlines this theory towards the beginning of *Surveiller et punir* (34-36), but this account can be supplemented by subsequent expositions in his later texts, lectures, and interviews, amongst which one of the most developed can be found in *La volonté de savoir* (1976: 121-135), the first volume of his, eventually unfinished, *Histoire de la sexualité*.

[14] Foucault asserts that he aims to advance 'moins vers une "théorie" que vers une "analytique" du pouvoir' (1976: 109) and in his Collège de France lectures of 1976 expresses his disdain for what he saw as the totalising ambitions implied by the term *théorie*: 'la question: "Qu'est-ce que le pouvoir?" serait justement une question théorique qui couronnerait l'ensemble, ce que je ne veux pas' (1997: 13). Richard A. Lynch (2010: 15) notes, however, that Foucault does employ the word "theory" himself and argues that it is valid to talk of Foucault's *theory* of power in the non-totalising sense of a 'hypothesis to organise diverse data'.

For Foucault, power refers above all to a 'microphysique du pouvoir', a term he uses frequently throughout *Surveiller et punir* (SP: 34-36, 38, 163, 175, 188), and which finds an echo in further references to a physics of power in the same text (SP: 136, 208, 243-244, 251).[15] As Richard A. Lynch (2010: 19-20) has suggested, this microphysics of power can be seen to relate to Foucault's later depiction of power as, first and foremost, consisting of 'la multiplicité des rapports de force qui sont immanents au domaine où ils s'exercent, et sont constitutifs de leur organisation' (1976: 121-122). The common reference to the field of physics in each of these descriptions (*micro-physique*, forces) indicates, according to Lynch (2010: 19-20), that Foucault principally understands power to refer to the active relations between (undefined) objects that consist in the exertion of a force. In *Surveiller et punir*, this reference to physics appears again to characterise the exercise of power when Foucault discusses the way in which power can be exercised to subject a body within a given set of power relations:

> il peut très bien être direct, physique, jouer de la force contre la force, porter sur des éléments matériels, et pourtant ne pas être violent; il peut être calculé, organisé, techniquement réfléchi, il peut être subtil, ne faire usage ni des armes ni de la terreur, et pourtant rester de l'ordre physique. (SP: 34)

[15] The distribution of these terms in *Surveiller et punir*, which appears to indicate a shift from a discussion of the *micro*physics of power to a consideration of the more general physics of power, may reflect the development of Foucault's argument in *Surveiller et punir* from an analysis of the emergence of the specific techniques of discipline to a consideration of the wider strategic model of disciplinary power and its generalisation.

It could be argued that this reference to physics is, again, expressed when, in a later 1982 text, Foucault maintains that power is the exercise of an action upon the actual or potential, current or future, actions of another acting (or potentially active) thing: 'une relation de pouvoir, c'est un mode d'action qui n'agit pas directement et immédiatement sur les autres, mais qui agit sur leur action propre' (2001: 1055-1056). For Foucault, power should be understood as the relational interplay of forces, which can be exercised, in any number of ways, upon other forces as expressed as the actual exercise or virtual capacity of a thing.

As his reference to a multiplicity of plural force relations in the above quotation (1976: 121-122) suggests, Foucault insists that the relations that are constituted in the exercise of power are multiple and immanent to their field of exercise. In *La volonté de savoir*, Foucault (1976: 122) maintains that power 'se produit à chaque instant, en tout point, ou plutôt dans toute relation d'un point à un autre'. It is for this reason that, in *Surveiller et punir*, Foucault proposes the model of a perpetual battle for this dynamic and conflicting array of power relations, in which myriad 'micropouvoirs', as 'dispositions', 'manoeuvres', 'tactiques', 'techniques' or merely 'fonctionnements', are deployed in countless points of confrontation to transform, reinforce or invert the present relations of power (SP: 35; also 1976: 122). Power is not monolithic, univocal, or totalising because these micropowers presuppose the existence of this multiplicity of points of resistance in relation to which these innumerable confrontations will, or could, arise. There is not a single confrontation that is at the base of all other conflicts, as Marx's class struggles would have it, but rather a multiplicity of conflicts that may only contingently

intersect and articulate with others to produce such apparent larger scale confrontations (SP: 34-36; Foucault 1976: 122-130).[16] For Foucault (2001: 424), this microphysics of power is omnipresent and appears to be 'toujours déjà là'; there is no position outside of these relations of power nor some source of power external to them. Even resistances to power exist within this field of power relations (Foucault 1976: 125-126; Revel 2002: 53-55). Power is omnipresent because, as Foucault (1976: 122) states, 'il vient de partout': power relations are immanent to all relations both as their effects and as the condition for these effects (Ibid. 122-130; SP: 34-36).

Importantly, for Foucault, power is also a primarily productive force, which establishes a network of relations between elements that it also brings into being through its exercise. As he writes in *Surveiller et punir*, 'le pouvoir produit; il produit du réel' (SP: 227). As noted in a passage quoted earlier from *La volonté de savoir*, the multiplicity of force relations that make up the microphysics of power constitute their own organisation and it is this 'socle mouvant des rapports de force qui induisent sans cesse, par leur inégalité, des états de pouvoir […] toujours locaux et instables' (Foucault 1976: 121-124). The multiplicity of instances of resistance to actualised power relations, which these relations presuppose, continuously drives the productive activity of the microphysics of power.

As a consequence of this conception of power, Foucault argues that the traditional view of power as a property, a capacity of imposition or prohibition, held by the dominant to be exercised over those who do not have power is

[16] See Laclau and Mouffe (2001) for a post-Marxist response to this fractured multiplicity of confrontations. Foucault's apparent dislike for Marxism as a totalising, even totalitarian, theory stems from this reductive and economicist tendency (Foucault 1997: 7-16). Foucault's relation to Marx and his works is, however, more nuanced (see Choat 2010: 94-124).

mistaken. The power that Foucault posits cannot be reduced to the sole power exercised by such dominant instances in a society, whether a government, a monarch, a class, or some other institution, group or person, nor to the effects of domination that these instances produce (SP: 34-35). Indeed, for Foucault (1976: 124; 1997: 26-29), power comes from below. These supposedly "powerful" dominant entities, their prohibitions and impositions, and the bodies to which these are applied are all considered by Foucault to be the effects produced by the diffuse, polyvocal and polyvalent microphysics of power (SP: 34-35). For Foucault, the power considered to be held by these institutions, groups or people is merely the effect of 'une situation stratégique complexe dans une société donnée' (1976: 123), 'l'effet d'ensemble [des] positions stratégiques [de pouvoir]' (SP: 35). It is not possible for this multiplicity of relations of power to be singularly localised in these apparatuses, nor in any point. The relational force of power is not a property to be owned by any entity, and, as a productive force, it is not repressive by nature. Although, the microphysics of power may produce effects of domination or repression, as shown in forms such as a police force, a prison or public execution, this multiplicity of power relations can also produce forms and strategies that would commonly be considered to be desirable, such as a teaching profession, a hospital or democratic elections.

Furthermore, despite the apparent coherence of a particular constellation of power relations and the form that crystallises it, in *Surveiller et punir*, Foucault states that these constellations and forms are piecemeal constructions that emerge from disparate calculated and intentional exercises of power, an argument that he restates in *La volonté de savoir*, where he again

asserts that power is both intentional and non-subjective. Building upon the description of power in the earlier work, Foucault claims in this later work that any exercise of power will be calculated in relation to some goal or objective, but each exercise of power will articulate with other exercises of power and their intentions and result in more complex strategies. The constellation of power relations drawn by these various intentional exercises of power and the larger strategies they may form may well express a coherent logic and mode of action, but these will be the product of multiple interplay of diffuse micropowers and their calculated intentions, and may be different from what was intended in these micropowers. Power relations are not singularly formulated by one subject of any sort but are composite forms resulting from multiple calculated and intentional exercises of (micro-)powers (SP: 34-35; Foucault 1976: 124-125; 2001: 306-309).

This is not to say that the relationship between the microphysics of tactical exercises of power and the articulated strategic powers that emerge from them is one of unidirectional causality. Indeed, for Foucault (1976: 131-132), there is always a 'double conditionnement' in which both the various tactical exercises of power and the more complex, articulated strategies that they subtend inflect and condition each other. These interactions may support, reinforce or encourage certain exercises of power while discouraging, isolating or disabling others; they express the exercise of power as 'une action sur l'action', as Foucault described it in 1982 (SP: 34-36; Foucault 1976: 121-135; 2001: 424-425, 1054-1057).

As a result of the above, the constellations of power relations that emerge from this continuous interplay of the diffuse tactics and strategies, and

the ‘formes terminales’ that they may take, such as the State, the sovereign, the law or an institution, only exist as contingent crystallisations of a given set of power relations at any one time (Foucault 1976: 121). These forms engendered by the microphysics of power are not ‘acquis une fois pour toutes’ (SP: 35), but, in order to persist, must continue to find support in the myriad tactical and strategic exercises of power and the effects these produce that make up this microphysics. Through the process of ‘double conditionnement’, the strategies crystallised in these forms will, of course, influence the tactics and strategies enacted, but will only be perpetuated insofar as these exercises of power reiterate the necessary effects for the maintenance of these strategic forms across the unstable and continuously active network of power relations. As Foucault notes, such forms and the strategies they present are local, unstable, and contingent upon the strategic situation expressed in the microphysics of power which produces them (SP: 34-36, 1976: 121-135).

In *Surveiller et punir*, Foucault underlines the productive nature of power, and how it is not just a force applied to, but rather one that works through and produces particular bodies or objects, by arguing that power produces knowledge and that this knowledge in turn constitutes an exercise of power, that ‘pouvoir et savoir s’impliquent directement l’un l’autre’ (SP: 35). For Foucault, knowledge, like all else, cannot exist outside of power relations. The knowing subject, the objects available to be known and the means by which knowledge of them can be gained are merely ‘autant d’effets de ces implications fondamentales du pouvoir-savoir et leurs transformations historiques’ (SP: 36). The determination of ‘les formes et les domaines possibles de connaissance’ (SP: 36) is itself an exercise of power, the exertion

of a force that, in seeking to code and fix the nature and qualities of material elements and the relations between them, partially conditions the exercise of power that may emerge. The intimate link between knowledge and power is clearly stated in *Surveiller et punir*: 'il n'y a pas de relation de pouvoir sans constitution corrélative d'un champ de savoir, ni de savoir qui ne suppose et ne constitue en même temps des relations de pouvoir' (SP: 36). This co-implication of power and knowledge could perhaps be most clearly exemplified by the science of eugenics in Nazi Germany, which, seen from our privileged external position, was quite evidently an artificial construct that expressed the relations of power at that time, but which also produced real effects of power that enabled some exercises of power and obstructed others by determining an object's nature as, for example, Aryan or non-Aryan, and thereby indicating what a body could legitimately do or be allowed to do. The same could be said, however, for any discourse insofar as it distinguishes and confers attributes upon a form and its capacities.

However, these discourses of power-knowledge, like the material constellations of practices that they might support or be supported by, are, again, immersed in the microphysics of power and therefore contingent and traversed by countless points of conflict. In *La volonté de savoir*, Foucault (1976: 133) depicts a complex and unstable competition where any given discourse may be 'à la fois instrument et effet de pouvoir, mais aussi obstacle, butée, point de résistance et départ pour une stratégie opposée'. Like the terminal forms produced by power discussed above, these discourses are contingent upon the continuation of the discursive strategies of power that support them.

In summary, Foucault's theory of power is that of a dynamic, impersonal multiplicity of relational forces that produces, through a piecemeal concatenation of myriad tactical exercises of force, the physical and discursive forms that contingently emerge in a society and the relations that pertain between them. This productive force is irreducible to the traditional image of power as domination or repression and, being capable of producing positive effects, affects and states, should not be thought of as inherently negative. Additionally, this relational power cannot be thought of as a property to be owned by any entity or entities, nor localised in any specific site. Indeed, by its immanence to all relations, power is omnipresent. The microphysics of power coextensive with a social field are not univocal and presuppose a multiplicity of points of resistance, which enable power to be manifested through the exercise of a force upon another force. For Foucault, as he states in a 1977 interview published under the title *Le jeu de Michel Foucault*, '*Le pouvoir, ça n'existe pas*' (emphasis in the original). It does not *exist* as a thing or form but instead *subsists* in relations *between* things; it is 'un faisceau plus ou moins organisé, plus ou moins pyramidalisé, plus ou moins coordonné, de relations' (2001: 302).

The contingent, strategically oriented networks of power relations between discursive and physical or non-discursive forms produced in a piecemeal fashion by the dynamic microphysics of power are what Foucault calls a *dispositif*. This important concept for the present study appears in Foucault's work in the 1970s and plays a central role in his *Surveiller et punir* and *La volonté de savoir*. As Deleuze noted in 1988 (2003b: 316), Foucault tends to focus on the analysis of concrete *dispositifs* and, as Agamben (2009:1)

notes, he never gives a definitive definition of this concept, but does define key aspects of this concept in the 1977 interview entitled *Le jeu de Michel Foucault* (Foucault 2001: 298-329) when asked to explain what he means by this term, which featured prominently in *La volonté de savoir* that had been published the previous year.[17]

Foucault determines three key elements of this definition. Firstly, for him, a *dispositif* is the network established between a set of heterogeneous elements, such as

> des discours, des institutions, des aménagements architecturaux, des décisions réglementaires, des lois, des mesures administratives, des énoncés scientifiques, des propositions philosophiques, morales, philanthropiques, bref du dit aussi bien que du non-dit (Foucault 2001: 299).

A *dispositif* links discursive and non-discursive elements. Secondly, a *dispositif* is said to emerge in response to what, at a given historical moment, appears as an urgent problem, and therefore it has 'une fonction stratégique dominante'. The network of relations, the *dispositif*, responds to this strategic imperative that has been seen to emerge and therefore acts as a matrix for the *dispositif*'s construction. Thirdly, it is the nature of the relations forged between the heterogeneous elements of a *dispositif* in relation to this strategic

[17] Agamben (2009: 1-24) draws upon this interview in his essay 'What is an apparatus?' and I follow his analysis of the concept of the dispositif in the following by emphasising the strategic nature of the *dispositif* as a network of relations established between heterogeneous elements highlighted by Foucault in this interview.

imperative that is of particular importance and determines how these elements are made to function and so make the *dispositif* function (2001: 299).

A *dispositif* can be seen to have two essential moments according to Foucault, which serve to bring it into existence. The first is the emergence of a strategic objective in response to the aforementioned historical emergency to which the *dispositif* responds, the aforementioned 'fonction stratégique dominante'. The second moment is that in which the *dispositif* constitutes and maintains itself as such by its own iteration and reiteration through a double process. For Foucault, the first part of this processes is functional overdetermination, by which the effects of multiple exercises of power that may emerge within the *dispositif*, be they desirable or undesirable, come to resonate with or to contradict each other in relation to the demands of the strategic objective that has imposed itself, and thereby call for the repetition of some exercises and the readjustment of others so as to achieve the strategic objective. The second aspect of the double process is what Foucault calls a 'perpétuel remplissement stratégique' where the *dispositif* continuously responds to the effects or events that arise by adapting current strategies or organising new ones to continue to fulfil and to further the strategic objective of the *dispositif* (2001: 299-300).[18]

As Olivier Razac (2008: 26) underlines, then, the *dispositif* both responds to a historical juncture and intervenes in it through the effects of such strategic manoeuvres that not only maintain, according to Foucault (2001: 309), the set of power relationships that constitute a given dispositif, but also stabilise them, accentuate them or extend them to new areas. Indeed, as

[18] Foucault gives the example of the development of a complex *dispositif* with the eventual strategic imperative of the moralisation of the working classes in nineteenth-century France (2001: 306-307).

Foucault notes in *Surveiller et punir*, the multiple interactions that constitute the microphysics of power underpinning a given *dispositif*, are only inscribed in history through the effects they have on the entirety of the network of relations (SP: 36).

This perpetuation of a *dispositif* in its historical effects reaffirms that such composite strategic exercises of power do not just act on elements that precede them but actively produce them. Just as he stated in *Surveiller et punir* that power and knowledge imply each other and are inextricably linked, Foucault (2001: 300) states that knowledge is born of but also conditions the exercise of power organised by a *dispositif* and defines a *dispositif* as 'des stratégies de rapports de forces supportant des types de savoir, et supportés par eux.'

In his discussions of Foucault's concept of the *dispositif* in his 1986 text *Foucault* and his 1988 lecture *Qu'est-ce qu'un dispositif?* (2003b: 316-325), Deleuze helps to clarify some of the aspects of this concept and also brings Foucault's work into relation with his own, highlighting how their work can be brought into productive dialogue. In distinguishing the dimensions of knowledge (*savoir*), power (*pouvoir*) and subjectivation that make up a *dispositif*, Deleuze echoes Foucault's definition of this concept and clarifies their functional relation to each other.[19]

The first dimension Deleuze discusses is that of *savoir* which he states is the sedimentary historical strata of a *dispositif* constituted by the, reciprocally presupposing, regimes of visibility and enunciability that are

[19] Revel (2003: 24) suggests that Foucault's use of the term *dispositif* is derived from its use in Deleuze & Guattari's (1972) *L'Anti-Œdipe*. Revel bases this on Foucault's use of the term in the preface he wrote for the 1977 English translation of Deleuze & Guattari's text. It should be noted, however, that the term *dispositif* only appears once in *L'Anti-Œdipe* (A-O: 178).

produced through the regularity of certain exercises of power (1986: 55-75; 2003b: 317).[20] Deleuze's distinction between these regimes of visibility and enunciation echoes Foucault's distinction between non-discursive and discursive elements within a *dispositif*. For Deleuze the regime of visibility is produced by the regularity of the bringing to light of certain objects in certain forms, which comes to define the objects which can be seen, whilst the regime of enunciation is produced by the regularity of certain statements which define a regime of what can be said and how (Razac 2008: 20-23). These regimes are produced in a relation of reciprocal presupposition, which means that neither takes precedence over the other as they are mutually constitutive of each other. As Buchanan (2015: 390) writes 'one implies and demands the other but does not cause or refer to it'. *Savoir*, for Deleuze, constitutes the historically sedimented strata of the discursive and non-discursive elements of a *dispositif* and the relations that pertain between them. It is these stratified forms which give a *dispositif* its existence as a visible and readable composite.

As Deleuze (1986: 129) notes, however, these historical strata that form the dimension of *savoir* 'ne f[ont] que recueillir, solidifier la poussière visuelle et l'écho sonore d'une bataille qui se déroulait au-dessus.' This perpetual battle is that which forms the second dimension of a *dispositif* identified by Deleuze: *pouvoir*.[21] This *pouvoir* is made up of the strategic relations between forces, capable of both affecting and of being affected, which are exerted between singular points. Existing outside the formed strata, these forces themselves are

[20] Deleuze's distinction between visibility and enunciation and his analysis of *savoir* is based upon his reading (1986: 11-30) of Foucault's *L'archéologie du savoir*, which was published in 1969.

[21] Deleuze actually discusses this as the third dimension of the *dispositif*, having considered the *courbes de visibilité* and the *courbes d'énonciation* as two separate dimensions (2003b: 317). As these together form the strata of *savoir*, I have chosen to simplify this aspect for the purposes of this discussion.

formless and therefore invisible and unsayable. The effect of their exercise is then, according to Deleuze, the action of one action on another that determine this force, its matter and its form (1986: 78-79). The regularities of these relations between these points that might emerge from this interplay form ‘un diagramme des forces ou de singularités prises dans les rapports’ which leaves its historical trace by integrating and actualising itself within the strata beneath (Deleuze 1986: 129; 2003b: 318).

This integration and actualisation of these forces serve to form the third dimension of a *dispositif* according to Deleuze: lines of subjectivation. This dimension is the process by which the “outside”, represented by the formless forces of *pouvoir*, folds itself into the strata of a *dispositif* (Deleuze 1986: 129-130; 2003b: 318). These folds of the formless forces of the outside within the strata create formed singularities that constitute points from which calculated exercises of power, understood as forces, can be exercised in relation to other exercises of power as part of the perpetual battle of amorphous forces above the strata. For Deleuze (1986 : 130), these folds of subjectivation establish not only ‘des singularités prises dans les rapports de forces, mais des singularités de résistance, aptes à modifier ces rapports, à les renverser, à changer le diagramme instable’. These are the ‘points innombrables d’affrontement’ or ‘foyers d’instabilité’ identified by Foucault (SP: 35), which make the *dispositif* a dynamic formation that is constantly producing itself from a non-univocal multiplicity of power relations.

We can see in Deleuze’s description of Foucault’s *dispositif*, then, that it serves, as Razac (2008: 26) puts it, as both cause and effect in dynamic relation. For Deleuze a *dispositif* is, again, produced from the perpetual

interplay of a multiplicity of formless forces (*pouvoir*). It is the regularities of the power relations that may emerge from this interplay that through a process of reiteration and sedimentation, lead to a stratification of certain regimes of visibility and of enunciation, which determine the formed non-discursive and discursive elements of a *dispositif* and the relations between them (*savoir*), in relation to, from, and through which power is exercised. Indeed, the actualisation of a given regularity of power relations creates folds of the formless outside of power within the strata (subjectivation) to constitute the singular points, as a space of strategic calculation, from and between which power is exercised to repeat, reverse or modify the strategies that make up the diagram of power relations which gives the *dispositif* its regularity through certain forms and their relations. As in Foucault's description, the dimensions of power and knowledge imply each other, they produce each other in a perpetual dynamic process.

This depiction of Foucault's *dispositif* enables us to highlight the close relationship between this concept and the corresponding concept of *agencement* that Deleuze developed with Guattari in their collaborative works of the 1970s. As François Zourabichvili (2003: 10) notes, it is in relation to this concept of *agencement* that the relationship between the thought of Deleuze and Foucault, 'le jeu de proximité et de distance qui relie les deux penseurs', can be best evaluated.

Unlike Foucault's concept of a *dispositif*, understood as the strategic disposition of heterogeneous elements produced by the interplay of power as an impersonal, immanent and non-univocal field of productive forces, Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the *agencement* as a functional arrangement of

heterogeneous elements is considered to be an *agencement* of desire, with power merely being a stratified result of the arrangement of desire. However, as Deleuze and Guattari conceptualised it in their 1972 work *L'Anti-Œdipe*, desire appears to also be an immanent, impersonal and non-univocal field of productive force. The somewhat synthetic distinction between desire and power will then be put to one side in order to highlight the similarities between these two concepts.[22]

In addition to establishing that Deleuze and Foucault share similar concepts through which we can consider the development and operation of the school in following chapters, we will now consider how Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the *agencement*, serves to re-emphasise the development

[22] In a footnote in *Mille plateaux* (MP: 175-176), Deleuze and Guattari note the similarity between their concept of the *agencement* and Foucault's concept of the *dispositif*. However, they assert that they differ from Foucault on two accounts. For Deleuze and Guattari the force that produces an *agencement* is desire not power, which is rather a stratified product of an *agencement*. Deleuze and Guattari also claim that Foucault understands those movements of deterritorialisation that alter an *agencement*/*dispositif* as secondary phenomena of resistance, whereas for them these deterritorialising 'lignes de fuite' of an *agencement* are primary. This would seem to dismiss fairly rashly the similarities between the concepts of desire and power, and how they function in their respective works.

Foucault's concept of power as an immanent multiplicity of dynamic productive forces has significant affinities with the concept of a dynamic, productive and immanent force of desire developed by Deleuze with Guattari in their 1972 work *L'Anti-Œdipe*. Indeed, one could argue that it is not by chance that Foucault acknowledges the debt his work in *Surveiller et punir* owes to Deleuze and his work with Guattari in a footnote just before he sets out his theory of power (SP: 32).

For Deleuze and Guattari, the concept of desire should not be understood in terms of lack, as it is in psychoanalysis, but as a creative force, a vital energy that produces reality (A-O: 34; Holland 1999: 22-24). Indeed, Deleuze and Guattari reject the image of the unconscious as a theatre of oedipalising representations (A-O: 64) and instead argue that it really functions as a factory, a continuous process of *production désirante* (desiring production), in which desire acts as an immanent principle causing the production of entities as *machines désirantes* (desiring machines) by making and breaking connections between partial objects extracted from abstract flows through a series of passive syntheses (A-O: 10-11. For more on Deleuze and Guattari's concept of flow, see Smith 2012: 160-172). This polyvocal process of desiring production, according to Deleuze and Guattari, can only be referred to as a multiplicity (A-O: 50). Further similarities between Deleuze and Guattari's concept of desire and Foucault's concept of power can also be seen in the fact that desire is also considered to be an impersonal force that cannot be possessed (A-O: 23-24, 27-28, 32).

Deleuze and Guattari's claim that Foucault's concept of power is merely an epiphenomenon of an *agencement* or *dispositif* seems to overlook their own recognition that what they call social production is just desiring production under given conditions (A-O: 36). Unfortunately, a further examination of the relation between Foucault's power and Deleuze and Guattari's concept of desire is, evidently, beyond the scope of this thesis.

of a *dispositif* through the two instances of the determination of a strategic imperative and the continual elaboration of strategies in pursuit of this imperative identified by Foucault (2001: 299), and also points towards the idea of an abstract model of the traits of a given model of power.

Deleuze and Guattari define *agencement* as an 'ensemble de singularités et de traits prélevés sur le flux - sélectionnés, organisés, stratifiés - de manière à converger (consistance) artificiellement et naturellement' (MP : 506). We can see in this Foucault's definition of a *dispositif* as a set of heterogeneous elements and the relations established between them that are brought together through a functional overdetermination and the operation of the *dispositif* in relation to that function (2001: 299). The consistency produced through the overdetermination of a *dispositif* and its continuing function, will be seen to be provided by the creation of the territory of an *agencement* and what Deleuze and Guattari would call its lines of flight respectively, which can be seen as developing along the two different axes of an *agencement* (MP: 629-630).

Deleuze and Guattari specify that an *agencement* is made up of two axes, the first of which correlates to the stratified discursive and the non-discursive elements of the *dispositif*, its formed regimes of visibility and of enunciation, and can be understood to produce the consistency of the *agencement* through the establishment of a territory. In *Mille plateaux*, Deleuze and Guattari define the first axis of an *agencement* as follows:

> D'une part il est *agencement machinique* de corps, d'actions et de passions, mélange de corps réagissant les uns sur les autres;

> d'autre part, *agencement collectif d'énonciation*, d'actes et d'énoncés, transformations incorporelles s'attribuant aux corps (MP: 112).

These two components indicate the non-discursive and the discursive elements of the *dispositif* identified by Foucault, or what Deleuze identified as the visible and the enunciable, and the relationships that pertain between them. The non-discursive *agencement machinique* and the discursive *agencement collectif d'énonciation* are also said to reciprocally presuppose each other like the visible and the enunciable identified above.[23] It is the regularity of the production of these two poles of the *agencement*, an expressive regularity that would be defined by Deleuze and Guattari as a refrain or 'ritournelle' (MP: 381-433; Holland 2013: 62, 66-76), that gives the *agencement* 'une constance temporelle et une portée spatiale qui en font une marque territoriale, ou plutôt terrtorialisante : une signature' (MP: 387). As Wise (2011: 92) notes, 'assemblages create territories', or rather, as Deleuze and Guattari (MP: 397) note, 'le territoire est le premier agencement, la première chose qui fasse agencement.' This expressive territory indicates the overdetermined function of the *dispositif*.

The second axis of the *agencement* that is defined by Deleuze and Guattari refers to the movement of the *agencement* in relation to its discursive and non-discursive forms, and relates to the dimension of power in Foucault's

[23] Each of these aspects of the *agencement*, representing things and statements, is considered by Deleuze and Guattari to have their own form and content. So in the example of a school, the non-discursive might have a content of a room, pupils, tables, chairs, a teacher and a blackboard, which would be given a form as a classroom. This might reciprocally presuppose a discursive content of statements about a subject, which might be given the form of a class taught by the teacher (See MP: 57-60, 112-114; Holland 2013: 57-60).

dispositif, in the sense that it indicates how the interplay of forces can reaffirm or alter established power relations as expressed in its stratified forms. The movement of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation that this axis of the *agencement* indicates can be seen to relate to the process of the 'perpétuel remplissement stratégique' that continually produces a dispositif (Foucault 2001: 299) and therefore, as Deleuze and Guattari underline, also serves to give the *agencement* an expressive consistency through its functioning. On its second axis, Deleuze and Guattari state that an *agencement* has 'd'une part, des *côtés territoriaux* ou reterritorialisés, qui le stabilisent, d'autre part des *pointes de déterritorialisation* qui l'emportent' (MP: 112). These indicate, through the peculiarly Deleuzo-Guattarian terminology of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation, the interplay of power relations and their potential effects of either reaffirming the existing power relations, which would be considered to constitute a reterritorialisation by Deleuze and Guattari, or modifying the previous state of power relations, which would constitute a deterritorialisation.

These processes of reterritorialisation and deterritorialisation can be thought of in the same way as the 'perpétuel remplissement stratégique' of the *dispositif* indicated by Foucault (2001: 299), and thereby show that the *agencement*, like a *dispositif*, gains its coherence and regularity through its dynamic function. A resistant singular point folded into the strata of a *dispositif* or *agencement* or novelty that might be produced by the interplay of power relations, in relation to which a *dispositif* would strategically respond as the fulfilment of its overdetermined function, can be understood as a point of deterritorialisation that is reterritorialised as part of the function of the *agencement*, relatively deterritorialising its discursive and non-discursive

assembages, but expressing, through this function of reterritorialisation, the consistency of the *agencement*'s territorial signature. In these movements of deterritorialisation, which are considered by Deleuze and Guattari to be primary and determinant of any given multiplicity such as an *agencement*, the concrete *agencement* is given its consistency as a functional assemblage of heterogeneous elements (MP: 630, 634-639; Patton 2006: 31). Deleuze and Guattari argue that the function of a concrete *agencement* can be abstracted from its concrete actualisation to create a diagram of an abstract machine that can be actualised in response to different concrete situations. This abstract machine is the starting point for our following discussion of historical forms and change in relation to Foucault's concept of discipline and Deleuze's argument of the emergence of a new power of control.

In summary, for Foucault, power is an impersonal and non-univocal field of productive forces immanent to the social field and produces, through asubjective but calculated concatenations of the relations between these powers, *dispositifs* defined as an ensemble of heterogeneous elements, which are both discursive and non-discursive, and the power relations that pertain between them. These *dispositifs* are brought into being through the immanent determination of a strategic imperative (what, as we will see later, Deleuze would refer to as a *mot d'ordre*) which overdetermines the strategic function of a heterogeneous ensemble of elements and the relations between them leading to the realisation of a *dispositif* responding to this imperative through its perpetual strategic function in response to this imperative. Deleuze's account of Foucault's *dispositif* underlines the mutual constitution of power and knowledge identified by Foucault, insisting on the construction of *savoir* as the

sedimented strata forming, reciprocally presupposing, non-discursive visibilities and discursive enunciations (*énoncés*) from the regularity of power relations, and the folding into these strata of singular points from, between and through which the formless forces of power are exercised, serving to conserve or modify the current state of power relations. By identifying the historic strata produced by the regular interplay of power relations, Deleuze's analysis of Foucault's *dispositif* emphasises that it is the effects of power relations that are inscribed in history as historic forms. Finally, by turning to Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the *agencement* of desire, which demonstrates the similarities between Deleuze and Foucault's analytical understandings of the world as an immanently self-organising multiplicities produced by impersonal productive forces, we underlined the idea that an *agencement* or *dispositif*, through its regularity and functional exercise creates its own historical and strategic consistency, but can also be abstracted from its concrete actualisation to isolate the virtual diagram of its relations as an abstract machine, which will be considered in the next section.

Given the clear correspondences between the two terms, it can be argued that Foucault's concept of a *dispositif* of power can be used concurrently with the Deleuze and Guattari's concept of an *agencement* of desire to analyse the *collège*, and any other school, or, indeed, institution, as an immanently produced *dispositif* or *agencement* that is composed of reciprocally presupposing non-discursive and discursive elements and the relations between them, which are the contingent result of the continuous dynamic interplay of impersonal and non-univocal forces and gain their consistency through their regular function. Indeed, in *Foucault*, Deleuze (1986:

82) writes that all institutions are ‘des pratiques, des mécanismes opératoires qui n’expliquent pas le pouvoir , puisqu’elles en supposent les rapports et se contentent de les “fixer”’. This would mean an analysis of ‘the school as an improvised historical institution’, such as that written by Ian Hunter (1994: 148) in relation to the development of mass schooling in nineteenth-century England and Prussia, in which these school systems are shown to be produced ‘as contingent assemblages put together under “blind” historical circumstances’ (147) from the emergence of a strategic imperative to improve the health and prosperity of the state, which established relations between ideas of public life and morals, *raison d’état* and state bureaucracies, and the apparatus of religious schools. To analyse a school as *dispositif* then we must consider its discursive and non-discursive elements, the relations that pertain between them, and the strategic function that gives them consistency and that they fulfil.

Historical change and *dispositif*/*agencement*

As mentioned above, an abstract machine or diagram of power relations can be extracted from the concrete function of a *dispositif*. Such an abstracted concept of the strategic arrangement of power relations is vital for this study, as will be shown below, because it is the generalisation of the strategies of such abstract machines of power which defines an era or society as, for example, disciplinary or of control. These abstracted strategies of power and their techniques do not emerge fully formed all at once to replace a current dominant diagram of power relations, but instead overlap, cut across and,

perhaps eventually, displace other forms. Drawing on Jeffrey T. Nealon's work suggesting that it is the intensification of power that is Foucualt's 'primary mechanism for explaining historical change' (2008: 38), it will be argued that the emergence of new strategies of power and any eventual generalisation of these new powers result from the dynamic adaptation and invention of techniques and strategies that are produced immanently to the 'perpétuel remplissement stratégique' (Foucault 2001: 299) pursued by a given *dispositif*. Indeed, this movement of intensification will be seen below to contribute to the decline of disciplinary enclosure and produce the techniques of control, and, in a later chapter, to lead to the establishment of the *collège* as an institution of control.

First, we return to the idea of an abstract machine. In *Mille plateaux*, Deleuze and Guattari assert that every *agencement* actualises an abstract machine which draws a diagram of the functional traits, the abstract conjunctions of form and amorphous matter, that an *agencement* might realise in relations between concrete forms and substances or expressions and contents (MP: 176-178). Perhaps more simply, Patton (2006: 31) describes the abstract machine as 'a virtual machine that governs the functionality of the assembled components' with the understanding that the components assembled are undetermined within the abstract machine itself.

This concept of an abstract machine or diagram of the function of an *agencement* and how it relates to *dispositifs* of power becomes clearer in Deleuze's 1986 book on Foucault.[24] In this text Deleuze (1986: 42), quoting Foucault, defines the *diagramme* or diagram, which, taken from Foucault's

[24] In fact, the use of this term in this text (1986) predates the use of the term in *Mille plateaux* (1980) because it is introduced in the section of this book which republishes Deleuze's review of Foucault's *Surveiller et punir* that was initially published in the journal *Critique* in 1975.

Surveiller et punir (202, 239), becomes the preferred term over abstract machine, as ‘un fonctionnement abstrait de tout obstacle ou frottement [...] et qu’on doit détacher de tout usage spécifique’ (SP: 239). The diagram or abstract machine defines certain abstract strategic power relations considered without reference to a specific context.

Deleuze (1986: 43) notes that ‘[t]oute société a son ou ses diagrammes’, which is to say that the strategies set out in a given diagram tend to be generalised across a society, that the *dispositifs* of this society tend to actualise the strategies set out in a given diagram. A diagram is ‘la carte, la cartographie, coextensive à tout le champ social’, but is also ‘une multiplicité spatio-temporelle’ and so it is also expressed historically (Ibid. 42).

If we remember how the regularity of a given set of power relations results in the sedimentation of their effects in the shape of discursive and non-discursive forms, in historical strata, we can see then how and why Foucault makes his famous periodisations according to the diagram of power actualised in a society over a period of time, and also what is at stake in Deleuze’s assertion that we are now seeing the emergence of a society of control. If, as Deleuze (PP: 240) notes, Foucault situates the disciplinary societies in the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries, it is because the diagram of discipline, panopticism, i.e. the concentration, distribution and composition of a given multiplicity for a given purpose, which will be discussed more fully below, becomes a generalised strategy of power across these societies over that period of time. Equally, if the societies that the disciplinary societies displaced are societies of sovereignty, it is because over a period of time these societies actualised the diagram of sovereign power, in which power relations are

arranged so as to ‘prélever plutôt qu’organiser la production, décider de la mort plutôt que gérer la vie’ (PP: 240). If then, as Deleuze suggests, we are entering societies of control then the diagram of control is becoming dominant. This begs the question of what this diagram of control consists of, which will be given some elements of an answer later in this chapter. The other question that we must answer here, however, is: how does such a shift from one society to another take place?

In *Surveiller et punir*, Foucault shows that the emergence of the disciplinary society is not a sudden event, but a long and gradual process of the development of the strategy of discipline and its generalisation throughout a society. Foucault states that ‘les disciplines sont devenues au cours du XVIIe et du XVIIIe siècles des formules générales de domination’ (SP: 161), and the diagram or abstract machine of discipline is provided in the late eighteenth century in the form of Jeremy Bentham’s ideal concept of the panopticon prison. However, Foucault emphasises the key role played by the programme of codification pursued in France by Napoleon in the propagation of disciplinary practices (SP: 165-166, 198-199, 252-253), indicating that it is not until the nineteenth century that discipline becomes rigorously applied across all spheres of society. Deleuze also highlights the importance of Napoleon’s role in establishing the disciplinary society (1986: 42-43; 1987; PP: 240-241).[25]

Indeed, Deleuze (1986: 43) points to the case of ‘le diagramme napoléonien, où la fonction disciplinaire se conjugue avec la fonction

[25] Deleuze’s argument that disciplinary societies ‘atteignent à leur apogée au début du XXe [siècle]’ (PP: 240) is supported by the ubiquity of the “scientific management” techniques of Frederick Winslow Taylor in that period. See Hoffman (2010) for a consideration of Taylor’s methods as an example of disciplinary power. For a reconstruction of Foucault’s account of the historical development of discipline, see Deacon (2002).

souveraine', as an example of a 'diagramme intermédiaire', which are 'comme des passages d'une société à une autre'. Deleuze admits that a society can allow for the concurrent function of distinct diagrams, as indicated by the plural in this quotation: 'Toute société a son ou *ses* diagrammes' (Ibid. 43, emphasis added). The emergence of a new society marked by a new diagram of power does not happen at once, but rather involves the development of a new strategy of power within a society in which another strategy is dominant.

Given this, and also Foucault's conception of a non-monolithic microphysics of power, it should be no surprise that, as Nealon (2008: 29) states, 'at any historical juncture, certain modes and practices of power are emergent, others dominant, still others residual', but that all are present in the multiplicity of power relations of that time, as the geological model of historic strata produced by regularities of power would suggest.

As Foucault suggests, emergent dominant forms of power coexist or overlap, with previous forms, which come to be employed or modified by this new *dispositif*. This can be seen in *Surveiller et punir* in Foucault's statement that, within the *dispositif* of discipline, there remains 'un fond "suppliciant"' that is proper to the *dispositif* of sovereign power's focus on the body as the object of the exercise of power, but that this focus on the body is increasingly oriented, through a new focus on the *activity* of this body, towards acting upon the incorporal object of disciplinary power, the "soul" or subjectivity of an individual (SP: 23). In a similar vein, Foucault states in his 1976 Collège de France lectures that the *dispositif* of biopower is

> [u]ne technologie de pouvoir […] qui n'exclut pas la technique disciplinaire mais qui l'emboîte, qui l'intègre, qui la modifie partiellement et qui, surtout, va l'utiliser en s'implantant en quelque sorte en elle, et s'incrustant effectivement grâce à cette technique disciplinaire préalable. (Foucault 1997: 215-216)

He affirms that this is because it works on a different level to discipline. Biopower, he says, acts on the level of a population, whereas discipline acts on the level of the individual body; a distinction that Foucault underlined in *La volonté de savoir* (1976: 183) where he juxtaposes discipline as an 'anatamo-politique du corps humain' with a new 'bio-politique de la population'.

Before these new strategies can be combined or put into relation with existing or old *dispositifs*, however, they must emerge and it is here that we must return to the idea of the 'perpétuel remplissement stratégique' (Foucault 2001: 299-300) of a *dispositif* as the means by which it seeks to continue to realise, and thereby intensify, the strategic function that overcodes it and gives it consistency. An example of this emergence of new strategies and their development can be found in *Surveiller et punir* in relation to the emergence and development of strategies of discipline. As Foucault notes, there is no sudden discovery of the new diagram of discipline or its strategies, but, instead,

> une multiplicité de processus souvent mineurs, d'origine différente, de localisation éparse, qui se recoupent, se répètent, ou s'imitent, prennent appui les uns sur les autres, se distinguent

> selon leur domaine d'application, entrent en convergence et dessinent peu à peu l'épure d'une méthode générale. (SP: 162-163)

This emergent diagram of power, tends to develop through singular strategic responses to 'des exigences de conjoncture' imposed upon a *dispositif* (SP: 163), exactly the kind of *perpétuel remplissement stratégique* that the continued fulfilment of a *dispositif*'s function demands. Through these strategic actions a new disciplinary *dispositif* is invented piecemeal.

It is the continual fulfilment of the strategic function of a *dispositif*, what, in referring to Nealon (2008: 31-32), we can discern as an intensification of the exercise of power, that produces emergent strategic functions. This intensification of the exercise of power through a *dispositif*'s 'perpétuel remplissement stratégique' (Foucault 2001: 299) seeks to make the effects of an exercise of power more efficient, more intense in terms of the saturation of its field, more extensive in terms of the field in which it operates, in short, to make itself more effective in response to new challenges (Nealon 2008: 32-33).

The continual functioning of the *dispositif* to perpetually fulfil its own functional imperative can be seen then as a process of intensification that brings new strategies of power into being. For Nealon (2008: 43), 'change "happens" through the slow intensification of existing practices, an intensification that redefines and reconfigures both the field of practice and the objects within that field'. Indeed, in his reading of Foucault, it is such processes of intensification that Nealon sees leading to the development of

different diagrams of power: the inefficient and expensive spectacle of sovereign power's violence on the body of the transgressor, was displaced by the much more efficient and economic practices of discipline that concentrate and organise the capacities of a mass of individuals, and, he suggests, the emergence of control also indicates a more intense form of power than discipline (Ibid. 29-38, 67-70). For Nealon (2008: 38), 'the logic of intensification is Foucault's primary mechanism for explaining historical change', as we have noted above, and the successful development of new *dispositifs* is contingent upon the intensification of their exercise of power, which should become more extensive, more thorough and more economic. The successful emergence and generalisation of a new diagram would, for Nealon, be the product of the emergence of a more intense, i.e. more effective and efficient, strategic exercise of power that could develop to become a new generalised abstract machine .

Every society has its own diagram or abstract machine that indicates a certain functional strategy of power abstracted from any given context, which tends to be actualised in the *dispositifs* of that society. This abstract machine or diagram serves to give that society a spatial and historical consistency defined by the abstract machine in operation: sovereign societies tend to actualise an abstract machine of sovereign power (removal, sentence of death), for example, whilst a disciplinary society tends to actualise, as a generalised function, an abstract machine of disciplinary power, the panopticon, which we will outline below. In asserting a shift from a disciplinary society to a society of control, Deleuze is asserting that there has been, or that we are in the middle of, a shift in the abstract machine or diagram that is actualised as a general

function in this society. No diagram of power relations develops or becomes dominant all at once, however, and in any social formation there will always be some strategic practices that are dominant, others that are emergent and yet others that are residual. The emergence and generalisation of new strategies and *dispositifs* of power are first and foremost created by the intensification of current *dispositifs*, understood as their increasing efficency and decreased cost, through the perpetual fulfilment of their strategic function, in response to new problems. For Jeffrey T. Nealon (2008) such intensifications and the development of more intense, thorough and efficient strategies of power are the mechanism of historical change, as more intense *dispositifs* of power will come to displace and frame the action of others. Deleuze's assertion of a new society of control, then, points to the emergence of such a new *dispositif* of control that constitutes an intensification of the existing disciplinary power and the generalisation of this function across society. We will see that control does, to a certain extent, constitute an intensification of the power of discipline and frames the function of discipline in a new society of control. First, however, we must examine Foucault's concept of the disciplinary society.

Deleuze's argument regarding the emergence of a society of control in place of a disciplinary society designates the coming to dominance in society of a *dispositif* of control in place of a declining disciplinary *dispositif*. As Foucault suggests, this shift from the dominance of one *dispositif* to another would not be sudden, nor would it necessarily entail the elimination of the displaced *dispositif*. The nature of the *dispositif* of discipline and its coming to dominance is described by Foucault in *Surveiller et punir*.

II - Discipline and the Disciplinary Society

Foucault's concept of discipline

The disciplinary society built upon the *dispositif* of discipine is shown in *Surveiller et punir* to displace the society based upon the *dispositif* of sovereign power. For Foucault, and also for Deleuze,[26] this society of sovereignty was underpinned by the *surpouvoir* of the sovereign, which was reaffirmed through practices enacting the 'vieux principe "prélèvement-violence"' in relation to those elements that transgress the will of the sovereign (SP: 255). In such practices, exemplified for Foucault by the horrific execution of the attempted regicide Robert-François Damiens in 1757 (9-12), elements which challenged the personal power of the sovereign in any way were arbitrarily "removed" from society in spectacular rituals of violence upon the transgressor's body, in which the crowds witnessed, participated in and invested in the public affirmation of the sovereign's might and the awful truth of the criminal subject's guilt of transgression against him (SP: 41-83).

The inefficient political economy of this *dispositif* of sovereignty, resulting from the sometimes unpopular enforcing of the arbitrary will of the sovereign, posed a problem which was partly resolved through a 'réaménagement du pouvoir de punir, selon des modalités qui le rendent plus

[26] The power of the sovereign described by Foucault, and which he discussed in *La volonté de savoir* (1976) as the juridico-discursive representation of power manifested in the repressive interdiction of the law, is summarised by Deleuze in very similar terms when he characterises the goals and function of the societies of sovereignty as being to 'prélever plutôt qu'organiser la production, décider de la mort plutôt que gérer la vie' (PP: 240). This power of the sovereign, as described by Foucault, also correlates with numerous related discussions of State/Imperial/Despotic power by Deleuze and Guattari in *L'Anti-Œdipe* (1972. See especially the concepts of infinite debt; paranoia; the despotic representation and the despotic machine; fascism; and the *Urstaat*) and *Mille plateaux* (1980. See for example the discussion of the concepts of the signifying semiotic; the faciality machine; rigid, molar segmentarity; striated space; fascism; arboresence; order-words and the death sentence; and the imperial and despotic state apparatuses).

régulier, plus efficace, plus constant et mieux détaillé dans ses effets' (SP: 96). This development of a codified justice system and more systematic public pedagogy regarding the law in the punishment of transgressions did not dispense with the sovereign *dispositif*, instead it displaced the sovereign will expressed in the law from the arbitrary will of the monarch to the codified general will of a society of (property-owning) individuals instantiated by a social contract (SP: 106-107). However, in this new *dispositif* that emphasised the efficiency of the exercise of power, deterrence emerged as a major concern in punishment alongside the sovereign's spectacular retribution and prompted a shift from the latter's focus on the guilty body of the transgressor to an emphasis on the criminal deviation of the transgressing individual's mind or soul and its correction, underpinned by a new understanding of human nature. This concern for efficiency expressed in desire for the deterrence and correction of deviance and the focus on the "soul" of the criminal, which, according to Foucault, developed over the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, created fertile ground for the techniques and strategies of the disciplinary *dispositif* that responded to these demands to become generalised and dominant in the nineteenth century, that is to form a disciplinary society.[27]

Underpinned by the principle of 'douceur-production-profit' (SP: 255), then, disciplinary power is expressed in 'une coercition ininterrompue, constante, qui veille sur les *processus* de l'activité plutôt que sur son resultat', to attain the maximum efficiency and economy of movements (SP: 161, my emphasis). To achieve this increasing efficiency of production, discipline exercises a 'pouvoir infinitésimal sur le corps actif […] selon une codification

[27] For Foucault's account of how and why such a move away from Sovereign power and towards Discipline occurred, see *Surveiller et punir* (41-155). A good, very brief, summary of this account, and indeed the entirety of *Surveiller et punir*, can be found in Schrift (2013).

qui quadrille au plus près le temps, l'espace, les mouvements' (SP: 161, see also 175-183).

It is significant that Foucault states that this 'contrôle minutieux des opérations du corps […] assure[ ] l'*assujettissement* constant de ses forces' (SP: 161, my emphasis) because if an element is *assujetti* it must necessarily be *assujetti à quelque chose* and, in this case, it is the 'fin déterminée' (SP: 251) in relation to which *discipline* is deployed. This is the strategic imperative identified by Foucault that calls the functioning of a *dispositif* into being, which we identified earlier. This chosen aim is expressed as a norm, a 'règle à suivre' expressing the optimum way that a body's forces should be arranged, which acts 'comme seuil minimal, comme moyenne à respecter ou comme optimum dont il faut s'approcher' (SP: 215). It is this norm to which 'l'assujettissement constant de[s] forces [du corps]' (SP: 161) is assured and subjects of this norm are brought into being through the exercise of disciplinary power.

Disciplinary power operates, and thus ensures this *assujettissement*, through the deployment of the instruments of 'le regard hiérarchique, la sanction normalisatrice et leur combinaison dans [...] l'examen.'(SP: 201) These disciplinary techniques will each be considered below.

In the *examen* the subjects of discipline are observed by a *regard hiérarchique* and their performance in relation to the norm is recorded, bringing them into being through this documentation as an *individual* case in 'un réseau d'écriture' (SP: 222), an individual subject, 'effet et objet de pouvoir, [...] effet et objet de savoir' (SP: 224-225), coded in relation to the norm (SP: 222-223). This individualising function of disciplinary power is

enabled by the spatial organisation of its subjects according to the principle '[à] chaque individu, sa place; et en chaque emplacement, *un* individu' (SP: 168, my emphasis) and ensures the separate consideration of their performance as individuals.

This *assujettissement* is pursued further through the practice of *la sanction normalisatrice*. Having been ranked in 'un espace sériel' (SP: 172) in relation to the norm, i.e. qualitatively coded, this sanction is applied to individuals according to the degree to which they have observed the norm. On one hand, 'si le sujet a atteint le niveau statutaire' (SP: 186) that individual will be rewarded through their placement in the aforementioned 'espace sériel' (1975: 172) as closer to the ideal performance, i.e. qualitatively coded as amongst 'les "bons" [...] sujets' (SP: 213), and may be allowed to progress to the next stage in a series based on 'une complexité croissante' (SP: 185) which 's'oriente vers un point terminal et stable' (SP: 188), the norm. Indeed, if they have sufficiently satisfied this norm and thus completed their subjectification to it, they may become subjected to another exercise of discipline in the service of another norm. The practice of such a sanction can be seen in the passage of a student from one year to the next having passed their exams for that year or, indeed, their graduation from school and their passage into the workplace where they are told, as Deleuze puts it, '"tu n'es plus à l'école"' (PP: 240).

On the other hand, however, if an individual subject does not conform to the established norm and their performance evidences an *écart* from the norm, then they receive a lower ranking in the 'espace sériel' (SP: 172), i.e. they are qualitatively coded as amongst 'les "mauvais" sujets' (SP: 213), and invoke the sanction of '[l]e châtiment disciplinaire'. This punishment,

however, is ‘de l’ordre de l’exercice – de l’apprentissage intensifié, multiplié et plusieurs fois répété’ – and so ‘essentiellement *correctif*’ (SP: 211), seeking thereby to improve the individual’s performance and thus reduce the *écart* between this and the norm. If we were to return to the example of a student, we could see the student’s correction of their homework with the help of a teacher or the necessity of retaking an exam as examples of this sanction. In short, under discipline, practice makes perfect and once you have achieved a sufficient degree of perfection you do not have to practice anymore and can leave; until then, as the superbly disciplinary adage attests, if at first you don’t succeed, you must try and try again.

A key aspect of the *sanction normalisatrice* in disciplinary power, therefore, is that it responds to the individual case to which it applies in order to produce the greatest result. This is what Foucault referred to as the ‘[*p*]*rincipe de la modulation des peines*’, which demands that the sanction applied to the individual subject to discipline must be able to be modified ‘selon l’individualité des détenus, les résultats qu’on obtient, les progrès ou les rechutes’ (SP: 314). If two pupils committed different grammatical errors in an examination, for example, one might expect different remedial exercises of perhaps differing length and type to be imposed, in function of the nature of each individual subject’s grammar error, its severity or frequency.

We can see in the placement of an individual case in a ranked series of individuals, as seen above, the two poles by which Deleuze characterises disciplinary society: ‘la signature qui indique l’*individu*, et le nombre ou numéro matricule qui indique sa position dans une *masse*’ (PP: 243). In the disciplinary society, the subject is always considered as an enclosed individual

case in its own individual space, a perfectly individuated individual subject to a given discipline in an equally enclosed singular mass of equally individual subjects under that discipline (SP: 168-175), in which each action is 'rapportée à celui qui en est l'agent particulier' (SP: 170).

The *examen* and the ensuing *sanction normalisatrice*, and thereby the production of individual subjects, would, however, not be possible without *le regard hiérarchique* as '[l]'exercice de la discipline suppose un dispositif qui contraigne par le jeu du regard' (SP: 201) and so assures the *assujettissement* of the individual to a given norm. This *jeu du regard* is based on the ability of 'un seul regard', that which conveys the applicable norm, 'de tout voir en permanence' (SP: 204) through 'des regards qui doivent voir sans être vus' (SP: 201) which induce in the subject of this *regard* 'un état conscient et permanent de visibilité qui assure le fonctionnement du pouvoir' (SP: 234). Through this functioning of power the individual interiorises the norm transmitted by this *seul regard* and *s'y assujettit*. This surveillance is hierarchical in that, although an ever greater delegation to a growing number of 'juges-annexes' (SP: 29) is established as the area under surveillance becomes greater in size and in complexity (SP: 205-208), these delegated gazes are under surveillance themselves in an 'organisation pyramidale [qui ...] donne un "chef"' (SP: 208), the figure who determines the norm of the *seul regard* of which he, she or it is the originator. As it maximises the ability to see all the individual subjects within it without being seen, Jeremy Bentham's panopticon prison design constitutes '[l]'appareil disciplinaire parfait' (SP: 204) and is therefore considered by Foucault as the ideal disciplinary institution.

Indeed, it is the establishment of a disciplinary institution through 'la *clôture*, la spécification d'un lieu hétérogène à tous les autres et fermé sur lui-même' (SP: 166), which enables this practice of discipline as depicted in *Surveiller et punir*. Through this *clôture* an 'emplacement fonctionnel', able to 'répondre […] à la nécessité de surveiller [et] de rompre les communications dangereuses', is established and coded for a given purpose, a given norm, thereby excluding other norms (SP: 168-169). This establishment of a space which acts as 'un filtre, un dispositif qui épingle et quadrille' (SP: 169), enables subjects as part of a separated individual mass to be distributed such that they can be watched over as individuals by *un seul regard* in a space which excludes the interference of other norms and disruptive elements.

We can therefore see that each disciplinary institution, although functioning analogously to each other according to the procedures of discipline, outlined above, has its own separate system of norms distinct from those of other institutions, its own 'seul regard [capable] de tout voir en permanence' (SP: 204), its own 'point terminal et stable' to which the exercise of discipline is oriented (SP: 188). The strategies of disciplinary power can be harnessed in a disciplinary institution set up in the service of any norm, itself given by those who establish it who themselves could, in theory, be anybody (SP: 251). For example, a group of doctors may establish a hospital in the service of a norm of perfect health; the French Third Republic may establish a national education system in the service of the norm of a perfect French citizen enlightened by "universal reason";[28] your friend may set up a boxing gym in

[28] 'Le modèle de l'Ecole Républicaine instaure historiquement une figure du sujet moderne qui trace les contours d'une identité collective. Comme réalité abstraite, impersonnelle, universelle, source de légitimité et destinataire des droits de l'Homme, cette figure s'inscrit

the service of the norm of a perfect boxer; a businessman may establish a factory in the service of the norm of a perfect worker (Taylorism). Of course, these norms do not necessarily coincide with each other. For example, the perfectly enlightened citizen who is not so perfect when he goes to your friend's boxing gym or the businessman's factory when he or she leaves his or her school (at the end of the day, or at the end of his or her school "career").

It is these disciplinary institutions, these '[l]ieu[x] protégé[s] de la monotonie disciplinaire' (SP: 166), which Deleuze refers to as 'les milieux d'enfermement' (PP: 240), the very 'internats' (PP: 242) subject to a 'crise généralisée' (PP: 241) which gives birth to the societies of control.

The concept of discipline developed in *Surveiller et punir*, as Jean-Pierre Audureau (2003: 18) notes, has strong connections to the idea of education. Although it is not the central subject of the book and the school serves as an example of disciplinary institutions amongst others, Audureau (Ibid.) argues that the school takes on a privileged position in Foucault's analysis as a type, a typical disciplinary institution that serves as a means of presenting the techniques of exercise as punishment, examinations and normalising sanctions, and he highlights the fact that Foucault, when later seeking to present a synthesis of his theory of discipline, uses the school as the basis of his explanation (Foucault 2001: 1053-1054). Indeed much has been written about Foucault and education in English that highlights the disciplinary nature of school education (Lewis 2009: 175, see Ball 1990; 2013, for example). Lizbet Simmons (2010), for example, highlights how the school encloses and concentrates pupils within the school space, establishes a series of

---

dans une rupture concernant le rapport de l'homme au monde qui plaçait celui-ci antérieurement sous la dépendance des traditions' (Giust-Desprairies 2010: 98).

functional partitions between classes, year groups, and individual pupils assigned their own space. Pupils are subjected to exams, sanctioned by their grade which places them in a series, and made to conduct exercises under the hierarchical supervision of the teacher.

In France, however, despite Audureau's observations regarding the importance of schools and education in Foucault's concept of discipline, Francois Dubet (2014) notes that the employment of Foucault's work in the study of education has been close to non-existent, arguing that the French attachment to the idealised republican institutional programme of the school, which Foucault's work serves to demystify to a certain degree, may be one reason for this underemployment (Ibid. 244-249).

Deleuze's description of disciplinary society

Before we consider the idea of a crisis of disciplinary institutions suggested by Deleuze, we must first consider the specific way in which Deleuze describes these institutions and the society based upon them in his *Post-scriptum*. Although his account of disciplinary society reflects the above description drawn from Foucault's *Surveiller et punir*, the significance of these details will become apparent as we proceed and will help us to better understand what has ceased to be and the transformation of society from one of discipline to one of control.

Deleuze opens the *Post-scriptum* by stating that 'les *sociétés disciplinaires* [...] procèdent à l'organisation des grands milieux d'enfermement' where discipline, 'le projet idéal des milieux d'enfermement',

is enacted (PP: 240). For Deleuze then, these disciplinary institutions are clearly the basis of disciplinary societies and the means by which they proceed. Additionally, in stating later in the *Post-scriptum* that discipline is 'de longue durée, infinie et discontinue' (PP: 246), Deleuze identifies three essential features of the discipline exercised within these disciplinary institutions which will be seen to be specific to this strategy and not applicable to that of control.

Discipline is necessarily 'de longue durée' because it must take place over an open-ended period of time. Firstly, a certain length of time is required for individuals to carry out the process subject to discipline itself, but to this must be added the unknown time required for the indefinite amount of practice needed by the individual to approach and eventually satisfy the norm. In discipline, Rome is probably not built in a day, nor can a definitive deadline for its completion be set.

The infinite and discontinuous nature of discipline, on the other hand, comes from 'l'*acquittement apparent* des sociétés disciplinaires' (PP: 243) in which '[l]'individu ne cesse de passer d'un milieu clos à un autre, chacun ayant ses lois' (PP: 240). There is a discontinuation of discipline where the individual is 'entre deux enfermements' (PP: 243) and ceases to be subject to the discipline of one institution before becoming subject to the discipline of the next institution. This discontinuity is underlined by the fact that each institution has 'ses [propres] lois' (PP: 240) and so

> [l]es différents internats ou milieux d'enfermement par lesquels l'individu passe sont des variables indépendantes [où] on est censé chaque fois recommencer à zéro, et le langage commun de

> tous ces milieux[, that of discipline,] existe, mais est *analogique*.
>
> (PP: 242)

That the individual 'ne cesse de passer d'un milieu clos à un autre' (PP: 240) in a process of '*acquittement apparent*' (PP: 243) suggests the infinite nature of discipline, in which an individual can always pass on to another disciplinary institution, and then on to another, in a potentially infinite chain of different, discontinuous disciplines exercised by institutions which share this common language of disciplinary techniques.

Whichever disciplinary institution the individual finds him or herself in, however, it will, Deleuze insists, constitute a '*moule*[ ], [un] moulage[ ] distinct[ ]' (PP: 242), a 'milieu[ ] analogique[ ] distinct[ ] qui converge[ ] vers un propriétaire, Etat ou puissance privé' (PP: 245), the holder of the institution's *seul regard*, mentioned in our discussion of *Surveiller et punir* above. This *propriétaire* therefore imposes the norm which is specific to a particular disciplinary institution, a norm, or 'moulage', distinct from other disciplinary norms and to which the subject of discipline is to be moulded.

Given this description of disciplinary institutions we can see why Deleuze claims that 'les sociétés disciplinaires sont réglées par des *mots d'ordre*' (PP: 243). As defined by Deleuze and Félix Guattari in *Mille plateaux* (1980), a *mot d'ordre* is the implicit and silently passed language function (MP: 97) through which '[l]e langage […] donne des ordres à la vie' (MP: 96) by the fixing of a variable as a constant (MP: 128, 135-136). In the disciplinary society, we can see *mots d'ordre* at work in the definition of what is to be done and how it is to be done, the fixing of a qualitative *surcode* to actions and

attitudes, the system of norms, in each disciplinary institution. It is the communication of an imperative that fixes norms to be attained in a disciplinary institution. The fixing of variables as constants that the *mot d'ordre* enacts puts in place

> un régime qui renvoie à un Maître immuable et hiérarchique, légiférant à chaque moment par constantes, interdisant ou limitant strictement les métamorphoses, fixant aux figures des contours nets et stables, opposant deux à deux les formes, imposant aux sujets de mourir pour passer de l'une à l'autre. (MP: 136)

Here, the *propriétaire* of the *seul regard* of the disciplinary institution constitutes the 'Maître immuable et hiérarchique'; the 'constantes' are the various aspects of the norm of an institution, its qualitative code, which, through the 'contrôle minutieux des opérations du corps' (SP: 161) practiced in the institution, 'interdi[t] ou limit[e] strictement les métamorphoses'. The 'figures' given fixed 'contours nets et stables' are the individual subjects brought into being through spatial distribution and individual surveillance and documentation by the disciplinary institution; and the opposed 'formes' are the various disciplinary institutions and their norms, between which the subject can only pass through '[l]a mort [...] comme condition, même initiatique, même symbolique, par laquelle un sujet doit passer pour changer de forme ou d'état' (MP: 136). This requirement indicates the discontinuity of discipline

where, in moving from one disciplinary institution to another, ‘on est censé chaque fois recommencer à zéro’ (PP: 242).

For Deleuze, the disciplinary society is regulated by *mots d’ordre* that fix constants or establish a code. These are expressed in the distinct normative moulds actualised by each disciplinary institution to which pupils are subjected over a relatively long time in a series of discontinuous subjections. Each disciplinary enclosure is analogously organised and converges towards a central authority.

III - The Decline of Discipline

This disciplinary society is, according to Deleuze, a thing of the past and next we will examine the two main reasons for its decline: the self-destruction of disciplinary enclosure, and thus discipline, through the intensification of disciplinary logics themselves, and the post-modern liberation of the individual from the constraints of tradition and disciplinary codes.

The *crise d'enfermement*

The ‘crise généralisée de tous les milieux d’enfermement’ (PP: 241) highlighted by Deleuze in the *Post-scriptum* undermines the aforementioned regime of fixed *mots d’ordre* operating through enclosed disciplinary institutions, that of the disciplinary society, and establishes the conditions for the emerging control societies. The essential element of this crisis is the way in

which the enclosure of the disciplinary institutions and the persistence of their separate norms, their *mots d'ordre*, are undermined to create a single seemingly open space. This is achieved by the radical extension, aided by the development of new information and communication technologies, of strategies of discipline beyond their institutional walls, which, despite this occurring due to an intensification of their disciplinary logics, leads them to cease to effectively function as disciplines.

Firstly, as Foucault recognises, the strategies of discipline employed within disciplinary institutions tend 'à se "désinstitutionnaliser", à sortir des forteresses closes où ils fonctionnaient et à circuler à "l'état libre"' (SP: 246). This is entirely consistent with the pursuit of the logic of discipline which seeks to 'rendre plus fortes les forces sociales', to 'augmenter la production' (SP: 242), but nonetheless moves towards a *désenfermement* of discipline and a blurring of disciplinary boundaries, of institutional *clôture*, as institutions seek to reach beyond their walls to more fully discipline their subjects in relation to their individual norms. Foucault himself gives examples of how 'l'école chrétienne' exercises a 'contrôle régulier' of parents' attitudes and practices, thus extending beyond its walls into the family of its students, to ensure a more complete subjection of the student to its norms (SP: 246), and of how 'l'hôpital est conçu de plus en plus comme point d'appui pour la surveillance médicale de la population extérieure' (SP: 246-247).

The medical discipline is a good example of how disciplines start to intermingle and overlap when they leave their specific disciplinary institution. Not only can we see the extension of the norms of health into everyday life through, for example, labels showing the nutritious value of foods and how

they relate to a (norm defined) healthy diet, or the judgement on a players Body Mass Index given in an individual's leisure time by video games such as Nintendo's Wii Fit, but they also extend into the areas of other disciplinary institutions, as can be seen in the appearance of sex education in schools and the emergence of health and safety training in the workplace.

Indeed, this latter point can be seen as an instance of the way education and the workplace become intertwined in what Deleuze calls, in an interview with Antonio Negri, 'une terrible formation permanente' (PP: 237) where not only does the workplace become a place for continuing education but also conversely there is 'l'introduction de "l'entreprise" à tous niveaux de scolarité' (PP: 247).

As hinted at in the above examples, there is also an important role played in this *crise d'enfermement* by the developing of new digital technologies of information and communication, a role recognised explicitly by Deleuze when he notes that the post-disciplinary societies of control 'opèrent par machines de troisième espèce, machines informatiques et ordinateurs' (PP: 244, see also 86-87, 101-111, 125, 137, 160, 237; Deleuze 1986: 140). Deleuze's indication in the *Post-scriptum* of Paul Virilio's ceaseless analyses of 'les formes ultra-rapides de contrôle à l'air libre' (PP: 241) can help us to understand the significant contribution of these new technologies.

Not only may the continuous development of new technologies necessitate the introduction of the school, of the educational discipline, in the workplace as suggested above but their development, as Virilio (1998a: 46) notes, tends towards the 'negation of space', a situation where the rule is

'[p]roximity, the single interface between all bodies, all places, all points of the world' (Virilio and Lotringer 2008: 75). This occurs through the reduction of space-distance and time-distance through the increasing speed of physical transportation (e.g. high speed trains, jet engines) and, more importantly, of telecommunication (Virilio and Lotringer 2008: 74-75). With these developments the *regard hiérarchique* of one institution and the particular discipline it conveys can be extended throughout the area under the jurisdiction of other disciplines, and any spaces in between, and receive instant, real time feedback (Virilio 1998b: 138-144). Every individual is permanently capable of being put into contact with any disciplinary logic through these technologies, for example, one can be at home and receive an email from work or vice versa, or one could be called or receive a text message whilst at university to be informed of medical test results. Especially given the advent of mobile technology, there is, as David Lyon (2007a: 25) notes, no longer any space not subject to the disciplines of all sorts of institutions and '[w]hat once was experienced only in specific contexts [...] has spilled over into every dimension of everyday life', resulting in a sort of permanent visibility of the subject. Deleuze underlines this phenomenon with the example of 'l'utilisation de colliers électroniques qui imposent au condamné de rester chez lui à telles heures' (PP: 247), thus extending the gaze of the prison warden to wherever the subject may be, but there are many other examples of technologies involved in what Gary T. Marx (2007) referred to as the 'new surveillance' which transcends the limitations of physical and temporal boundaries encountered by less technologically sophisticated surveillance (Marx 2007),

for example, CCTV, radio-frequency identification (RFID), or internet cookies.

As a result of the overlapping of disciplines with this ‘évolution technologique’ (PP: 244) the exercise of disciplinary power may indeed cease to be discontinuous, due to its permanent pervasive exercise, but it also becomes imperfect (Koskela 2003: 293): it ceases to be a ‘contrôle minutieux des opérations du corps’ (SP: 161), i.e. it ceases to be the proper exercise of discipline. This type of surveillance can give only a ‘*superficial* image of an individual and their outward behaviour, in contrast to the depth and personality sought by traditional disciplinary observation’ within the institution (Jones in Koskela 2003: 293).

Thus, in this new constellation of power relations we find that the body of the individual, as an object of power, effectively disappears (Lyon 2007b) and, in the words of Jacques Rhéaume (2010: 72), there develops a tendency towards ‘l’oubli ou la négation effective, voire “le mépris” de ce processus du travail au seul intérêt du résultat, de la performance atteinte’, pointing towards a key distinction identified by Deleuze, between the old disciplinary societies and the new societies of control: the subjects of this power are no longer constituted as individuals whose processes of production are *assujetti* to the disciplinary norm of one institution at a time but as dividuals (*dividuels*), ‘des échantillons, des données’ (PP: 244) produced by a subject who is no longer an individual body enclosed within a single disciplinary mould.

A consideration of the earlier appearance of the term *dividuel* in Deleuze’s work in his 1980 collaboration with Félix Guattari, *Mille plateaux*, may help us to understand what Deleuze means by this. In this text the term

dividuel is used to refer to a type of relationship between elements of an assemblage which 'ne se rédui[t] pas à l'individualité des sujets qui la composent' (MP: 420-421). The *dividuel* assemblage therefore is 'l'Un-Foule', an 'ensemble flou' of elements which cannot be reduced to or subsumed under one individual, and thus indivisible, subject (MP: 420-425). This reflects the distinction made by Paul Klee, a key figure of reference for Deleuze, between individual structures in which 'one cannot take anything away without changing the character of the whole' (Klee 1961: 229) and dividual structures in which '[p]arts can be taken away or added without their [...] character [...] being changed' (Ibid. 227). Deleuze heralded his declaration of the advent of the dividual in the *Post-scriptum* and underlined the fall of the disciplinary individual in his 1988 *Réponse à une question sur le sujet* where he stated that 'la notion de sujet a perdu beaucoup de son intérêt *au profit des singularités pré-individuelles et des individuations non-personnelles*' (Deleuze 2003b: 328).

This figure of the dividual, of an individual without the *clôture* proper to discipline, appears in two forms through the crisis of disciplinary enclosure: as a nebulous aggregate of products, data, and as an indistinct aggregate of processes, of subjectivities.

Firstly, the focus on results over processes, the *donné* over the *donner*, in the surveillance of individuals at a distance through new technologies noted above creates a 'database discourse [which] produces objectified individuals with dispersed data "identities"', a data double, a 'virtual self' (Lyon 2007a: 55). The composition of the subject as a data-double, an *ensemble flou* of data,

is at odds with the inscription of the disciplinary individual as an individual case of that given discipline as

> [i]t can be recombined, in principle endlessly, for other purposes, and this may be seen in the commercial use of government information, police use of consumer information, and marketing use of emergency services information. (Lyon 2007a: 114)

For example, a subject's telephone number and their usage statistics, including any GPS data collected, could be used by businesses to target their products, by the police to investigate a crime, by a jealous spouse to investigate infidelity, or emergency services to locate or identify a caller. Indeed, the importance given to the data produced by subjects means that a dividual may dispense with individual embodiment as a characteristic and instead be constituted as a categorical subject which unifies the infra-individual characteristics of subjects in a supra-individual form. Such a categorical dividuality can be seen in the proliferation of categories, such as produced in marketing through strategies of research leading to market segmentation (Lyon 2007a; 2007b: 141-142).

Secondly, the individual becomes dividual in that it is no longer the unified subject to one discipline but an *ensemble flou* of the subjectivities of the various overlapping, different disciplines. This dividual subject of control can be seen as a reinforcement of the existence of what Bernard Lahire (2006: 62) calls *l'homme pluriel*, an individual 'porteur[ ] d'habitudes disparates et

opposées'.[29] In the society of control, far from being the subjects of one discipline at a time, individuals are subjected simultaneously to a variety of different disciplines and

> dès lors qu'un acteur a été place dans une pluralité de contextes sociaux non homogènes, son stock de dispositions, d'habitudes ou de capacités ne sera pas unifié. (Ibid. 62)

The overlapping logics of discipline mean therefore that '[l]'homme pluriel est la règle plutôt que l'exception' (Ibid. 62) and illustrates Deleuze's remark that 'l'homme du contrôle est plutôt ondulatoire, mis en orbite' (PP: 244), not an individual subject confined and localisable in a certain disciplinary institution, but a dividual subject engaged in a number of disciplinary logics and not confined to or localisable in just one of these.

Given the evident difficulty of therefore exercising a discipline of the subject's processes in the service of a single logic, we can see here the significance of Deleuze's use of the word *contrôle* as a name for the new strategy which operates 'par transformation de produit plus que par spécialisation de production' (PP: 245) and displaces that of discipline.

The word *contrôle* usually refers in French to a 'vérification (d'actes, de droits, de documents)' and comes from the thirteenth-century term *contrerooulle*, 'un registre (*rôle*) tenu en double, l'un servant à vérifier l'autre (d'où *contre*)' (*Le Grand Robert*; Rey 2012: 835-836), and this is increasingly

[29] For more on Lahire's concept of *l'homme pluriel*, see Lahire (2001; 2013).

the strategy by which the disciplinary logics are brought to bear.[30] This strategy is a 'contrôle continu' (PP: 243) of subjects considered as products, 'des échantillons, des données' (PP: 244), rather than a process 'de longue durée' of disciplinary training (PP: 246). Given the interference from other overlapping logics, discipline can no longer sustain its hierarchical normalising gaze, and so if this *contrôle* is continuous it is not because it is uninterrupted, but because it consists of a continuous rotation of punctual normalised *contrôles* from every overlapping logic, what Deleuze describes in the *Post-scriptum* as continuous control 'à court terme et à rotation rapide' (PP: 246).

Paradoxically then, the intensification of the various disciplines, aided by developments in technology, results in their *désenfermement* and means that these strategies of discipline can no longer function as such and assure an *assujettissement* of individual subjects to their norms, their *mots d'ordre*. Although, for each previously separate discipline, as Michael Hardt (1998a: 149) notes, 'the logic that once functioned primarily within the institutional walls now spreads across the entire social terrain', these logics can no longer function through the enclosed strategy, 'de longue durée, inifinie et discontinue'(PP: 246), of discipline as they overlap and thereby interfere with each other's disciplinary process of detailed control of an individual body's processes over a, potentially, long duration in relation to a single pre-established norm. Indeed, the object constituted by discipline, the localisable and embodied individual, is untenable in such a situation and instead '[on] substitue au corps individuel [...] le chiffre d'une matière "dividuelle" à contrôler' (PP: 247). The disciplines can no longer impose upon individuals

[30] Indeed, the sense of *contrôle* as a mastery over something was only derived, according to Rey (2012: 835-836), from the English cybernetic use of the term control in the twentieth century.

separate ‘moulages distincts’ but exist instead as ‘[d]es différents contrôlats [qui] sont des variations inséparables’ of a universal modulation (PP: 242).

A “liberation” of the individual

This *crise d’enfermement* claimed by Deleuze is deepened by the questioning of the validity of the pre-determined norms imposed by disciplinary institutions themselves and its corollary, the freeing of individuals to choose their own subjectivity. In what has been called the postmodern era, emerging from the liberationist individualism of the 1960s and noted particularly by Jean-Francois Lyotard, ‘l’incredulité à l’égard des métarécits’ (Lyotard 1979: 7) undermined the basis of the concept of a ‘verité commune’ as a means ‘de légitimer des institutions et des pratiques sociales et politiques’ (Lyotard 2005: 36) and instigated ‘l’ere de l’individualisme triomphant’ (Enriquez 2006: 40) at the expense of disciplinary power and its qualitative codes, fixed by its *mots d’ordre*.

This movement, which Gilles Lipovetsky (1993: 56) refers to as the ‘Grand désarroi des Maîtres’, leads to ‘l’affaiblissement des repères et des structures d’encadrement et de sociabilité traditionnelles (famille, parti, église, école…)’, i.e. the disciplinary institutions and, therefore, their ability to discipline individuals. As François Dubet (2002: 68) notes, the ‘professionnels du travail sur autrui’, such as teachers, doctors and parents, who work and, in a sense, ruled in such instiutions, ‘décrivent le déclin du sanctuaire, la fin du respect auquel ils pensaient avoir droit’ and ‘se sentent envahis par la société’ as ‘on leur demande des comptes, on les oblige à s'expliquer’.

We see therefore, in the words of Nicole Aubert (2006a: 14), ‘l’émergence d’un individu libéré de toute entrave’ who, according to Gilles Lipovetsky in his 1983 text *L’ère du vide*, is seized by a spirit of *carpe diem*, confronted with ‘rien que des stimulations et des *options* équivalentes en chaîne’ from which to choose freely according to his or her desires (Lipovetsky 1993: 57). It is in such a world, augmented by the time and space proximity of globalisation introduced by the development of technology, that Lyotard, in the early 1980s, recognises eclecticism as ‘le degré zéro de la culture générale contemporaine’ where

> [o]n écoute du *reggae*, on regarde du *western*, on mange du McDonald à midi et de la cuisine locale le soir, on se parfume parisien à Tokyo, on s’habille rétro à Hong Kong. (Lyotard 2005: 22)

This evokes the way, highlighted by Nicole Aubert (2010a: 25), in which the new technologies of information and communication, by surpassing the constraints of time and space, lead to each individual having ‘le sentiment de s’approprier le temps, d’en être maître, d’en déjouer les pièges, de jongler avec lui’, a sentiment ‘d'ubiquité existentielle’ where one has ‘la terre entière au bout de son téléphone portable ou de son ordinateur’. Indeed, as Gilles Lipovetsky (1993: 73) highlights, the postmodern individuals, in supposedly being liberated from the constraints of traditions, are liberated from the past and can ‘vivre au présent, rien qu’au présent et non plus en fonction du passé et du futur.’

In postmodernity, there is then ‘une sorte de souveraineté des petits récits’ (Lyotard 2005: 38-39) functioning according to ‘le principe de souveraineté individuelle’ (Lipovetsky with Charles 2004: 96), and the system of discipline, ‘réglé[ ] par des *mots d’ordre*’ (PP: 243), as identified by Deleuze, no longer functions as this clearly undermines the disciplinary *regard hiérarchique*, based on a vertical ‘organisation pyramidale [qui ...] donne un “chef”’ (SP: 208). The disciplinary confinement of the outside, the virtual, the potential indiscipline or abnormality of an act and its subject, through a strict codification of practices, and the norms, the qualitative codes of right and wrong, acceptable and unacceptable, upon which they are based (Lazzarato 2006: 175-177), give way to a situation where individuals ‘have fled from the disciplinary world by inventing incompossible worlds which are actualised within the same world’ (Ibid. 177).

With the restrictions and pre-established rules and norms of the society of set disciplines gone, the individual’s identity is, as Zygmunt Bauman (2001: xv) notes, transformed ‘from a “given” to a “task”’ and the individual, as Jean-Claude Kaufman (2006: 179) puts it, ‘peut, et même doit [...] choisir, dans tous les domaines, sa vérité, sa morale, son identité,’ and therefore becomes responsible for his or her own subjectivity with the only rule appearing to be that of authenticity, being who you *really* are, expressing your “true” self (Taylor 2006: 24-27).

IV - Beyond Disciplinary Enclosure

A new mode of norm and subjectivity creation

The individualisation of norms points towards a change in the way in which norms and subjectivities are formed in this post-disciplinary society, a change which can be understood as a shift from *assujettissement social* to *asservissement machinique*, two concepts discussed by Deleuze and Guattari in *Mille plateaux* (1980).

Deleuze and Guattari distinguish between these two concepts as differing forms of subjectivity formation which relate themselves to different forms of norm. *Asservissement machinique* is at work 'lorsque les hommes sont eux-mêmes pièces constituantes d'une machine, qu'ils composent entre eux et avec d'autres choses.' In contrast, the *assujettissement social* is at work 'lorsque l'unité supérieure constitue l'homme comme un sujet qui se rapporte à un objet devenu extérieur' (MP: 570).

As can be seen in the 'contrôle minutieux des opérations du corps, qui assure[ ] l'assujettissement constant de ses forces' (SP: 161) exercised in disciplinary institutions, discipline clearly functions according to 'un assujettissement social de plus en plus fort' (MP: 571) to an external norm (pre-)established under the *propriétaire* of the institution. Indeed, Foucault (2004a: 59) explicitly recognises, in his lectures at the Collège de France of 1977-78, that 'il y a un caractère primitivement prescriptif' of discipline where '[l]a normalisation disciplinaire consiste à poser d'abord un […] modèle optimal qui est construit en fonction d'un certain résultat' which is then used as an external reference point to which elements are coded as

normal/acceptable or abnormal/unacceptable. The prescribed norm of the disciplinary institution acts as a transcendent *unité supérieure, un objet devenu extérieur* to which the subject *se rapporte, s'assujettit*, revealing in the *assujettissement social* of disciplinary techniques the existence of what, drawing on their limited typology of a number of "regimes of signs" in *Mille plateaux*, Deleuze and Guattari would have considered a 'régime signifiant' where the disciplinary norm acts as the central transcendent signifier, from which all other terms derive their meaning (MP: 146-147).

In contrast to this we can see that, for Deleuze and Guattari, the dominant term in the post-disciplinary society is *l'asservissement machinique* and, indeed, this is the 'troisième âge' mentioned by Deleuze and Guattari, following those which Foucault identified as functioning first by sovereign power and second by discipline, which brings with it 'un régime d'asservissement généralisé' (MP: 572). With each individual now choosing their subjectivity we have moved away, as Deleuze notes in the *Post-Scriptum*, from a disciplinary series of 'milieux analogiques distincts qui convergent vers un propriétaire' to 'une même entreprise qui n'a plus que des gestionnaires' (PP: 245). As indicated in Deleuze and Guattari's concept of *asservissement machinique*, individuals in this post-disciplinary situation are

> des pièces composantes intrinsèques, [...] des *feed-back* ou des récurrences, qui appartiennent à la machine et non plus à la manière de la produire ou de s'en servir. (MP: 573)

Rather than being subject to a transcendent model imposed by an external norm-producing "machine"[31] as in a system of *assujettissement social*, these individuals construct a social machine between themselves under a system of *asservissement machinique* from which immanent norms are derived. As Brian Massumi (1998: 57) puts it, '"Normal" is now free-standing, no longer the opposite and necessary complement of "abnormal" […] as it was under disciplinary power'.

Deleuze and Guattari use the example of television to illustrate this phenomenon (MP: 573). In this example, as Philip Goodchild (1996: 163-164) explains, each individual 'becom[es] less of a user or consumer of television than an output generating feedback in terms of viewing ratings', which contribute to the shaping of television that will be watched in the future. This process is furthered, as Olivier Razac (2008: 160-168) has shown, in the more recent emergence of reality television and the role of the audience in the elimination of competitors through telephone votes.

The emergence of this post-disciplinary system of norm creation is also noted by Foucault (2004a: 65) in his 1977-78 lectures when he refers to the constitution of norms through 'un repérage des différentes courbes de normalité'. In this mode of normalisation the norm is derived quasi-statistically from the aggregated actions of the individuals; it is what is normal (in the sense of most frequent) within society and results in a norm which is not fixed but constantly immanently constructed between this aggregate of individuals. These are trends, and indicate a move in contemporary society, noted by Gilles

[31] My use of the word machine is due to its use by Deleuze and Guattai in their discussion of these concepts in *Mille plateaux* (570-575), which itself derives from the machinic ontology developed in their 1972 book *L'Anti-Œdipe* where anything and everything is a machine of some variety defined by the way it functions (A-O: 7-59).

Lipovetsky (1987), towards a system of norms which take the form of fashions. In such a system, as Guillaume Erner (2011: 21) indicates, 'les tendances sont formées par [l]es choix individus agrégés qui constituent le goût collectif […et] apparaissent puis disparaissent sans bonnes raisons évidentes.'

With this immanent derivation of mobile norms from an aggregate of individuals' actions we can clearly see the two ways in which this results in a shift from a disciplinary system of 'milieux analogiques distincts qui convergent vers un propriétaire' towards 'une même entreprise qui n'a plus que des gestionnaires' (PP: 245).

Firstly, drawing on the root of the word in the verb *entreprendre* and its meaning of 'se mettre à faire (quelque chose)' (*Le Grand Robert*) this collective creation of mobile norms forms a single *entreprise* in the sense that the task of creating norms is a task continuously undertaken, or *entrepris*, which cannot constitute a fixed *milieu distinct* as it is constantly moving.[32]

Secondly, given that they collectively produce these norms together through their own choices and without the injunctions of a *propriétaire* conveyed through a *regard hiérarchique*, these post-disciplinary individuals are all *gestionnaires* in this process, through the fact that they decide on and manage their own affairs. Indeed, this highlights the collapse of the singular disciplinary *regard hiérarchique* which has, in effect, given way to the multiple, individual normalising gazes of individuals.

[32] Given this broader sense of *entreprise* as something undertaken, an ongoing process, we should be wary of the translation of this term in a narrowly economic sense such as those effectuated by Martin Joughin, first as 'corporation' (Deleuze 1992: 6) and then as 'business' (Deleuze 1995: 181).

From fixed *mots d'ordre* to mobile *mots de passe*

We can see in this shift to a post-disciplinary process of norm formation, and its interaction with the now freely circulating logics of discipline, the key to Deleuze's statement in the *Post-scriptum*, which in turn is key to understanding the control society, i.e. that whilst the 'sociétés disciplinaires sont réglées par des *mots d'ordre*', '[d]ans les sociétés de contrôle, au contraire, l'essentiel […] est […] un chiffre [… et] le chiffre est un *mot de passe*' (PP: 243). In order to understand the significance of this claim, we must explore what Deleuze means by a *mot de passe* by looking back to mention of this term in *Mille Plateaux* (1980), written with Félix Guattari.

In this text, Deleuze and Guattari define *mots de passe* as '[d]es mots qui seraient comme de passage, des composantes de pasage [*sic*], tandis que les mots d'ordre marquent des arrêts, des compositions stratifiées, organisées' (MP: 139). These *mots de passe* exist 'sous les mots d'ordre' (MP: 139) and, rather than extracting fixed constants to act as orders to life, they form a 'langue secrète' whose role is to

> [m]ettre en variation continue des éléments quelconques, […] une opération qui fera surgir de nouvelles distinctions, mais qui n'en conserve aucune tenue pour acquise, qui ne s'en donne aucune d'avance. (MP: 123)

Indeed, these *mots de passe* are the second element of the *mot d'ordre*, not a verdict, an imposition of a constant as a sort of death sentence, but 'un cri

d'alarme ou un message de fuite' (MP: 135), an injunction towards movement and change.

In the process of *asservissement machinique* we can see that the norms produced are clearly *mots de passe* produced through a continuous variation of the aggregated actions of the various individuals. These norms are neither 'tenue[s] pour acquise[s]' nor 'donn[ées…] d'avance', since they are continuously produced from a quasi-statistical observation of frequencies of behaviour in a group, and not taken as a finally determined constant, since these frequencies of behaviour are themselves not fixed but constantly varying.

That these new post-disciplinary norms are quasi-statistical in their form and production shows how 'le chiffre est un *mot de passe*' (PP: 243) and helps us understand the importance of this essential concept in the control societies sketched by Deleuze. This term also appears in *Mille plateaux*, as a feature of the nomadic war machine, where it is defined by Deleuze and Guattari as the 'nombre nombrant' as opposed to the 'nombre nombré' (MP: 482-489). The difference between the two is in how they give different types of numerical organisation to an assemblage. The *nombre nombré* is akin to the disciplinary *mot d'ordre* in that it imposes a pre-determined model as a constant against which a subject is measured and expected to conform (MP: 483-485). On the other hand, the post-disciplinary norm as a *mot de passe* is more akin to the *nombre nombrant*, 'l'organisation arithmétique autonome', which emerges 'dès qu'on distribute quelque chose dans l'espace' (MP: 484) and indicates a direction of travel, a tendency, a trend (MP: 485).

V- Control

The *assujettissement* in the *asservissement*

However, as Deleuze recognises in the *Post-scriptum*, the ‘nouvelles libertés’ gained by individual participants in this post-disciplinary environment are balanced by their role in developing ‘des mécanismes de contrôle qui rivalisent avec les plus durs enfermements’ (PP: 241-242) as the continuous production of varying and non-predetermined *mots de passe* in the process of *asservissement machinique* does not mean that there is no *assujettissement social*, no norm to which one must be subjectivated. Indeed, Deleuze and Guattari underline that ‘[a]ssujettissement et asservissement forment deux pôles coexistants, plutôt que des stades’ (MP: 573) and, as Deleuze notes in the *Post-scriptum*, there instead emerges in the control societies a new unlimited subjectivation that is never complete, in the form of an ‘atermoiement illimité’ (PP: 243), recognised by numerous French sociologists and social theorists in their assertion that the apparent liberty of postmodernity was a mere illusion and instead marked the emergence of the more profound constraints of a “hypermodernity” (Aubert 2006a: 14-16).

As Deleuze and Guattari tell us, the process of *asservissement machinique* is, in fact, ‘sous le contrôle et la direction d’une unité supérieure’ (MP: 570), this being the immanently produced temporary and mobile norms, the *mots de passe*, which serve as temporary guides for the actions of subjects. Indeed, rather than providing no qualitative code of measurement, these *mots de passe* are the ‘nouvelles distinctions’ which the continuous variation from which they are born ‘fera […] surgir’ (MP: 123). This highlights the intimate

relation of the *mot de passe* to the *mot d'ordre*, for which it is the 'message de fuite' and indicates the fact that the *mot de passe* does not abolish the death sentence of the *mot d'ordre* but, through the continuous variation that it induces, 'fai[t de la mort] elle-même une variation' (MP: 137). Much the same can be said for the *nombre nombrant* which 'devient principe chaque fois qu'il occupe un espace lisse, et s'y déploie comme sujet […,] l'occupant mobile' thereby giving a space a particular organisation, even though it may be only temporary (MP: 485). Foucault also recognised in his 1977-78 lectures that, even though norms are no longer predetermined but produced from 'un repérage des différentes courbes de normalité […,] c'est à partir de cette étude des normalités que la norme se fixe et joue son rôle opératoire', i.e. that of *assujettissement*, and

> l'opération de normalisation va consister à faire jouer [ces différentes distributions de normalité] les unes par rapport aux autres […] et [à] faire en sorte que les plus défavorables soient ramenées à celles qui sont les plus favorables. (Foucault 2004a: 65)

Indeed, that *assujettissement social* occurs alongside *asservissement machinique* is illustrated by Deleuze and Guattari's example, considered above, of television where the audience contributes to the formation of the spectacle they are watching as a feedback but at the same time, through consuming it, subject themselves to the spectacle (MP: 573). As Deleuze recognised, this televisual spectacle provides a complete model of the world

for spectators (PP: 102-105) in relation to which they are ceaselessly called upon to position themselves (Razac 2008: 163-164; Barus-Michel 2010: 19).

The sanction deployed to ensure this new *assujettissement* is transformed alongside the norms which guide this process. As the decline of disciplinary institutions means that the disciplinary normalising sanction of the repeated exercise of a process under the *regard hiérarchique* of a particular norm can no longer be maintained, the new *contrôle continu* introduces a different sanction to ensure the *assujettissement* of subjects to its norms: a social striation through an acceptance or a refusal of access in response to the dividual product presented (PP: 244, 246). This striation, as Deleuze suggests (PP: 242), is not binary, as there is no longer an inside or an outside of an institution, but is rather a differential striation with differing degrees of acceptance according to the *données*, the dividual subject, considered, these being the 'chiffres[…] qui marquent l'accès […] ou le rejet' mentioned in the *Post-scriptum*, an indication of the importance of the *mot de passe* in the post-disciplinary society (PP: 244). Examples of such a differential striation can be seen in a subject's credit rating, a *donnée*, where they may have a rating that allows them to access a credit card, but may be refused a large loan with a "competitive rate of interest", or simply at airport security in the European Union where an EU passport will allow you to join a faster queue whereas holders of other passports will be denied this privilege, and even amongst these passengers there may be a further differential striation leading to a greater or lesser degree of acceptance according to the other *données* presented: bearded or clean shaven, rich or poor, Canadian or Syrian.

Horizontal surveillance and social validation

We can see then that individuals are no longer subjected to a single, fixed, external norm under a hierarchical gaze, as in disciplinary society, but, in response to the sanction of differential ex/inclusion dependent on the state of *l'asservissement machinique*, they are subjected to what are, in the words of Brian Massumi (1998: 57), 'socially valorized normative entities', the *mots de passe* formed through the aggregate feedback from subjects in the *asservissement machinique*. As Jacqueline Barus-Michel (2010: 17) states, with the disappearance of a transcendent, external and hierarchical normalising gaze, '[l]es copains, les voisins et le public anonyme des jeunes internautes, constituent la caisse de résonance qui confère gloire et existence' and so the degree to which one is accepted or rejected is dependent on the recognition of others in a sort of immanent horizontal surveillance, or even sousveillance, rather than the transcendent vertical surveillance of disciplinary institutions.

As Barus-Michel implies in the above quotation, technology, particularly the internet, has widened the audience for any act and the ability of this audience to respond punctually as the new rule of time and space proximity, mentioned above in the discussion of the crisis of disciplinary enclosure, has spread the ability of others anywhere to respond in real time and so, in the words of Paul Virilio, '[t]echnology [has] appropriated divinity, [defined as instantaneity, ubiquity and immediacy,] so we don't need a person for that; anyone can avail themselves of this absolute power' (Virilio and Lotringer 2008: 230). With the possibilities opened up by new technologies such as the internet then '"we rush towards this strange ideal of sociability" where brains "touch one other at each and every instant through multiple

communications"'(Lazzarato 2006: 181, quoting Gabriel Tarde) and one's status therefore is largely dependent on the recognition granted in the *asservissement machinique* by a potentially anonymous, mass of others, on the position one is granted by this mass in relation to a socially validated norm. In order to ensure this recognition, one's normative affirmation or otherwise, and, in the words of Barus-Michel (2010: 13), 'se sentir exister […], il faut etre vu, construire son image, capter les regards et les objectifs, trouver son reflet sur les écrans.'

Indeed, it is in service of such a search for recognition that 'une nouvelle socialité se construit sur le *web*' (Barus-Michel 2010: 18), with people presenting themselves, their private, or even intimate, thoughts and feelings through blogs, message boards, social networking sites and sites such as YouTube; and that reality television has seen such rapid growth, offering people a possibility to reveal the details of their private life and troubles on talk-shows and in competitions such as *Loft Story* (Mehl 2006) where individuals present themselves as a specimen of humanity, an *échantillon* of humanity, to be judged, to be affirmed as acceptable, or more or less acceptable than another specimen (Razac 2008: 160-168). The success of these programmes should be considered in relation to, and as a more contemporary complement to, Deleuze's statement in the *Post-scriptum* that '[s]i les jeux télévisés les plus idiots ont tant de succès, c'est parce qu'ils expriment adéquatement la situation d'entreprise' (PP: 242). These programmes express the *entreprise* of the *asservissement machinique* in that the subject-participants are productive parts constituting the spectacle of the programme, which is judged by the other productive parts, the subject-spectators, altogether forming

an abstract whole indicating an immanent socially constructed norm and a positioning of all the subjects in relation to it.

In light of this horizontal surveillance and necessity of visibility for a position in the relation to the socially constituted norm, the freedom of individuals to choose their own subjectivity confronts a paradoxical demand in that they are required, in the words of Jean-Claude Kaufman, to '[se] couler dans des moules de socialisation conformes, tout en affirmant une singularité irréductible' (in de Gaulejac 2006: 130) and, as a result, each individual, as de Gaulejac writes, is

> enjoint de se présenter comme un homme libre, responsable, créatif, capable de faire des projets, et en même temps de se couler dans des modèles (être bon élève, diplômé, bien dans sa peau…), des contraintes (concours, sélections, embauche…), des normes très strictes. (De Gaulejac 2006: 130)

Individuals therefore, although no longer *assujettis* by the disciplinary *dispositif*, must *s'assujetir* in order to assure their positive inclusion and acceptance in the *asservissement machinique*. We should remember, however, that these strict models and competitions have also been transformed by the development of a generalised *asservissement machinique* as expression of the modulation of control.

Une rivalité inexpiable

The ongoing *entreprise* of norm generation from its own field of application through *l'asservissement machinique*, however, 'ne cesse d'introduire une rivalité inexpiable comme saine émulation, excellente motivation qui oppose les individus entre eux et traverse chacun' (PP: 242-243) as each subject seeks to position themselves most favourably in the *courbe de normalité* and thereby assure their degree of acceptability and prevent their relegation, their relative rejection. As individuals have ceased to be given relatively stable positions in a fixed disciplinary institution and instead, as Michael Hardt (1998b: 32) suggests, find themselves amongst 'the shifting desert sands' of control where 'positions are continually swept away', there develops what Vincent de Gaulejac (2010: 42) has referred to as 'la lutte des places', where individuals try to be the best at any given task in order to avoid a relegation in their status, their degree of acceptability, and must fight to maintain their position, their degree of acceptance in relation to a norm which is constantly moving. This permanent competition indicates that the demands on the individual become potentially greater and greater without any foreseeable end, that they are *illimités*.

This movement brings to mind Foucault's concept of 'un racisme d'Etat' elaborated in his lectures of 1976. This is not based on race in a biological sense but in the sense of a social entity representative of a norm confronted with social entities other to it. This *racisme d'Etat* is 'un racisme interne, celui de la purification permanente' (Foucault 1997: 52-53). It is such an internal purification that is pursued through this *rivalité inexpiable* of control, both within society and within each individual, confronting the

individuals who fall behind in this process with the implicit risk of elimination, complete rejection.

This *purification permanente* finds expression in the idea, which Nicole Aubert (2010a: 30) claims to have emerged in the last decades of the twentieth century, that 'il faut se surpasser sans cesse, [...] aller toujours plus loin, plus vite, plus fort, [...] travailler sans répit pour être "le meilleur"'. This is the 'saine émulation' of which Deleuze talks in the *Post-scriptum* (PP: 242), introducing 'le dépassement de soi' as the norm (Aubert 2010a: 30; Barus-Michel 2010) and establishing what Robert Castel has called 'l'individu par excès' as the model for others to follow. This concept constitutes one of the first of the two poles of contemporary existence identified by Castel and finds its opposite in 'l'individu par défaut'. The former is the very expression of superlative success, of 'l'individualisme conquérant de celui qui, maître de ses entreprises, poursuit avec acharnement son propre intéret', showing themselves to be consistently ahead of the curve, an unconstrained exceptional individual better than the rest. The latter type is that of the individual who cannot keep up and falls behind the curve, who is defined in relation to that which he or she lacks, and who is inacapable of surpassing his or her situation because they are lacking the means to do so and will not gather these means unless they do surpass themselves and achieve a more favourable normative position (Aubert 2006b: 73-74). The individual *par excès* constitutes the purest embodiment of a norm and is therefore rewarded with access to fame, fortune, good health, and exciting travel whereas the individual *par défaut* is that which is to be eliminated, rejected, and so suffers the social disqualifications that exist, such

as long-term unemployment, immobility, loneliness, unwarranted attention from the police, and social invisibility.

This position of such a successful individual, however, is also delicate, requiring intense effort from the individual to maintain, and vulnerable to the modulation of norms operated in the *asservissement machinique*. These superlatively successful individuals, or 'défoncés' as Jean Cournut called them, due to the immense risks taken and the stress of the continuous work involved in maintaining their extraordinary performance, are haunted by the potential of an equally superlative collapse, of a burn-out in which the individual fails to sustain their performance and

> [c]'est alors la perte de l'estime de soi et des autres, un effondrement psychique, somatique, social, [...] le naufrage, le rejet du *has been* et une immense fatigue. (Cournut 2006: 63)

Equally these individuals may fall from grace due to the shifting norms produced in *l'asservissement machinique*. A celebrity may, for example, be considered the height of beauty one day and the next be considered to be too thin and labelled as an anorexic, or a business person may be given great esteem as a rich entrepreneur, but may be reviled as a scrooge-like parasite with too much personal wealth gathered at the expense of the less fortunate the next. As Nicole Aubert (2010a: 31-32) notes, there are pathologies diagnosed at either extreme of this spectrum, those 'du trop plein et de l'excès' and those 'du manque et du vide', the clearest example of which being obesity and anorexia, indicating that there remain risks of rejection in the pursuit of

surpassing the normal, that being ahead of the curve can have consequences similar to those of falling behind the curve.

The modulation of control

Mots de passe are key features of this modulation which we have seen to be the fate of the now freely circulating disciplinary logics, and a closer examination of this modulation will give us a clear sense of how, in the new control societies, 'on n'en finit jamais avec rien' and have moved away from a disciplinary *acquittement apparent* towards an *atermoiement illimité* of normative judgement (PP: 243).

Firstly, the modulation of control clearly functions according to *mots de passe* because the norms which it actualises are temporary and constantly changing. If we start from Simondon's statement that 'moduler est mouler de manière continue et perpétuellement variable' (in Deleuze 2002: 126n) we can see how the fixed moulds of the disciplinary *mots d'ordre* find themselves transformed into fleeting *mots de passe* as 'variations inséparables, formant un système à géométrie variable' (PP: 242). In this modulation of control the norms of each former discipline exist as virtual mouldings to be actualised at any moment, through the speed of communication made possible by new technologies, as part of the modulation of a *contrôle* 'à court terme et à rotation rapide' (PP: 246), which manifests itself as 'un moulage auto-déformant qui changerait continûment, d'un instant à l'autre' (PP: 242). This can be seen, for example, in the *contrôle continu* of a public figure such as politician, who not only must continuously prove his or her professional achievements (work), but

also his or her health (medecine, sport), his or her compassion with others (mental health), his or her commitment to family life (family) and a certain degree of knowledge (education). Given the pervasive surveillance enabled through technology and the desire for recognition, and therefore the necessity of visibility, the fate of such a public figure is that of all subjects as they are made, and make themselves, public.

This fleeting nature and the rapid rotation of the various moulds, the various *mots de passe*, in this modulation creates a radical uncertainty which can be more thoroughly understood if we consider the shift from disciplinary enclosure to this modulation in an open space in the terms of information theory.

As Tiziana Terranova (2004: 10-20) explains in expounding the mathematical theory of communication elaborated by Claude E. Shannon and Warren Weaver in the late 1940s, information theory is essentialy concerned with the clear and accurate reception of a signal and this requires the establishment of a clear channel through which the signal can be clearly sent and received against a background of noise generated as a by-product of these very signals. We can see that such a channel is established in the disciplinary institutions as they exclude communications with the outside world, the noise which would interfere in the safe transmission and reception of their *mots d'ordre*. In the open space of *contrôle*, however, these enclosures cease to function and, as Nathan Moore (2007: 450) points out, '[a]ny piece of information is quite capable of existing alongside any other piece of information, regardless of any apparent conflict between them'. These

overlapping *mots de passe* constitute a noisy environment in which, according to Terranova,

> the middle zone of meaning is increasingly difficult to construct and maintain, in as much as the noise always implicitly carried by information hedges in from all sides. (Terranova 2004: 14)

In the modulation of *contrôle*, contact is only established as 'a temporary suspension of the multitude of tiny and obscure perceptions out of which information emerges as a kind of fleeting clarity' (Ibid. 15), before one is again faced with noise, unsure of what *mot de passe* will make a transient contact next and whether it will contradict the previous communication, or even the one after that. The indistinct noise of multiple attempts of communication interfering with each other certainly embodies the passive danger of the new technologies of the society of *contrôle* identified by Deleuze in the *Post-scriptum*: 'le brouillage'' (PP: 244), defined earlier by Deleuze in relation to 'l'informatique' as 'le pur bruit' (PP: 60).

That the mould actualised, the communication received, at any point in the modulation is liable to rapidly change at the next contributes to the emergence, as a corollary, of a new "urgentist" relation to time experienced by the subject of control, a relation which emphasises the here and now, the *mot de passe* requiring immediate action in the present, but at the same time places in the foreground the uncertainty of informational noise, *le brouillage*, and the necessity of being ready for other, potentially contradictory, demands in the future.

The sudden and pervasive nature of the modulation of *contrôle*, which, especially given the technological production of radical proximity, seems capable of appearing at any time, in any place, and of equally remotely measuring the relevant performance of a subject, combines with the new capabilities of the subject to respond, through the aforementioned technologically produced proximity, to produce a pressure to respond urgently to the *mot de passe* invoked. Indeed, as Aubert (2010a: 26) observes, the sentiment, mentioned above, of mastery of time and space given by the new technologies of information and communication means that '[t]out se passe désormais comme s'il ne devait plus y avoir d'écart entre l'injonction à agir et l'acte qui doit en découler' and the individual is thereby '[s]ommé[ ] de réagir de manière toujours plus rapide pour gérer un télescopage permanent d'actions ou de réponses à apporter dans l'instant'.

However, as indicated in Aubert's reference to management of this 'télescopage permanent d'actions ou de réponses'' this "urgentist" relation to the present marks the fact, noted by Gilles Lipovetsky in relation to hypermodernity, that in the society of control 'c'est moins un *carpe diem* qui caractérise l'esprit du temps que l'inquiétude face à un avenir frappé d'incertitudes et de risques' (Lipovetsky with Charles 2004: 69). Given the uncertainty of the future, the subject of control lives in 'un présent divisé, anxieux, hanté par les virus et les ravages du temps' (Ibid. 72) and so acts in the present in such a way as to position him or herself favourably for future challenges. Lipovetsky claims that we can see such a projection in the domain of health, in the emphasis placed on, for example, healthy eating, stopping smoking, losing weight and regular exercise (Ibid. 71), and in that of

education, through the choice of subjects in function of their supposed worth on the future job market and the increasing use of private tuition (Ibid. 69-70), but we can also see such a phenomenon in the emphasis given by Ulrich Beck (1992: 116-123) to behaviours which promote a flexibility in the face of potential future demands in social relationships, such as the tendency towards staying single and avoiding the attachments of a spouse or children. The unpredictability of the modulation of control and projective actions in the present to pre-empt it militate against fixed positions.

Indeed, secondly, these temporary moulds which are actualised in this modulation do not refer to the fixed and predetermined *mots d'ordre* of the disciplines but instead, as Deleuze states in the *Post-scriptum*, 'renvoie à des échanges flottants' (PP: 244), a mobile *mot de passe* continuously produced through the *entreprise* of *asservissement machinique*, a norm which is itself modulated, and which, as such, can place changing and thus potentially ever greater demands on a subject. Deleuze indicates this in the *Post-scriptum* by noting that the disciplinary institutions such as the family, the school, the army or the factory have become 'les figures chiffrées, déformables et transformables, d'une même entreprise' (PP: 245) and gives the example of how the disciplinary institution of the factory has transformed in the society of control into the *entreprise*, which is no longer fixed but 'une âme, un gaz' (PP: 242). Unlike the factory, which 'portait ses forces intérieures à un point d'équilibre, le plus haut possible pour la production, le plus bas possible pour les salaires', this *entreprise*, in a way which reflects the new normalising sanction of differential striation, imposes 'une modulation de chaque salaire, dans des états de perpétuelle métastabilité' (PP: 242).

This modulation of salaries is just one example of the continuous modulation of recompenses, of degrees of acceptance and rejection of a *dividual* subject, of the normalising sanction, which reveals, not a change in the object being recompensed, but in the system of recompense itself, which is now based on norms that are themselves constantly being modulated through the process of *asservissement machinique*. The importance of this process is underlined by Deleuze in the *Post*-scriptum through the illustration, said to be taken from Guattari, of a city based on such a system. In this city we see the modulation of normalising sanction for the same dividual entity, in that 'chacun p[eu]t quitter son appartement, sa rue, son quartier, grâce à sa carte électronique (dividuelle) qui f[ai]t lever telle ou telle barrière', but this card could equally be 'racrachée tel jour, ou entre telles heures' (PP: 246). That this same card can be rejected despite originally being sufficient and accepted shows how the modulation of the norm operated through the mode of *asservissement machinique* changes the criteria by which subjects are judged. Indeed, Deleuze underlines the centrality of the process of *asservissement machinique*, and also how this process is enabled by the emergence of 'machines de troisième espece, machines informatiques et ordinateurs' which enable constant surveillance and connection between all points (PP: 242), in relation to this illustrative example in stating that

> ce qui compte n'est pas la barrière, mais l'ordinateur qui repère la position de chacun, licite ou illicite, et opère une modulation universelle. (PP : 246)

This same phenomenon can also be seen to be at work in the example discussed earlier of reality television. A contestant's performance may be accepted at one point but, without having changed, may be rejected at another point perhaps because other contestants' performances are now considered to be better or perhaps simply the demands of the audience have changed and the previously acceptable performance is now insufficient, passé or even intolerable. As Deleuze states in the *Post-scriptum*, the modulation of control is like 'un tamis dont les mailles changeraient d'un point à un autre' (PP: 242).

This modulation of norms highlights the fact that 'dans les sociétés de contrôle on n'en finit jamais avec rien' and indicates a move from the *acquittement apparent* of disciplinary society towards an *atermoiement illimité* of normative judgement (PP: 243). In this new situation, '[l]'homme n'est plus l'homme enfermé, mais l'homme endetté' (PP: 246), no longer a 'producteur discontinu d'énergie' in an infinite chain of disciplinary institutions with separate fixed norms that can be definitively satisfied, but 'sur faisceau continu' in an unlimited modulation of different norms that can only temporarily be sated but never definitively satisfied (PP: 244).

Axiomatic dynamism and the dividual subjectivity

The combination of the freedom of all individuals to choose for themselves, the weighty consequences of their actions and the constant shifting of norms of the control socety leads to a profound pressure being exerted on, and a profound anxiety being felt by, individuals in a society of radical uncertainty. As Michel Kokoreff and Jacques Rodriguez (2006: 136) explain,

with the decline of disciplinary institutions and the ‘incertitude normative’ that follows, ‘l’individu a gagné en liberté ce qu’il a perdu en certitudes’, but still must choose because, as Zygmunt Bauman (2001: xvi) reminds us, individualisation, self-construction, is itself ‘a fate, not a choice’ and individuals are left with no one else to blame if they choose incorrectly, with potentially disastrous consequences, whether it be falling ill because they have not chosen to follow a rigourous health regime, staying unemployed because they chose not to try hard enough in finding a job, or failing to make friends because they chose not to develop a more appealing personality. As Vincent de Gaulejac (2010: 37) states, the individual is not only fated to construct him or herself, but in order to be normatively validated, ‘l'individu est “condamné à réussir”. Et cette réussite est sans limite, sans fin, sans repos.’

Indeed, given that *contrôle* is concerned with the product rather than the process of production, every individual in a society is left to subject themselves, to discipline of their own free choice their own activity, more and more strongly to norms. However, as Ulrich Beck and Elisabeth Beck-Gernsheim (2001: 3) point out, ‘[t]he do-it-yourself biography is always a “risk biography”, indeed a “tightrope biography”, a state of permanent […] endangerment’, as there is the risk of not subjecting oneself enough or to the correct norm, the risk of subjecting oneself too much to a norm, the risk that others have achieved a more pure *assujettissement* to a norm and one is relegated as a result, the risk of a breakdown as one tries to do too much and fails to keep up appearances.

The subject of the society of control therefore must act on the basis of a radical uncertainty. Not only is the norm in relation to which one will be

measured unknown, the criteria of the norm itself is not necessarily knowable. Dynamism and activity become axiomatic.

‘Rivalité inexpiable’ and control as secret organisation

That the ‘rivalité inexpiable’ of the control society ‘oppose les individus entre eux et traverse chacun’ (PP: 243) points to the extent which, through the replacement of the fixed and prescribed *mots d'ordre* of discipline with a *chiffre*, a cipher, an encoded code, a secret language made up of elusive *mots de passe*, the society of *controle* has inaugurated a society of the secret, of radical uncertainty and paranoia. In *Mille plateaux*, Deleuze and Guattari recognise this role of *mots de passe* in forming a *langue secrète* and link the development of such a language to the secret societies in which they are produced (MP: 122-123, 351-356). By exploring Deleuze and Guattari’s development of these terms we will see how the modulation of *mots de passe* has produced such a society.

In *Mille plateaux*, we can see that there is an intimate relationship between secrecy and the *mot de passe*, both in its definition and its effects. Deleuze and Guattari first define a secret as a content ‘*trop grand* pour sa forme’ (MP: 351) and, given that the *mot de passe* merely expresses an instant of a more profound continuous variation, we can see that the *mot de passe* also can be defined as a content ‘trop grand pour sa forme’. The continuous variation of norms cannot be contained in the norm given as a *mot de passe*, which can only express a momentary state of this variation.

In *Mille plateaux*, the effect of the secret is to spread a certain uncertainty and induce a sort of paranoia, just like that of the *mot de passe* in the society of *contrôle*. Given that the secret is too large for its form it is in its very nature to be perceived; indeed, the secret is already secretly perceived by those aware of it, those who guard it. Those who guard a secret seek to protect it from the secret perception of others but will not necessarily be aware of other more secret, more imperceptible, perceptions of this secret and thereby a sort of paranoia is born in relation to this secret because, as Deleuze and Guattari put it, there is always a possibility that '[i]l y aura [...] une perception plus fine que la vôtre' (MP: 351). In the modulation of *mots de passe* every subject has a secret to protect from the perception of others and the need to perceive the secrets of others for it is these secrets, individual performances in relation to various norms, which will determine their position in the *courbes de normalité* as well as the greater secret, the norm itself, the *mot de passe*.

It is in this paranoia instituted by the secret that we find the action of '[l]e secret comme secretion' (MP: 351) identified by Deleuze and Guattari where the secret 's'insère, se glisse, s'introdui[t] entre les formes publiques, fa[it] pression sur elles et fa[it] agir des sujets connus' (MP: 351). We can clearly see such an action of the secret in the society of control through the *mots de passe* which instigate a continuous modulation of *contrôle* and thereby introduces a *rivalité inexpiable* which puts pressure on individuals to subject themselves to the relevant norms.

From this insistence on the action of the secret *between* entities we can see why Deleuze and Guattari state that '[t]out secret est un agencement collectif', 'une notion sociale' which not only introduces a certain type of

relations, but is invented by society and as such always exists in relation to a secret society (MP: 352). Indeed, the secret languages and the *mots de passe* are said in *Mille plateaux* to be born of the mode of action of a secret society, 'lui-même secret, par influence, glissement, insinuation, suintement, pression, rayonnement noir', by which it pursues the 'projet universel de pénétrer toute la société, de se glisser dans toutes les formes de la société, en en bousculant la hiérarchie et la segmentation' (MP: 352).

This project and the becoming of the secret seems to reach a greater level in the society of control as a society in which the '[l]e secret acquière sa propre forme en tant que secret' and 's'élève du contenu fini à la forme infinie du secret.' The emergent dominance of *mots de passe* in the place of the disciplinary *mots d'ordre* illustrate the moment where

> [o]n va d'un contenu bien déterminé, localisé ou passé [*mot d'ordre*], à la forme générale a priori d'un *quelque chose* qui s'est passé, non localisable [*mot de passe*]. (MP: 353, bracketed inserts my own)

The control society is then a society in which the dominant form is the secret as *mot de passe*, a society of a *rivalité inexpiable* where everyone has a secret, or secrets, and the relation inherent in the secret, that of a paranoia, is that which pervades all social relationships as an a priori. As can be seen in the radical uncertainty of the control society, where individuals must act anticipatively in an attempt to pre-empt the rapid modulation of *contrôle*, Deleuze and Guattari assert that in such a situation of infinite secrecy 'une

anticipation de la perception [...] remplace la recherche empirique des boîtes et de leur contenu: *coupable a priori*, et de toutes manières!' (MP: 354)

Philip Goodchild (1996: 180) notes the existence of such a 'condition of a generalised paranoia where secrecy is elevated from a finite content to an infinite form' in relation to the development of mass-media representation. He states that the collective subject of mass-media representation in which we are all conspirators, and which we must therefore recognise as the process of *l'asservissement machinique* involving of all individuals in the society of control, 'judges every public figure as guilty a priori – each has a guilty secret or ambiguous motives that, even if they cannot be directly exposed, can be anticipated or magically foreseen.'

The society of control can also be seen to be a society of infinite secrecy in that the 'arrière-société encore plus secrète', which is an integral part of any secret society (MP: 352), is itself no longer localisable or determined and affects the entirety of the larger society rather than a separate and closed milieu. This *arrière-société* 'perçoi[t] le secret, [...] le protège, [... ou] exécute les sanctions de sa divulgation' (MP: 352), all actions that would have been determined by the external *propriétaire(s)* and their *regard(s) hierarchique(s)* in the disciplinary society, but are, in the control society, molecularised and put into continuous variation by the generalised *asservissement machinique*. A horizontal surveillance exists by which norms are formed and sanctions executed in the form of a rejection or acceptance which makes every individual a virtual member *en puissance* of the *arrière-société* as executor of sanctions. Additionally, we can see that the *arrière-société* as holder of the secret has been profoundly changed by the

asservissement machinique of the society of control. Those who hold the secret in this society at a given point are those who, at this point, are atop the *courbe de normalité*, those who, again, at this point, fulfill the ideal of the *individu par excès*. As we have seen, this is a precarious position and can be an ethereal one, no sooner established than wiped away in the shifting desert sands alluded to by Michael Hardt (1998b: 32), established by the *chiffre*, as the organising principle of the control society, and wiped away by the *chiffre*. The *individu par excès*'s membership of the *arrière-société* itself is something non-localisable that comes and goes, inviting the paranoiac question of 'Qu'est-ce qui s'est passé?' (MP: 354)

As the society of control makes the secret 'une forme organisatrice structurante' and so the secret itself 'devient mince et partout répandu, [...] son contenu devient moléculaire, en même temps que sa forme se dissout', the speed of the modulation of control reveals the ultimate status of the secret, claimed by Deleuze and Gattari, as a secret 'tout caché par célérité, limpidité' which invites a certain response to this question: that nothing has happened, or certainly it is impossible to perceive that something has happened (MP: 354-355). In the society of *contrôle* the secret influence, the 'influence du type "lobby"' (MP: 351), of *mots de passe* becomes imperceptible, bypasses paranoia and appears as an individual's free will, as can be seen in the *Post-scriptum* with Deleuze's mention of the many young people who 'réclament étrangement d'être "motivés"', demanding and redemanding the elements that make up the modulation of *contrôle continu* (PP: 247). With each modulation of *contrôle* then, as those atop the curve find themselves expressing the greatest affinity with the *mot de passe* and others are shown to be relatively

lacking through the pervasive horizontal surveillance enhanced by new technologies, we can see that this appearance of the final imperceptible form of the secret as described by Deleuze and Guattari means that, in the society of control,

> [c]ertains peuvent parler, ne rien cacher, ne pas mentir: ils sont secrets par transparence, impénétrables comme l'eau, incompréhensibles en vérité, tandis que les autres ont un secret toujours percé, bien qu'ils l'entourent d'un mur épais ou l'élèvent à la forme infinie. (MP: 356)

It is this type of secret organisation and pervasive normalising pressures that are indicated by the *chiffres* of control and the 'langage numérique du contrôle' (PP: 244), which they make up.

In *Mille plateaux* (484-490), a *chiffre* is identified as what Deleuze and Guattari call the 'nombre nombrant' in which 'Le nombre n'est plus un moyen de compter ni de mesurer, mais de déplacer [...]: c'est un nombre directionnel, et non pas dimensionnel ou métrique' (MP: 484-485). For Deleuze and Guattari, this *chiffre* institutes an 'organisation numérique' of which the organising principle is expressed as an implicit *nomos* that is derived from the distribution of elements, a mode of distribution (in an open space), which suggests the immanent constitution of the *asservissement machinique* identified above as indicative of control.

This *chiffre* that is connected explicitly to the society of control by Deleuze would be opposed to the idea of a 'nombre' used as a 'numéro

matricule', which is identified as being indicative of discipline (PP: 243-244). This type of number is contrasted with the 'nombre nombrant' in *Mille plateaux* as a 'nombre nombré', a numbered number that is a tool of unitary measurement, counting and comparison. Rather than an implicit *nomos* this numbered number establishes a *logos* that institutes explicit rules and definitions to measure and organise a distribution of elements (MP: 484-490).

Capitalism and control

In contrast to Foucault's use of the prison as the model of the ideal disciplinary institution in *Surveiller et punir*, Deleuze takes the factory (*usine*) as the privileged example of a disciplinary institution in his *Post-scriptum*; a choice which highlights the importance of the changing economy, understood beyond its strictly economic, monetary sense, in Deleuze's account of the shift from discipline to control. Indeed, Deleuze describes a capitalism of disciplinary power which reflects a concern with the control of process in its exercise: 'le capitalisme du XIXe siècle', a capitalism 'pour la production' where '[l]es conquêtes de marché se font […] par spécialisation de production' (PP: 245).

For Deleuze, however, in the control society there is a 'mutation du capitalisme' (PP: 244) which sees a move towards 'un capitalisme de surproduction' (PP: 245). This mutation can be seen in much the same way as 'la victoire de la technoscience capitaliste' (Lyotard 2005: 36) asserted by Lyotard, and indeed contributes to 'l'affaiblissement des repères et des structures d'encadrement et de sociabilité traditionnelles' (Aubert 2006a: 14)

and a relative democratisation of the norm. We will explore Deleuze's assertion of such a mutation and his concept of capitalism with reference to the the work of Deleuze and Guattari on capitalism (*L'Anti-Œdipe* (1972) and *Mille Plateaux* (1980)).

According to Deleuze, 'le capitalisme du XIXe siècle est à concentration […] et de propriété' and so the *usine,* Deleuze's favoured example of a disciplinary institution, is established with the capitalist as the 'propriétaire des moyens de production' (PP: 245). For Deleuze and Guattari, such a concentration of capital in the hands of the capitalist 'dessine en creux le capitalisme, mais [...]il faut pour le réaliser toute une *intégrale des flux décodés,* toute une *conjugaison généralisée* qui déborde et renverse les appareils précédents' (MP: 564-565). Thus, due to the lack of flow (*flux*), this concentration of capital holds back the development of capitalism, the production of more and more capital, through the extraction of surplus value (profit), as it tends towards crises of overproduction. These crises, observed by Marx and Engels (2002: 225-226), are where 'the extraction of surplus-value from the circuits of production and sale of commodities leaves the working-class with insufficient purchasing power to buy back the goods they have produced' (Holland 1999: 138).

Capitalism for Deleuze and Guattari, as we can see from the above, is intimately related to the proliferation of decoded, i.e. unqualified, purely quantitative, flows which are conjugated according to an *axiomatic*, a system of axioms. An axiom, by definition, does not require a basis in a qualitative code and in such axiomatised conjugations 'l'axiomatique considère directement des éléments et des rapports purement fonctionnels dont la nature

n'est pas spécifiée' (MP: 567). In these axiomatisations '[i]t matters not at all *what* (qualitatively) is produced, only *that* production occurs and surplus-value is realized' (Holland 1999: 67-68), a surplus value in the form of a '*plus-value de flux*' (A-O: 270). In a capitalist society,

> [l]a véritable axiomatique est celle [...] qui se substitue aux anciens codages, et qui organise tous les flux décodés […] au profit du système capitaliste et au service de ses fins. (A-O: 277)

In so doing the surplus value of flow created is a flow of uncoded capital, of 'la monnaie comme équivalent général' (A-O: 296), but this creation of a surplus of flow 'n'est pas séparable d'un devenir-concret sans lequel il ne deviendrait pas capital et ne s'approprierait pas la production' (A-O: 296). The lack of flow, where we find only product and not production, is the source of crises of overproduction. In order to continue to extract a surplus value, that which has been produced must continue to flow through its axiomatic conjugation with other decoded flows (A-O: 277-282). For example, it may conjugate with a flow of technology to make a manufacturing machine; it may conjugate with a flow of labour to become a wage; it may conjugate with a flow of matter to become a commodity. In all of these examples capital is *reterritorialised* in an actual(ised) form to be taken up again in the axiomatic conjugation of flows and so create more virtual surplus value: a machine may conjugate with a flow of labour to produce a flow of commodity, a wage conjugates with a commodity to release the surplus value invested in both. In capitalism therefore 'une plus-value de flux non réalisée est comme non-

produite' (A-O: 279) and the only rule is 'produire pour produire' (A-O: 309), a rule that does not depend on a qualitative code as it is a functional imperative.

Capitalism, in that it is purely based on the accumulation in society of 'l'argent comme quantité abstraite illimitée' (A-O: 296), is limitless as it has 'seulement une limite intérieure qui est le capital lui-même […] qu'il ne rencontre pas, mais qu'il reproduit en la déplaçant toujours' (A-O: 274). This forever deferrable limit is that which is expressed in the crisis of overproduction: the dead weight of immobile product. As Marx and Engels (2002: 226) noted, capitalism pushes back its limits and overcomes crises of overproduction 'by the conquest of new markets and by the more thorough exploitation of the old ones.' For Deleuze and Guattari, this is achieved in the decoding and recoding through the application of the axiomatic to previously axiomatised, and new, areas of social production determined by qualitative codes and so, 'in its perpetual search for new sources of profit, capitalism continually axiomatizes other qualitatively dissimilar resource-flows, transforming them into quantitatively exchangeable commodities on the market' (Holland 1999: 67). Given the constant displacement of capital's internal limit, the limit of overproduction, Marx and Engels (2002: 223) correctly observed therefore that in capitalism, '[a]ll fixed [...] relations [...] are swept away [and] all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air[;] all that is holy is profaned'.

These new flows of commodities produced by the creation of new markets opened up by this decoding must in turn be realised to release a surplus through their consumption. It is for this reason that Deleuze and

Guattari state that 'le but suprême du capitalisme [… est] d'introduire le manque là où il y a toujours trop, par l'absorption qu'elle opère de ressources surabondantes' (A-O: 280). It is in such a way that the overproduction inherent in the movement of capitalism is absorbed and crises are avoided through the stimulation of consumer desires as '[i]t is only when people can be convinced that they are lacking something [...] that they can be induced to consume' (Holland 1999: 79).

We can see in "postmodernity" then a process of axiomatisation of the social field where that which was fixed in disciplinary society, the norms of action and attitude, the *mots d'ordre*, are swept up into a market as exchangeable commodities to be "consumed", or not, according to one's choice. In this movement, codes of right and wrong, acceptable and unacceptable gave way to 'quantitatively exchangeable commodities on the market' (Holland 1999: 67) which responded to 'un désir illimité d'accomplissement de soi, de liberté et de loisirs' (Lipovetsky 1993: 182): a market of "lifestyle choices" to satisfy individualist demands based on the feeling of a lack of individuality. Qualitative codes themselves become objects of exchange (Lipovetsky with Charles 2004: 89-96), as '[d]es produits tout faits' to be bought or 'des pièces détachées' (PP: 245) to be put together, as the new individual of control begins to 'choisir, dans tous les domaines, sa verité, sa morale, son identité' (Kaufman 2006: 179).

This is the creation of a control society functioning through a capitalism of *surproduction* described by Deleuze as 'pour la vente ou pour le marché' (PP: 245). Here a capitalism is realised where the '*circulation* of objects replaces their *production* as the motor of the economy' (Massumi

1992: 199) and the persistence of overproduction is allowed through creating new markets and new demands, which encourage the new consumption of new flows of commodities.

This capitalism is, and must be, also 'essentiellement dispersif' (PP: 245) where the appearance of a dispersed 'propriété privée' (A-O: 258) creates what Deleuze and Guattari describe as 'la *seule* classe', 'la bourgeoisie comme classe décodante et décodée' (A-O: 302). It is the dispersal of capital which creates a market for the new commodities, a flow of exchange capital, money, to conjugate with and realise a surplus value of flow and thereby, in the words of Marx and Engels (2002: 223), 'give[ ] a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country.'

This intimate relation of subjects to the flow of capital involved in these 'libérations', however, leads us, as Deleuze notes in the *Post-scriptum*, into new 'asservissements' (PP: 241) where 'il n'y a même plus de maître, seuls maintenant des esclaves [qui] commandent aux esclaves' (A-O: 302).

In the factory of nineteenth-century capitalism, the capitalist, 'le propriétaire', constitutes the machine to which others, 'les "prolétaires",' are subjected (A-O: 571) and appears therefore in a transcendent position as 'the target/object of universal envy' (Holland 1999: 65). Due to the concentration of capital in the hands of the capitalist, the flow of capital in this social machine appears as a tribute of sorts to this transcendent external object, it maintains a meaning in a code of qualification, i.e. it indicates the subordination of the workers (Holland 1999: 66). The working individual is a subject of capital, 'il est assujetti *à* la machine' (MP: 571), the social machine of capital.

The new subjects within the capitalism of control, however, are, as we have seen in the process of *asservissement machinique*, 'asservi[s] *par* la machine' (MP: 571), which is to say that they are not subjected to an externally posited transcendent figure but produce, and are produced within, the flows of capital. The mutation of capitalism identified by Deleuze as part of the emergence of a society of control is yet another indication of the emergence of a modulation as a basic model, a model of an ongoing enterprise, understood as ongoing production, in which there are only *gestionnaires*.

Although Deleuze privileges the *usine* as an example of disciplinary institution, it should be remembered that it is only one institution amongst many, as Deleuze recognises in the final section of the *Post-scriptum* where he discusses the separate regimes of different institutions (PP: 246-247). We should be wary of identifying the society of control too strongly with the development of neo-liberal capitalism, as Hardt and Negri (2000) and Lazzarato (2011) appear to do, for example. The transformations of capitalism indicates a more abstract machine of modulation, a diagram of control, which is actualised in relation to different contexts, whether it be in businesses, prisons, hospitals or schools. Control as an abstract machine cannot be reduced to its actualisation in capitalism, although we must admit that the decoded and decoding nature of the quantitative flows and axiomatic of capitalism, as described by Deleuze and Guattari, lend themselves to the shifting modulations of control and serve as an apt depiction of this abstract machine. The question we must answer is how this abstract machine may be actualised in the institution of the school.

VI - The abstract machine of control

From the above, broad consideration of actualisations of the society of control, we can extract some abstract traits that will help us identify the abstract functions that determine the diagram or abstract machine of control that Deleuze claims is becoming dominant in contemporary society and assess the extent to which these are at work in the contemporary *collège*.

Firstly, the disciplinary institutions, partly through their own intensification, are no longer enclosed as single normative moulds but instead constitute the 'états métastables et coexistants d'une même modulation' (PP: 243). No longer constituted and produced individually by an enclosed hierarchical system of authority over a single space, the various elements of all of these institutions constantly and immanently produce the variable and temporary contours of these now dividual, i.e. unfixed, social forms in a process identified in *Mille plateaux* as one of cybernetic *asservissement machinique* (MP: 570-575): 'La famille, l'école, l'armée, l'usine ne sont plus des milieux analogiques distincts qui convergent vers un propriétaire, État ou puissance privée, mais les figures chiffrées, déformables and transformables, d'une même entreprise qui n'a plus que des gestionnaires' (PP: 245).

As a result of this process of immanent constitution and the decline of enclosure, the *mots d'ordre* or strategic imperatives that had instituted disciplines in institutional *dispositifs* with fixed spatio-temporal and normative contours become shifting and obscure, or rather *chiffrés*, *mots de passe* that only fix temporary points that are themselves born of the modulatory production of the immanent *asservissement machinique*. The norms fixed by these *mots de passe* are limitlessly deferred and shifting so that in the societies

of control ‘on n’en finit jamais avec rien’ (PP: 243) as the normative modulation constitutes a ‘moulage auto-déformant qui changerait continûment, d’un instant à l’autre’ (PP: 242).

In the society of control, the normalising sanction of a disciplinary logic operating beyond the former boundaries of its enclosure can no longer be that of a hierarchically observed exercise and training. Instead it is expressed in a neo-sovereign exercise of power that marks rejection or acceptance dependent upon the tracing of a subject’s position or performance in relation to those of others (PP: 244-246), a process akin to the post-disciplinary processs of normalisation described by Foucault (2004a: 65).

The model of the abstract machine of control, then, is that given by Deleuze towards the end of the *Post-scriptum*, where he cites his frequent collaborator, Guattari:

> Félix Guattari imaginait une ville où chacun pouvait quitter son appartement, sa rue, son quartier, grâce à sa carte éléctronique (dividuelle) qui faisait lever telle ou telle barrière; mais aussi bien la carte pouvait être recrachée tel jour, ou entre telles heures; ce qui compte n’est pas la barrière, mais l’ordinateur qui repère la position de chacun, licite ou illicite, et opère une modulation universelle. (PP: 246)

In this model, we have the open space of control, and the subject considered as partial object (dividual) by reference to one aspect of this subject amongst others. More importantly we have the impostion of a sanction, the refusal of

entry, which is applied in relation to a constant modulation of a field of performances which immanently produces a temporary norm that is not fixed but mobile dependent upon the situation that leads to its formation. This is the abstract machine of the strategy of control which we can call modulation and it would be actualised in relation to various different contents or forms by different disciplinary logics.

VII - Control and the school

How might this abstract machine of control be actualised with regards to the school? There are a number of indications of how the school might become a school of control in Deleuze's texts addressing control. Indeed, it is a common reference point in his discussions. However, these indications tend to be vague or oriented towards an unknown time in the future. We can abstract from these statements though some features that may suggest how the school of control might appear and function and supplement these with some insights from the very few articles (Webb 2011; Thompson and Cook 2012) that analyse the actualisation of control in the context of the institution of the school.

Given the crisis of disciplinary institutions that accompanies the emergence of the control society, one might first of all question whether there would continue to be a school institution at all. Indeed, in his 1987 lecture *Qu'est ce que l'acte de création?* Deleuze suggests that education in the control society could do without 'le regroupement d'écoliers dans un milieu d'enfermement' (2003b: 300) and in a 1990 interview with Negri he argues

that '[o]n essaie de nous faire croire à une réforme de l'école, alors que c'est une liquidation' (PP: 237).[33] In a complete transcription of the aforementioned 1987 lecture, we even find that Deleuze (1987) suggests that 'ça pourra se faire tout à fait autrement, cela se fera par Minitel'. Indeed it is the effect of such, more advanced, communicational technologies on education and children that is considered by Stiegler (2008), but the question of the organisation of actual institutions of education remains somewhat marginal in this work.

These statements regarding the school in a society of control should be considered in relation to the emergent status of control as a power, which, as we noted earlier, means that the strategies of control will be mixed in and with other strategies of power, specifically for our purposes, this would mean the disciplinary institution of the school. Indeed, Deleuze (2003b: 299) states, again in his 1987 lecture, that the 'restes' of the disciplinary societies would remain for years and years. The temporality of the society of control in Deleuze's discussions is always that of a future that may be on its way, a society that we are entering into (2003b: 299; PP: 236) or that is 'en train de remplacer les sociétés disciplinaires' (PP: 241), but which is still yet to come. We can then consider Deleuze's statements regarding the school as indications of how in actualising the abstract machine of control a school might be reconfigured.

Deleuze's most common statement on the school in a society of control is that it will give way to a 'formation permanente' (PP: 237, 243, 246; 2003b:

[33] Of course the timing of this statement would seem to suggest that Deleuze is referring to the recently passed *Loi Jospin* of 1989, which, as will be seen in our third chapter, established the principle of pupil-centred education and reinforced the decentralisation of the administration of certain schools, including the *collèges*, which supported local initiatives and the involvement of the local community in producing the school as a functioning institution.

300). There are two ways of reading this statement, which can both highlight some potential implications for the school.

The first way of reading this statement is to emphasise the implication of life-long vocational training implied by this term. This reading of 'formation permanente' might suggest the intervention of the norms of economic activity, the factory or office, in the disciplinary space of the school. We could therefore say that the institution of control will be opened up to the disciplinary programmes of other institutions, and indeed this is what the crisis of disciplinary enclosure that heralds the emergence of control would suggest. Indeed, that would seem to be exactly the suggestion of this statement: 'On peut prévoir que l'éducation sera de moins en moins un milieu clos, se distinguant du milieu professionnel comme autre milieu clos, mais que tous les deux disparaîtront au profit d'une terrible formation permanente' (PP: 237). However, we should also note that it is not just the 'milieu professionnel' with its economy-oriented norms that the school opens up to but to potentially all disciplinary programmes escaping their boundaries. We should then expect to see a modulation of different normative disciplinary logics seeking to be actualised in the same school space.

The second way of thinking about the replacement of the school with a 'formation permanente' is in the terms of the replacement of the school as a finite spatio-temporal site of subjection and its development as part of a universal modulation, in which the normative mould is permanently in formation, never settled. This would also connect to the idea that, in a control society, one never finishes with anything, one's normative subjection is forever ongoing. In this reading the school itself becomes just one step that forms part

of a long process, and indeed, through its actualisation of a normative sanction of acceptance or rejection, one of the first *contrôles*, understood as verification, through which a subject must pass.

This idea of the school as becoming part of a 'formation permanente' can also be related to Deleuze's 1990 statement that we are seeing the liquidation rather than the reform of the school (PP: 237). The liquidation of the school can be thought of in terms of the decline of its solid, regular disciplinary construction under a central authority and its new construction through an 'entreprise qui n'a plus que des gestionnaires' (PP: 245).[34] This is particularly likely given that Deleuze is referring to recent school reforms and there had been an unprecedented decentralisation of powers regarding the direction of schools to local communities in the 1980s and official recognition of pupil-centred education in the 1989 *loi Jospin*. In these situations, as we will see, the local communities and pupils themselves became part, as *gestionnaires*, of the enterprise of constructing the school. This idea of the development of a broad constellation of agents that produce the school through its government is suggested by Taylor Webb's (2011) analysis of accountability networks in higher education institutions in British Columbia. Indeed, Webb uses the term societies of control as a synonym for the 'governmentality constellations' that bring together the various actors who hold universities to account and thereby govern their function.

Finally, Thompson and Cook (2012) underline the overlapping nature of strategies of discipline and emergent control through an analysis of the

[34] This idea of a liquidation of the school is suggestive of David Savat's (2013: 151-192) claim that the shift from a disciplinary society to a control society is accompanied by a shift from a solid politics, based on fixed relationships between solid entities, to a fluid politics, based on differential rates of flow.

introduction of a new standardised assessment regime for pupils, teachers and schools in Australia. They note that this new testing regime was introduced as an intended intensification of the disciplinary exercise of power, that would improve the accuracy of exams, and enable the increasing efficiency of the disciplinary *dispositif*. They argue, however, that this testing regime that overlays the disciplinary function of the classroom tends to abstract the punctual performance given by individuals from their actual learning. As suggested above, these new mechanisms of *contrôle* privilege the dividual abstraction of the performance or product, from the individual performer, or producer. According to Thompson and Cool, this abstracted performance is then used to quantitatively assess the performances of schools and teachers in relation to each other, with potential negative consequences for careers and institutions considered to be underperforming. Thompson and Cook argue that this results in a culture of insecurity and the promotion of a 'rivalité inexpiable' (PP: 242) between schools and teachers that reorient classroom practices from the long-term disciplining of subjectivities towards the production of short-term performances for a punctual system of control.

The development of a system of control within the disciplinary institution of the school is likely then to manifest a certain degree of overlapping strategies, but from Deleuze's commentary we may expect to see the modulation of a number of normative moulds from various disciplinary logics within the institutional space of the school; the displacement of the hierarchical organisation of the institution by its composition through an immanent process by all elements of the school as *gestionnaires*; and the displacement of the normative horizon for pupils of the school, for whom the

school will be the first of many *contrôlats* by which an individual must pass. Such developments as these will serve to help identify the emergence of a *dsipositif* of control in the context of the school.

Conclusion

The concepts of discipline and control both refer to particular strategies of power that, as an abstract machine or diagram of a generalisable strategic function, can become the dominant form of power in a given society. This is what is indicated by the idea of a disciplinary society or control society: the disciplinary society described by Foucault is a society in which the strategies of discipline have been generalised across society, the control society foretold by Deleuze is a society in which the strategies of control are generalised and dominant. In suggesting the emergence of a new society of control that is displacing the disciplinary society, Deleuze is asserting that the strategies of control are displacing those of discipline, becoming more generalised and dominant.

Strategies of power such as those of discipline and control are actualised in *dispositifs* of power, which we have seen to function similarly to the *agencements* of desire theorised by Deleuze and Guattari (1975, MP). These dispositifs are produced from the non-univocal, perpetual interplay of the impersonal force of desire that is immanent to all relations and are composed of both discursive and non-discursive elements, as well as the relations that pertain between these elements and allow the *dispositif* to fulfill a function. For Foucault, the *dispositif* comes to be through first the

establishment of a strategic imperative, what Deleuze and Guattari would call a *mot d'ordre*, that overcodes a series of power relations, and then persists through the perpetual fulfilment of this strategic objective. As Deleuze's analysis of Foucault's concept of the *dispositif* underlines, it is through the regularity of a *dispositif*'s power relations that it inscribes itself through the effects that it creates in historical strata as forms of discursive enunciations and non-discursive visibilities. There is a perpetual double conditioning between the exercises of power in a dispositif and the discursive and non-discursive forms that are produced as effects of the exercise of power. As Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the *agencement* suggests, the consistency of an *agencement* or *dispositif* is produced both by its stratified territories and by its becoming through its various points of deterritorialisation, its continuing function.

A historical period, such as those ascribed to the societies of sovereignty and the disciplinary society, can be established and identified by the regularity of the power relations in a society that inscribe their effects in the historical strata. In a society there may be various diagrams of power, the abstracted generalisable functions of a strategy of power, that coexist alongside each other, interacting with, framing, or undermining one another. There will be residual diagrams, dominant diagrams and emergent diagrams. The development of a new *dispositif* of power and its generalisable diagram emerge from the continuing fulfilment of their strategic function, what can be understood as the intensification of a *dispositif* of power in the fulfilment of its strategic imperative. It is this intensification of power, understood as its increasing efficiency, wider field of application, greater saturation of a field

and its lower cost, that Nealon (2008) identifies as the basis of historical change. As a strategy of power intensifies it will displace other strategies of lower intensity.

The disciplinary society described by Foucault provides one such example, as the greater intensity of disciplinary power, seen its its greater efficiency, regularity and saturation of its field of operation, displaces the inefficient and irregular power of the sovereign as the dominant form of power. Disciplinary power is exercised within a series of disciplinary institutions, enclosures coded to serve a specified normative programme. Within these enclosures a series of partitions and distributions of spaces, times, individuals, and their actions is effected and through the processes of hierarchical surveillance, the examination and normalising sanction the individual is subjected to a given set of norms. The ideal model of the operation of discipline is the panopticon prison design which would enable the enclosure and careful individualising distribution of persons, and their continuous visibility to a normalising gaze. This panoptic schema serves as the diagram of every exercise of disciplinary power. The school can be identified as one of the disciplinary institutions that actualised this diagram of control, distributing its pupils carefully within functionally coded positions to subject its pupils to a given set of norms through the practice of hierarchical surveillance, examination and normalising sanction.

For Deleuze, the disciplinary society is based upon the organised series of these disciplinary institutions as analogously organised enclosures that are each directed by a central authority that is at the top of the pyramidal *dispositif* of hierarchical surveillance. This society is for Deleuze regulated by fixed *mots*

d'ordre which fix norms and the contours of institutions. Each of these institutions operates according to its own separate norms according to which a subject's forces are composed and organised to achieve the maximum efficiency in service of the given norm. Each institution constitutes a distinct mould for its subjects.

We can understand the crisis of disciplinary enclosures that Deleuze asserts to be underway in the post-war period as the intensification of the exercise of disciplinary powers themselves, which seek to go beyond the limitations of their enclosures to intensify the effect and extent of their function. We can also partly understand this crisis through the postmodern decline of metanarratives that tended to serve as justification of the exercise of power in these disciplinary institutions.

Having highlighted a number of examples from sociological and other literatures, as well as further developments of certain concepts in Deleuze's earlier works, we could identify the abstract traits of control as being the central role of modulation in terms of the variation of *mots de passe*, and the concurrent receding horizon of the unlimited normative demand, the shifting nature of dividual subjectivities, and the immanent constitution of norms and institutions through the cybernetic processes of *asservissement machinique*, an enterprise in which there is no longer a central authority but only *gestionnaires*. The normative sanction of acceptance or rejection was also identified in the context of a shifting and immanently produced system of norms, resulting in the development of a *rivalité inexpiable* between all subjects. Significantly, despite the reference to a mutation of capitalism and an emphasis on the development of the *usine* to become an *entreprise* and the

references to digital technologies, the strategies of control cannot be reduced to the emergence of neoliberal capitalism or the application of digital technologies. Indeed neoliberal capitalism and the application of digital technologies can rather be better understood as particular concrete actualisations of the abstract machine of control as a generalisable schema of power relations. The use of *entreprise* in Deleuze's brief text would seem to indicate a more abstract understanding of an ongoing process of modulation, and the use of terms such as *numérique* can be seen to refer to a wider history, in Deleuze's work with Guattari, of concepts indicating the immanent production of norms and exertion of normative pressures of the sort that can be seen in the inexpiable rivalry that such a modulation produces.

Few studies have examined what this shift means for the organisation and functioning of the school as a disciplinary institution. However, we would expect a school institution entering an age of control to demonstrate the emergence of strategies of control alongside those of discipline, to be opened up to a modulation of a variety of different normative logics, constituted less by a hierarchical organisation that converges towards a central authority and more by a process in which there are only *gestionnaires*, and explicitly open towards a longer, even unlimited, process of *formation continue* in which it would serve as one of the first tests.

We will conclude briefly here by drawing a brief outline of the different features or traits of first discipline and then control that will serve as analytical guides for the following chapters. Discipline can be identified by its regular and hierarchically organised *dispositifs* that converge towards a central authority, and its fixed norms and disciplinary contours, indicative of *mots*

d'ordre, that form distinct normative moulds. Control on the other hand, can be identified by its normative modulations that express a shifting and temporary circulation of *mots de passe* rather than a fixed normative demand or mould, and the immanent production of its elements in a cybernetic process, identified by Deleuze and Guattari as *asservissement machinique*, in which there are only *gestionnaires*. With these distinctions established, we will now move on to consider the development of the French education system in the Third Republic as a disciplinary structure.

2. The disciplinary prehistory of the *collège*

Having, in the previous chapter, presented Foucault and Deleuze's related analytical concepts of *dispositifs* and *agencements* and outlined the abstract traits of discipline and control, this chapter leads towards the analysis of the emergence of the French *collège*, considered as a *dispositif* or *agencement*, through an examination of the historical strata from which the contemporary *collège* eventually emerges as a *dispositif* of deleuzean control. As will be seen in the next chapter, the contemporary *collège* emerges in the first two decades of the Fifth Republic, whose education system had largely been inherited from the Third Republic. It is this education system of the Third Republic that will be analysed in the current chapter in order to contextualise the later development of the French education system and the place of the *collège* in this development.

Paying attention to the dual discursive and material nature of the Foucauldian *dispositif* highlighted in the previous chapters, what Deleuze and Guattari would refer to as their mutually presupposed *agencement collectif d'énonciation* and *agencement machinique*, this chapter's analysis will proceed by the identification of discursive and material regularities that form the historic strata of the French education system. The 'régularités énonciatives' that constitute the discursive stratum of 'énoncés' (Deleuze 1986: 14, 55-75) will be examined in policy documents and political discourse, whilst the material regularities will be identified in the administrative arrangements and instruments instituted by this discourse and crystallised in the institutions of the education system.

This chapter examining the prehistory of the *collège* focuses on the education system that developed under the Third Republic because this is a period which both correlates with that in which Deleuze claims the disciplinary society reaches its peak, the beginning of the twentieth century (2003a: 240), and is said by Antoine Prost to be that in which 'l'institution scolaire [...] trouve alors son apogée' (1968: 325). Also, as Briand and Chapoulie (2011: 9) note, the arrangement of educational institutions established under the Third Republic is essentially that which immediately precedes the current system of education in France, in which the *collège* is perhaps the central institution, and as such this pre-war organisation is one of the keys for understanding this contemporary system, which is in part born of the problems engendered by its predecessor, and how it might manifest a shift away from discipline and towards a system of control.

"The" French school of the Third Republic will be seen not to constitute a single monolithic disciplinary institution but rather a system of distinct and separate schools, understood as disciplinary *dispositifs*, and, therefore, if we are to speak of a crisis of disciplinary enclosure with respect to "the" school we must refer to the separate enclosures that make up this school as well as the enclosure of the school system considered as a whole. This will be of considerable importance in the following chapter when we consider the development of a modulation indicative of control in the institution of the *collège*.

In the following analysis we will identify the establishment and function of three distinct disciplinary *dispositifs* that were operational within the school system of the Third Republic and the different abstract disciplinary

logics of education which they actualised. The term disciplinary logic as it will be used in this chapter refers to the abstract orientation of a practice of discipline that responds to what Deleuze would call the *mot d'ordre* (MP: 95-139), and Foucault would call the strategic imperative (2001: 299), that calls for this exercise of power. The term will be used here to refer primarily to this abstract rationale guiding the exercise of disciplinary power rather than the specific content of the norms that are operational as points of subjection within a disciplinary *dispositif* so oriented.

Three separate disciplinary *dispositifs* will be identified as separate orders of the education system of the Third Republic, each animated by a different *mot d'ordre* and operating a distinct disciplinary logic of education that responds to this *mot d'ordre*. These orders are: the primary order of education, or *l'enseignement primaire*, which, responding to the *mot d'ordre* of community, operates according to a community-centred logic of education; the secondary order of education, or *l'enseignement secondaire*, that operates according to an individual-centred logic of education that responds to the *mot d'ordre* of realisation of individual capacities; and the professional or technical order of education, or *l'enseignement professionnel* or *technique*, which actualises an economy-centred logic of education that responds to the *mot d'ordre* of economic productivity.

Each of these orders of education will be considered in turn to show how they each were constituted as a disciplinary *dispositif*, marked by the fixation of a finite set of norms and the construction of an enclosed, hierarchically organised, and codified structure of hierarchical surveillance, examination and normalising sanction that subjects individual subjects to these

norms. The community-centred primary education will be seen to constitute a centralised disciplinary *dispositif* that subjects its pupils to the norms of a common culture in a series of primary schools of increasing levels. The individual-centred secondary education will be shown to construct a centralised disciplinary *dispositif* that subjects its pupils to the norms of a disinterested culture of self-realisation through a long course of study in institutions such as the *lycée*. Finally, the economy-centred order of technical and professional education will be shown to subject pupils to the norms of a variety of technically or professionally oriented skills, knowledge and aptitudes through a variety of vocational schools that are organised as part of a disciplinary *dispositif* that, like the other orders, converges towards the central power of the state.

The chapter will conclude following a case study of the development of one particular set of institutions that will demonstrate how these different orders of education maintained a strict normative enclosure against alien norms. The focus of this case study will be the institutions of the intermediate level *enseignement primaire supérieur*, which correlate to the level of the contemporary *collège* in the current education system and will demonstrate therefore the separation of different orders of education that existed at this level.

Referring to the work of Jeffrey T. Nealon (2008: 32) on the concept of intensification in Foucault's work, the development of each of these disciplinary *dispositifs* can be read as an intensification of power, understood as the process by which an exercise of power becomes more concentrated, extensive and efficient in its action, in response to a given strategic imperative

or *mot d'ordre*. Indeed, for Foucault, disciplinary power itself, of which he describes the panoptic diagram as 'un intensificateur pour n'importe quel appareil de pouvoir' (SP: 240), developed as a result of attempts to produce a more economic and efficient exercise of power than that of sovereign power (SP: 96). Understood by Nealon (2008: 38) to be Foucault's 'primary mechanism for explaining historical change', it is this process of intensification as 'the modern historical movement of power's increasing efficiency, spread, saturation and abstraction' (Nealon 2008: 116),[35] which will be shown, in the following chapter, to result in the emergence of the *collège* as a modulatory institution of control as the divergent disciplinary powers of each of these disciplinary *dispositifs* seek to further extend their field of application and saturate this field.

I - The community-centred logic and *l'enseignement primaire*

Perhaps the clearest example of the intensification of the exercise of power in relation to one of these disciplinary logics of education is that of the development of the primary school as disciplinary institution in service of the community-centred logic over the course of the nineteenth century. This community-centred disciplinary logic of the French education system is that of which, to use the words of Francois Jacquet-Francillon (2010b: 38), the aim is to create 'les moeurs et les manières d'un peuple ou d'une nation'. According to Émile Durkheim, in his entry on 'Éducation' in Ferdinand Buisson's 1911

[35] Nealon's use of 'abstraction' in this quotation refers to the increasingly abstract object of the exercise of power, e.g. the movement from the exercise of sovereign power on the body of the criminal to the exercise of discipline on the time and space of an action. See Nealon (2008: 32-38).

Nouveau dictionnaire de pédagogie et d'instruction primaire, '[i]l n'y a pas de peuple où il n'existe un certain nombre des idées, de sentiments et de pratiques que l'éducation doit inculquer à tous les enfants indistinctement'. For him, therefore the key element of education is the constitution of this *être social* in each individual. Here, the rationale is the production of a community, and so this logic is oriented towards fostering commonality, a shared culture that enables members to function and coexist in a given society. This disciplinary logic of education is expressed in the positing of a common culture and the subsequent subjection of each and every pupil to the norm of a community-member who shares in and expresses this prescribed culture.

This inculcation of a shared culture through education has a long history in France, in which the mutability of the particular norms of the communal culture to be taught can clearly be seen. The Jesuits, for example, amongst other religious orders, had established many schools in France since the sixteenth century in which an adherence to the transnational, religious culture of Roman Catholicism was promoted (Poucet 2010a: 69-71; Troger and Ruano-Borbalan 2010: 14-15, 29-31). Writing in the wake of the 1762 expulsion of the Jesuits, La Chalotais, on the other hand, was among the first to promote a national basis for the community-centred logic of education in France by proposing in 1763 a *national* education as 'la base et le fondement des États' (2010: 417, see Lelièvre 1990: 7-11). However, the way that conflicts in the years following the 1789 revolution over the nature of the ideal community, which essentially pitted the republican ideal community of self-governing individuals enlightened by universal reason against the ideal community of deferent religious subjects proposed by clerical conservatives,

were reflected in educational programmes of this period perhaps provides the clearest illustration of how this distinctly political community-centred logic can function whatever the particular content of the norm of citizen and community to be actualised in this distinctly political disciplinary logic.

As Françoise Mayeur (2004: 23) notes, the governments which followed the revolution of 1789, in keeping with their Enlightenment ideals, considered education to be 'le moyen de forger l'unité des citoyens autour des grands principes de liberté, d'égalité politique et de fraternité au-delà de toutes les barrières sociales et matérielles qui pouvaient subsistait.' The revolutionary governments therefore saw the school's aim as being to form each pupil as a citizen, 'le pétrir de vertus civiques afin qu'il devienne un élément actif de la société' (Ibid. 30).

This republican model of a citizen dedicated to the cultural values of the revolution is held up in the various unrealised projects for a national education system proposed by the revolutionary governments (see Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 14-23, Baczko 2000: 22-42; Mayeur 2004: 23-84), but is perhaps most evident in the 1793 school textbook the *Catéchisme républicain, philosophique et moral* written by Auguste-Étienne-Xavier Poisson de la Chabeaussière. In this text the citizen defines him or herself as '[h]omme libre et pensant, né pour haïr les Rois, / N'aimer que mes égaux, et servir ma Patrie, / Vivre de mon travail ou de mon industrie / Abhorrer l'esclavage, et me soumettre aux lois' (2010: 446). This ideal republican is to cultivate his[36] love for his country, whose laws express 'La volonté de tous, la règle universelle' and whose constitution acts as 'Le garant de nos droits, de notre volonté, / De

[36] My use of the masculine pronoun is intentional here as education, particularly publicly funded education, was not available to nor intended for women until the second half of the nineteenth century. See Rogers (2010).

nos mœurs, nos devoirs, la règle et la mesure' (Ibid. 447-448). In this description of a patriotism, said to be '[u]n mouvement sublime' (Ibid. 448) that transports the heart of the true citizen, we can see the norm of a society of citizens united by and dedicated to the republican cultural principles of liberty, equality and fraternity that constituted the objective of a community-centred logic of education in the projects of the period immediately following the revolution.

The more conservative norm of citizen and community, however, was affirmed under the First Empire in *l'Université Impériale*, the national education system instituted by Napoleon in his *décret-loi* of 10 May 1806 and organised by decree on 17 March 1808. This 1808 *décret impérial portant organisation de l'université* enumerated in its 38th article the principles that were to form the basis for the education to be given at all levels of this national education system:

> 1° les préceptes de la religion catholique ;
> 2° La fidélité à l'empereur, à la monarchie impériale dépositaire du bonheur des peuples et à la dynastie Napoléonienne, conservatrice de l'unité de la France et de toutes les idées libérales proclamées par les constitutions (Art. 38)

This same article declared the aim of the education system to be that of forming, 'pour l'état, des citoyens attachés à leur religion, à leur prince, à leur patrie et à leur famille'. Running contrary to the insistence in Poisson de la Chabeaussière's *Catéchisme...* that it is ignorance that creates the authority of

priests and kings (2010: 448), an adherence to the dogma of the Catholic church and loyalty to the sovereign are depicted in this programme to be the proper outcome of education. Indeed, if reference is made in this decree to the liberal ideas of the preceding constitutions they are properties to be guarded by the Napoleonic dynasty, not the rights and freedoms shared by all citizens. What is demanded here is a community of loyal and deferent subjects who will obey established authorities, be they a God or a dynasty of sovereigns, rather than a community of free-thinking and self-governing citizens. For Napoleon the school was a to be a means of creating a single national community: 'Il faut avant tout arriver à l'unité, et qu'une génération entière puisse être jetée dans le même moule' (quoted in Mayeur 2004: 511).

In both of the above examples, however, it is the community-centred logic of education that is foregrounded and, as Poisson de la Chabeaussière's use of the term catechism might suggest, a similar process is at work whether this education espouses a culture that values Reason and its free exercise by citizens or one that values the obedience of subjects to a god or king (See Jacquet-Francillon 2010b: 39).[37] Whatever the norm to be transmitted, the community-centred logic of education functions to form a community based on the shared cultural values, practices and knowledge prescribed by this norm.

Although largely untouched by the revolutionary governments and Napoleon's *Université Impériale*, despite their programmes of education clearly oriented by a community-centred logic, and left to variable local initiatives whilst the state focused on *l'enseignement secondaire*, (Mayeur 2004: 315-325; Dancel 2010: 129-130), the institutions of *l'enseignement*

[37] For an account of how the Third Republic school's promotion of republican values through the teaching of French literature emulates the dogmatic instruction of Catholicism, see Guiney (2004).

primaire developed over the course of the nineteenth century as the privileged instrument through which this community-centred logic was expressed. The intensification of power in service of this community-centred logic is evident in the progressive movement towards ever greater coherency and regularity in content and practices of education that excluded other norms of community and logics of education, and the ever wider geographic and social reach of this *dispositif*.

Shortly after the Bourbon Restoration, the *ordonnance royale du 29 février 1816 concernant l'instruction primaire*, acknowledged by Mayeur (2004: 328) to be one of the founding laws of French public education in the nineteenth century, sought to begin the process of establishing a network of primary schools. Article 14 of this *ordonnance* stated that every town or village is required to provide for the primary education ('l'instruction primaire') of all of the children living within it, and to provide this education for free to the destitute (as identified by the local council) among them (in Chevallier and Grosperrin 1971: 102; also Prost 1968: 94). Although this goal was not to be realised, due to a lack of funding and of sanctions for non-compliance, (Mayeur 2004: 329-330; Prost 1968: 91), article 30 of this *ordonnance* indicated the affinity of the primary education that was to be delivered with the community-centred disciplinary logic by identifying a series of cultural values upon which it had to be based: 'la religion, le respect pour les lois et l'amour dû au souverain' (in Chevallier and Grosperrin 1971: 102).

Under the regime of the July Monarchy, François Guizot's law of 28 June 1833 successfully established the basis of a primary education system in order to further what he described in his 16 July 1833 letter to *instituteurs* as

the ‘gouvernement des esprits’ (in Mayeur 2004: 335). Article 9 of this law declared that every town or village would be required to maintain, either by themselves or with neighbouring municipalities, at least one ‘école primaire élémentaire’,[38] and, unlike in 1816, funds were provided (Art. 13) to enable the execution of this aspect of the law (Chevallier and Grosperrin 1971: 121-127; Prost 1968: 92) thereby extending the reach of the disciplinary *dispositif* animated by the community-centred logic of education by establishing a wider network of disciplinary institutions.

The close relation of this primary education to the community-centred disciplinary logic of education is suggested by the nature of this education set out in first article of the *loi Guizot*: ‘L’instruction primaire et élémentaire comprend nécessairement l’instruction morale et religieuse, la lecture, l’écriture, les éléments de la langue française et du calcul, le système légal des poids et mesures’ (in Chevallier and Grosperrin 1971: 121). Not only are these elements intended to constitute a culture common to all students, the mention of the French language and the legal system of weights and measures being highlighted by Françoise Mayeur (2004: 338) as ‘instruments d’unification nationale’, but the importance of the inculcation of shared cultural values in this education is evident by the position of moral and religious instruction at the head of the list. Indeed, the political, community-centred aim of this expansion of primary education is made explicit in the letter Guizot distributed to *instituteurs* on 4 July 1833 following this law, in which he states:

[38] Article 10 of this law also required the *chef-lieu* of each *département* and any town with a population of over 6,000 to establish an ‘école primaire supérieure’ (EPS) that would extend the primary education given in the *écoles élémentaires*. The institutions of *l’enseignement primaire supérieur* will be discussed in greater detail below.

> L'instruction primaire universelle est désormais une des garanties de l'ordre et de la stabilité sociale. […] Vous n'ignorez pas qu'en vous confiant un enfant, chaque famille vous demande de lui rendre un honnête homme et le pays un bon citoyen. […] La foi dans la Providence, la sainteté du devoir, la soumission à l'autorité paternelle, le respect dû aux lois, au prince, aux droits de tous, tels sont les sentiments qu'il [l'instituteur] s'attachera à développer. (2010 :502-504)

This public primary school incarnates therefore the community-centred discipline of education which seeks to establish a community unified around shared cultural values.

The intensification of the exercise of power in service of this community-centred logic can be seen in the administrative measures taken following the *loi Guizot* that constructs a larger disciplinary *dispositif* to ensure a more efficient exercise of power in the primary school and a more thorough saturation of this institution's space with the norms in relation to which it forms its subjects. A hierarchical administration of this primary education also began to be put in place to ensure its regularity, reflecting Guizot's intention to make this public school, and the *ministère de l'Instruction publique* to which it was attached, 'un rouage complet et régulier, capable de rendre à la société et au pouvoir, dans l'ordre intellectuel et moral les services dont […] il ne saurait se passer' (in Lelièvre 1990: 64). On 26 February 1835 a royal order introduced one school inspector per *département*, the duties of which – to be part of the *brevet* exam board and to inspect the upkeep and equipment of the

school, the teacher's morality and teaching and the nature of texts used – were fixed in a ministerial *circulaire* issued the following day, and in 1837, just after Guizot's departure from the Ministry of *Instruction publique*, another level was added to the hierarchical pyramid of discipline by providing these inspectors with *sous-inspecteurs* to enable a more thorough surveillance of the school system's function. The Comte de Falloux's law of 15 March 1850 (the *loi Falloux*) completed this construction by formally recognising and organising the state primary inspectorate, whose *conseils académiques de département* replaced the local *comités d'arrondissement* which had previously retained the primary responsibility of the surveillance of the local schools (Prost 1968: 92-93; Lelièvre 1990: 66-70).

The disciplinary regularity of this apparatus under the single gaze of the state was also intensified by Guizot's attention to the standardisation of primary education, the imposition of a single disciplinary mould, which he promoted through a number of innovations. Firstly, Guizot created the *Manuel général de l'instruction primaire* in 1832, which, produced by the *ministère de l'Instruction publique* and distributed to all primary schools in France, served to aid the diffusion of "bonnes pratiques." These practices tended to be the distinctly ordered and regular pedagogy of *l'enseignement simultané*, in which a relatively homogenous class of children were all taught simultaneously by a single teacher, as opposed to *l'enseignement mutuel*, which had been in vogue during the period of the Bourbon restoration and in which the teacher, with a diverse group of pupils, would, having taught the more advanced pupils a particular lesson, delegate to these students the task of teaching the less

advanced pupils the same lesson.[39] Indeed, the structure of the *école primaire élémentaire* decided in 1834, where three divisions, ages 6-8, 8-10 and 10 and above, were demanded, complemented this simultaneous method, which had, due to its organised regularity, been judged to be more effective, and interfered with the effective deployment of the mutual method. In addition to the promotion of a specific pedagogical approach in the *manuel général*, a series of five official textbooks were commissioned and widely distributed to schools throughout France following their completion in 1836, providing a common source for *instituteurs* to supplement their usual teaching. Finally, the *loi Guizot* of 28 June 1833, required each *département* to maintain a boys' *école normale primaire* (Art. 11) for the training of *instituteurs* who would teach in the primary schools for boys. Completed by the establishment of an *école normale primaire* for the training of *institutrices* to teach in the primary schools for girls in each *département* required by the *loi Bert* of 9 August 1879, this network of institutions were under the centralised control of the state, a control that Jules Ferry reasserted over all the *écoles normales primaires* in 1881 (Grandière 2010: 146-147), and thereby increased the capacity of the state to mould *instituteurs* in line with its normative values and according to its own pedagogical model. The nomination of *instituteurs* to positions in primary schools, and thus the control of who would teach, only became the prerogative of the state, however, in 1852 when this power of nomination was taken away from *conseils municipaux* and given to the *recteur*, the local delegate of the central *ministère d'Instruction publique*, thus making the career of the primary school teacher dependent on the state, reinforcing the

[39] For more on the differences and similarities between *l'enseignement simultané* and *l'enseignement mutuel*, and their historical relationship up until the official abandonment of the latter in 1853, see Mayeur (2004: 400-419).

potential sanction resulting from a school inspection (Lelièvre 1990: 71-80; Prost 1968: 92-94, 137).

The intensified disciplinary function of *l'enseignement primaire* in the service of the community-centred logic of education, however, was not entirely matched in the expansion of its field of exercise as this public primary education was still not available to all children due to geography, gender, finances, or demands for extra, seasonal labour. The *loi Falloux* of 15 March 1850 demanded that every settlement of 800 or more inhabitants have a primary school for girls (Art. 51) and provided more funding for the expansion of the network of schools to rural areas (Art. 40) and this law was built upon by Victor Duruy, the *ministre de l'Instruction publique* from June 1863 to July 1869, whose law of 10 April 1867, in addition to adding '[l]es éléments de l'histoire et de la géographie de la France' as an essential element of the primary education curriculum (Art. 16), made the provision of a primary school for girls obligatory for every commune of 500 or more inhabitants (Art. 1) and provided more funds to expand the network of rural *écoles de hameau* (Art. 8, see Mayeur 2004: 360-361). However, the cost of education, the imposition of seasonal labour, and the fact that many parents did not see the utility of school meant that, for much of the nineteenth century, attendance was irregular and brief (Prost 1968: 97-102).

It is in this context that we can see the response to this situation formulated in the celebrated *lois Ferry* of 1881 and 1882, which founded the free, obligatory and *laïque* public primary school of the Third Republic, as a further intensification of the exercise of power in the service of the community-centred disciplinary logic of education. The free access to this

state-provided primary education, instituted by the law of 16 June 1881, and the obligation for all pupils of both sexes to attend a primary school from the ages of six to thirteen years old, introduced by the law of 28 March 1882 and supported by sanctions outlined in this same law (Articles 12, 13 and 14), constituted an intensification of this disciplinary logic by significantly and durably expanding its field of action. Additionally, by excluding competing religious cultural norms from all orders and levels of the public school through the imposition of *laïcité* by the law of 28 March 1882, these laws constituted a further intensification of power in the service of this disciplinary logic by clearly establishing a more strict disciplinary enclosure saturated by the exercise of power oriented towards its particular set of norms. This distinct disciplinary mould was strengthened by René Goblet's 1886 law, article 17 of which declared that '[d]ans les écoles publiques de tout ordre, l'enseignement est exclusivement confié à un personnel laïque', and, later, by the 1905 separation of Church and State.

This obligation of secularism was unambiguously directed towards the constitution of a particular community, in this case a republican community of citizens, and thus demonstrates the community-centred logic at work in this institution; indeed, Antoine Prost has described this attempt to unify young minds around this secular worldview as 'un choix de société' (Prost 1997: 63-64, also see Kahn 2006). Ferry stated in 1879 that '[L'État] s'occupe de l'éducation […] pour y maintenir une certaine morale d'État, certaines doctrines d'État qui importent à sa conservation' (2010a: 621), and, indeed, this obligation of *laïcité* can be seen as a means of ensuring national unity around the Republic in response to the refractory clerical influence on

education encouraged by the 1850 *loi Falloux*, which removed barriers to congregational education (Prost 1968: 173-177), and emboldened by Pope Pius IX's 1864 *Syllabus of Errors*, which strongly rejected the liberal ideals of the enlightenment and modernity as anathema.[40] In place of *une instruction morale et réligieuse*, therefore, this school provided *une instruction morale et civique*, which sought to spread a common morality based on universal reason rather than religious faith, what Ferdinand Buisson, the director of primary education from 1879 to 1896, would call *la foi laïque* (Prost 1968: 383-386), and what Ferry referred to in his 1883 letter to *instituteurs* as 'la sagesse du genre humain, […] ces idées d'ordre universel que plusieurs siècles de civilisation ont fait entrer dans le patrimoine de l'humanité' (in Chevallier and Grosperrin 1971: 282). Buisson, who had been appointed as director of primary education by Ferry, underlined the community-centred logic operational within this new primary school when he wrote in both the first and second editions of his *Dictionnaire de pédagogie et d'instruction primaire*, published in 1887 and 1911 respectively, and said by Françoise Mayeur (2004: 606) to constitute a bible of sorts for the personnel of *l'enseignement primaire*, that primary education should impose certain values that reflect this morality upon all pupils: 'le respect pour toutes les traditions respectables', by which we should understand those that are considered to be universally rational, but also 'l'esprit de progrès' (Buisson 1911a; 2010: 680-681). For Buisson (1911a; 2010: 680-681), the "most noble and legitimate" aim of this education was thoroughly political and should prepare the child to love his or her country, obey the law, respect the government, and fulfil all of his or her duties and

[40] See Léon Gambetta's 'Discours de Saint-Quentin, 16 novembre 1871' in Chevallier and Grosperrin (1971: 249-250)

enjoy, to the fullest extent, all his or her rights (‘user de tous ses droits’) as a citizen. Indeed, this inculcation of values and attitudes and a shared minimum level of education was underlined as ‘un intérêt de premier ordre, dans [...] une société démocratique’ by Ferry in the parliamentary debates of 13 July 1880 over free and obligatory education (in Chevallier and Grosperrin 1971: 266). This education, as a necessity intended to guarantee the republican community, clearly expresses the community-centred logic of the primary school.

This civic moral constituted what Laurence Loeffel (2010: 81-82) has referred to as a ‘discipline de surplomb’ that permeated all activities within the primary school, from arithmetic problems to the *dictées* competed by pupils. Indeed, François Audigier (2010: 307) notes that this transversal approach to the subject tended to be more dominant than lessons directly addressing the Republic’s institutions and its citizens’ rights and responsibilities. This pervasive focus on a common civic culture of patriotism and universal morality in *l'enseignement primaire* of the Third Republic is particularly demonstrated by the widespread use of Augustine Fouillée’s famous textbook, published under the pseudonym “G. Bruno”, *Le Tour de la France par Deux Enfants*. First published in 1877, selling six million copies by 1901 and eight million by the beginning of the Fourth Republic (Guiney 2004: 128; Ozouf and Ozouf 1997: 277-278), this text tells the story of two children's geographic, historical and cultural discovery of France and, as its preface states, seeks to group ‘toutes les connaissances morales et civiques autour de l’idée de la *France*’ in order to present to its readers ‘la patrie sous ses traits les plus nobles, […] grande par l’honneur, par le travail, par le respect profond du devoir et de la justice’ (Fouillée 1913: 4). Indeed, this narrative introduction to

the history and geography of France is littered with patriotic morals, for example:

> — Alors, pour nous mettre d'accord, dit André […], disons donc que la France entière, la patrie est pour nous tout ce qu'il y a de plus cher au monde.
> — Bravo! vive la France, dit d'une même voix le petit équipage.
> — Vive la patrie française! reprit le patron Jérôme; quand il s'agit de l'aimer ou de la défendre, tous ses enfants ne font qu'un cœur. (Ibid. 191)

As Vincent Troger and Jean-Claude Ruano-Borbalan (2010: 33) have stated, 'l'école primaire républicaine est bien une institution qui associe étroitement instruction et inculcation de valeurs et de normes sociales.'

In addition, the encyclopaedic character of this text, noted by Ozouf and Ozouf (1997: 278), which could therefore be used by *instituteurs* as a teaching resource for subjects as diverse as the natural sciences, history and geography, and, of course, French, is indicative of another stated ambition of the primary school that is equally oriented by the *mot d'ordre* of community: to provide a general knowledge that is common to all members of the community. In an *arrêté* of 27 July 1882 that set the curriculum for the republican primary school, Jules Ferry (2010b: 656) stated that the aim of primary education was to provide all of its pupils with a limited treasure of knowledge: 'L'objet de l'enseignement primaire [...] n'est pas d'embrasser sur les diverses matières auxquelles il touche tout ce qu'il est possible de savoir, mais de bien apprendre dans chacune d'elles ce qu'il n'est permis d'ignorer.'[41]

[41] In the text, this passage is attributed to an impersonal pronoun ('comme on l'a très justement dit'). The man referred to by this pronoun was Octave Gréard (1828-1904), an important figure in the development of primary schooling in the nineteenth century who, following an impressive teaching career, had been appointed inspector of the *académie* of Paris in 1864 and director of primary education in the Seine *département* in 1870. He remained in this position, concurrently fulfilling the role of *inspecteur général* and, from 1872 to 1873, director of

Alongside the common morality that they carry with them, this relatively small selection of shared knowledge constitutes a norm, acting as a necessary minimum to be respected (SP: 215), to which all pupils were to be subjected and therefore further contributes to the production of a unified community, to the community-centred disciplinary logic enacted in this school.

As well as a moral and intellectual education, the 27 July 1882 *arrêté* cited above also stated that the primary education given in these schools would include a component of physical education. As this text states, this physical education would be intended to keep pupils healthy, but also to introduce them to the manual activities and dexterity that would, according to the text, be particularly necessary for the pupils of the primary school of whom the majority would be destined for manual labour. As this text makes clear, however, this physical and practical education was not to undermine the general nature of the education given within these institutions and was instead intended to predispose both male and female pupils to this sort of work, whether in the army, fields or factories for boys or, for girls, housework or other 'ouvrages de femmes': this education was to remain general and these manual tasks were only to constitute a 'préparation à l'éducation professionnelle'. Indeed, the 1887 national congress of *instituteurs* agreed that this manual education must not constitute a professional education ('il ne devra pas être professionel') (in Lelièvre 1990: 160). As Prost (1968: 340-341) notes, such physical or manual education tasks, which had been included in the curriculum of the primary school for boys for the first time in 1882 (primary schooling for girls already usually involved needlework), appeared as

---

primary education in the Ministry of Education, until Jules Ferry appointed him as head of the *académie* of Paris in 1879. See Ferry (2010b: 655-656, 659) and Gréard (1904: 87).

something of a ‘pièce rapportée’ in the primary curriculum, a status reflected in the lack of the necessary workshops within primary schools, and, in light of the cultural disdain for technical and professional education amongst the teachers of the French education system, tended to be turned away from any more vocational orientation so that they could be properly “educative”, being subsumed, for example, in mathematics as a geometry lesson (Lelièvre 1990: 159; d’Enfert 2007).

The incorporation of practical knowledge that may be of use to pupils after school, a category that exceeds the narrowly professional or economy-centred, within the wider morals and subject knowledge to be acquired in the school is again to be found in *Le Tour de la France par deux enfants*, which is littered with episodes where the protagonists, often through encounters with representatives of a French regional industry, learn moral, intellectual, *and* practical lessons. On one occasion in the text (Fouillée 1913: 26-36), for example, a famer in the Lorraine has taken in the eponymous children and during their stay, they are introduced to practical knowledge (fishing skills, how to look after cows and which cows to keep, how to make various dairy products and how much milk would be needed) and subject knowledge (mathematics, biology, geography) alongside moral lessons (that there is no excuse for not being tidy and presentable, the value of patience, that one should be grateful for hospitality and return the favour).

The manual and physical education offered within *l’enseignement primaire* therefore is incorporated into the minimal common culture to be acquired by the pupils of the primary school, defined by the aforementioned 1887 *Congrès national des instituteurs* as ‘la somme des notions générales qui

leur sont ou qui leur seront nécessaires, abstraction faite de la profession qu'ils pourront exercer plus tard et de leur future condition sociale' (in Lelièvre 1990: 160), and thus the community-centred disciplinary logic of education that orients the school. This minimal culture was practically oriented and formed the basis of a general education that was not oriented towards economic demands or professions, which constituted the focus of the economy-centred logic of *l'enseignement technique et professionnel* that will be discussed later, but was also not oriented towards the development of individual pupils' intellectual capacities.

This practical and minimal orientation of *l'enseignement primaire* was reaffirmed in the official instructions of 20 June 1923 regarding the primary school curriculum, which were signed by Léon Bérard, *ministre de l'Instruction publique et des Beaux-arts* in 1919-1920 and 1921-1924:

> L'enseignement est essentiellement intuitif et pratique: […] c'est-à-dire qu'il ne perd jamais de vue que les élèves de l'école primaire n'ont pas de temps à perdre en discussions oiseuses, en théories savantes, en curiosités scolastiques et que ce n'est pas trop de cinq ou six années de séjour à l'école pour les munir du petit trésor d'idées dont ils ont strictement besoin.

This reaffirmation of the practical minimum culture emphasised in primary education some 40 years after the initial establishment of the republican primary school demonstrates the remarkable continuity of *l'enseignement primaire* throughout the Third Republic (Lelièvre 1990: 117n), with the

preceding curriculum developed in the 1880s being praised for its simplicity elsewhere in the text. However, it also indicates the priority given to the inculcation of this common culture in all the members of the community over the further development of individual pupils, which, as will be seen below, is rather the orientation of the individual-centred disciplinary logic of *l'enseignement secondaire*.

The above quotation highlighting the limited ambition of the primary school for the full development of its pupils echoes Ferry's statement in the *arrêté* of 27 July 1882 that '[l]'idéal de l'école primaire n'est pas d'enseigner beaucoup, mais de bien enseigner'. This ambition is reflected in Ferry's description of the moral education to be given in this school as one that seeks affective adherence to the articles of the *foi laïque* rather than a rational understanding or justification of them:

> Cette éducation n'a pas pour but de faire *savoir*, mais de faire *vouloir*; elle émeut plus qu'elle ne démontre; devant agir sur l'être sensible, elle procède plus du cœur que du raisonnement; elle n'entreprend pas d'analyser toutes les raisons de l'acte moral, elle cherche avant tout à le produire, à le faire répéter, à en faire une habitude qui gouverne la vie. (2010b: 657-658)

The same limited ambition for individual pupils is suggested in the, admittedly reasonable, assumption that the vast majority of pupils would become, like their parents, manual labourers seen above. Indeed, Buisson stated in 1883 that the education given in the primary school should not lead a good pupil to

dream of a more prestigious job (‘rêver à devenir un employé de commerce, un commis ou un bureaucrate’) or wish to escape a given profession (‘métier’), but rather to ‘vivre honorablement du travail de ses mains’ and distinguish themselves in their manual labour (in Prost 1968: 341). In the primary school of the Third Republic, as Decaunes and Cavalier note (1962: 42), ‘on appren[ait] à bien servir plutôt qu’à bien penser’ and the the development of individual capacities was subordinated to the acquisition of a minimum acceptable common culture that would make its pupils functioning members of the republican society. The disciplinary logic operated by these schools was community-centred rather than focused on the individual.

That such a logic centred on the cultivation of the individual did not orient the disciplinary action of the primary school was reflected in the system of *bourses d’enseignement secondaire* made available to pupils of the primary school who were deemed to be especially gifted. Implicit in this limited number of grants intended to enable talented pupils to pursue further study in the fee-paying institutions of *l’enseignement secondaire* was the idea that it was this order of secondary education that was the correct place in which individual talents were to be fully developed and that a primary education was not intended for or suited to this role.[42] This division of educational labour was a reflection of the consensus, which was especially clear in the period preceding the First World War, that a secondary education should only be made available to those of particular talent (Dubois 2007). In the parliamentary debates of 13 July 1880, Ferry himself asserted that, for him, there would be no question of expanding access to secondary education beyond those who

[42] For an account of the limited and unequal distribution of these *bourses* under the Third Republic, see Prost (1968: 327-328).

were ‘capables de le recevoir’ (in Chevallier and Grosperrin 1971: 266). In an address to the *Chambre de députés* on 6 June 1889, in which he reflected on the education system that he had helped to establish over the preceding decade, Ferry again alludes to the divergent logics of the two educational institutions in stating that ‘la société doit à tous le nécessaire du savoir pratique, et l’avènement aux degrés successifs de la culture intellectuelle de tous ceux qui sont aptes à les franchir’ (in Dubois 2007: 14). The community-centred *enseignement primaire* was to provide a common culture to all, whereas the secondary school constituted an individual-centred space for the, particularly intellectual, development of “gifted” pupils.

This distinction between the community-centred primary order of education and the individual-centred secondary order of education becomes clearer when one considers that *l’enseignement primaire* under the Third Republic was not limited to the *écoles primaires élémentaires* which accommodated the pupils aged six to thirteen years old obliged to attend school and could lead to the *certificat d'études primaires*,[43] and, in fact, constituted a comprehensive and autarkic order of educational institutions oriented by the community-centred logic of education. Indeed, the *loi Goblet* of 30 October 1886 states in its first article that, in addition to being dispensed in the aforementioned elementary schools, primary education was given in ‘les écoles maternelles et les classes enfantines’ which, organised by a *décret* of 2 August 1881, welcomed pupils from the age of two years old until they moved

[43] This qualification was gained through passing a public exam, which could be taken by pupils from the age of 11 years old. Passing this exam before the age of thirteen would excuse the certified pupil from the remaining period of obligatory education (Art. 6 of *Loi du 28 mars 1882 relative à l'obligation scolaire et à la laïcité*, in Chevallier and Grosperrin 1971: 275). Even by the end of the Third Republic, this exam was, in fact, only ever passed by about half of the pupils that attended primary school (Lelièvre 1990: 117-118; Dancel 2010: 133; Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 105).

on to an elementary school by the age of seven, and also in the *écoles primaires supérieures* (EPS) and *classes d'enseignement primaire supérieur* attached to *écoles élémentaires* that were known as *cours complémentaires* (CC). Over a normal course of study of three years, later extended to four years, the EPS led to the *brevet élémentaire* or the *certificat d'études primaires supérieures* (renamed the *brevet d'études primaires supérieures* in 1917). Without their own specific curriculum and taught by *instituteurs* of the elementary schools to which they were attached, the CC offered a course of study that sought to roughly follow the EPS curriculum, but which varied in length, from one to four years, and content, depending on local circumstances.[44]

In addition to these institutions, there were also those institutions that, following Prost (2013: 17), we can consider to be the primary order of education's own higher education institutions: the *écoles normales* mentioned above, which trained the *instituteurs* and *institutrices* who taught in the *écoles primaires maternelles, the écoles primaires élémentaires* and the CC, and the *écoles normales supérieures* of Fontenay and of Saint-Cloud, founded in 1880 for women and in 1882 for men, respectively, whose students would become the *professeurs du primaire* that would teach in the EPS and the *écoles normales*, or join the primary order's school inspectorate. These schools

[44] This list of primary institutions is completed in the *loi Goblet* by the *écoles manuelles d'apprentissage*, but these institutions were only briefly a component of *l'enseignement primaire*. However, despite being attached to the administration of the *ministère de l'Instruction publique* by the law of 11 December 1880 that established these schools as public institutions, the *décret* of 30 July 1881, which executed this law, subjected the *écoles manuelles d'apprentissage* to the control of the *ministère du Commerce*. Indeed, after a brief period from 1887-1892 following the *loi Goblet* mentioned above in which the *ministère de l'Instruction publique* was fully responsible of these institutions, these vocational schools were fully made the responsibility of the *ministère du Commerce* by article 69 of the finance law of 26 January 1892. These administrative arrangements indicate that these institutions are distinct from *l'enseignement primaire* and will instead be considered later as part of *l'enseignement technique et professionnel*.

trained the personnel of this order of education to become the "hussards noirs de la République"[45] who would preach the *foi laïque* that was at the core of this primary education,[46] each one, in the words of Ferry, an 'éducateur laïque' who represented French society itself and who would prepare its children for the future by ensuring that they were 'intelligents, instruits, libres, égaux et mûrs pour la vie civique' (in Buisson 1911d). Taught and monitored by those teachers and inspectors who had themselves been subject to a complete primary education, these *instituteurs*, *professeurs du primaire* and inspectors of primary education presented the ideal subjects of the primary order, fully subjected to the norms of the comprehensive common culture that united its various institutions, and contibuted to what Prost (1968: 392) has referred to as the almost total 'fermeture sociologique du milieu primaire'. As Françoise Mayeur (2004: 613) states in terms reminiscent of Deleuze's depiction of discipline as a mould: 'Tout l'encadrement de l'enseignement primaire est ainsi confié à un moule commun.'

Indeed, in line with the concentric curriculum, in which the same programme is reviewed but in greater detail at each successive level, that was in place in primary education until the introduction of cumulative, progressive curricula in CC, EPS and *écoles normales primaires* in August 1920 and then

[45] This is a nickname for the *instituteurs* of the Third Republic that has now become part of French popular culture. It is derived from Charles Péguy's description of the young student-teachers from the *école normale* annexed to the *école primaire* that he had attended from 1879-1885, which appears in his 1913 work *L'Argent*, and alludes to an elite cavalry unit of the French army known for their black uniform. Péguy notes that these young *instituteurs* were 'beaux comme des hussards noirs' and that 'ces jeunes hussards de la République' were 'vraiment les enfants de la République'. See Péguy (1961: 1116-1119).

[46] The image of the *instituteur* as a republican missionary of the *foi laïque* is a common trope. Buisson, for example, said of the *instituteur* that '[i]l vient au nom de la nation jeter la semence des croyances nouvelles: souveraineté nationale, morale laïque, justice sociale, liberté, égalité, fraternité!' (in Chevallier and Grosperrin 1971: 336). Marcel Pagnol would later recall, in his *La gloire de mon père*, that 'Les écoles normales primaires étaient à cette époque de véritables séminaires, mais l'étude de la théologie y était remplacée par des cours d'anticléricalisme' (in Chevallier and Grosperrin 1971: 337).

in *écoles primaires élémentaires* in February 1923, which will be discussed later, the education of these primary teachers followed a curriculum, codified in the *décret* of 18 January 1887 (Art. 82), which, alongside a limited complement of pedagogical training, covered much the same subjects as those taught in the lower levels of primary education primary school. In fact, the pedagogical principle taught to the students of the *écoles normales* was that of merely transposing lessons of a higher level to a lower level, as Gabriel Compayré, a *professeur* of pedagogy at the *écoles normales supérieures*, explained in 1908: 'pour transposer une leçon d'école normale et en faire une leçon d'école élémentaire, il suffit bien souvent de la réduire à des proportions plus humbles, de même qu'on ébranche les rameaux des arbres trop touffus' (in Lelièvre 1990: 115). The continuity of the curriculum throughout the various levels of the institutions of primary education underlines the consistent orientation of this unified order by a community-centred logic, whereby the disciplinary subjection of pupils to the norms of the republican community is pursued further at each stage, reaching its maximum intensity in the *écoles normales supérieures*.

The disciplinary *dispositif* of *l'enseignement primaire*

The unity and regularity of *l'enseignement primaire* under the Third Republic was ensured by the completion of a disciplinary *dispositif* of centralised administration for this order of education. In 1872 the new Republic re-established a *direction de l'enseignement primaire* within the *ministère de l'Instruction publique*, that had previously been briefly set up

towards the end of the Second Empire, and the 1886 *loi Goblet*, followed by the *décret* and the *arrêté* of 18 January 1887, codified its administrative apparatus, the status and class of its institutions and personnel, its *dispositifs* of inspection, or examination, and its system of normative sanctions (Caplat 1984: 43-45; Mayeur 2004: 602-605; Chapoulie 2010: 42-43).

The *loi Goblet* (Art. 44) instituted a *conseil départemental de l'enseignement primaire* in each *département*, which assembled the relevant regional prefect, the *inspecteur d'académie* responsible for that *département*,[47] four representatives from the local *conseil général*, the directors of the local *école normale d'instituteurs* and *école normale d'institutrices*, two *instituteurs* and two *institutrices* from local public schools, elected by their peers, and two *inspecteurs de l'enseignement primaire* responsible to the *inspecteur d'académie* and chosen by the minister. These *conseils* were charged with ensuring that the pedagogical, curricular and organisational instructions of the central ministry were followed in the schools of the area, monitoring the material and personnel needs of these schools, conducting disciplinary hearings, discussing the reports provided to them by *l'inspecteur d'académie* and providing an annual report to the central ministry (Art. 48). The composition of this *conseil* demonstrates the enclosure of this administrative system to concerns external to the community-centred logic of *l'enseignement primaire*, with personnel of the primary order of education claiming nine of its fourteen seats. The prefects, the state's regional representatives, were to act as presidents of these councils, but their authority was generally limited by the powers, notably with regard to nomination of the personnel of *l'enseignement*

[47] The *académies* were introduced by Napoléon as the principal administrative unit of his *Université impériale* in his *décret* of 17 March 1808 (Art. 4), and remain today, the principal administrative unit for the education system in France (Simon et al. 2010: 183-189).

primaire, given to the vice presidents of these boards, the *inspecteurs d'académie* who, as the local representatives of the *ministre de l'Instruction publique*, acted as 'de[s] véritables directeurs départementaux de l'enseignement primaire' (Buisson 1911b). In the case of disagreement between the prefect and the *inspecteur d'académie*, it would be the minister himself who would settle the matter (Buisson 1911c). That the remaining five members of this council includes representatives of the Republic in the form of the prefect and locally elected officials also suggests the close relationship of this primary order of education and its community-centred disciplinary logic to the political community that it was to help form. In execution of article 5 of the *loi Ferry* of 28 March 1882, the *loi Goblet* (Art. 54 to 60) also codified the *commissions scolaires* to be established in each town and village, that were intended to monitor and ensure school attendance and reported to their *conseil départemental*. Again, the hierarchical authority of the ministry's central *direction de l'enseignement primaire* was manifested in this commission by its subordination to the *inspecteurs primaires* of the *departément*, who would receive the reports produced by these commissions, and attend and, when necessary, call its meetings, and the appointment of the delegates of each relevant *canton* who were members of this commission by the *inspecteur d'académie*.

The hierarchical authority of the *ministère de l'Instruction publique* that was manifested in the organisation of these administrative bodies was also shown in a disciplinary *dispositif* of inspection that would transmit the normalising gaze of the ministry to the institutions of the primary order of education. This disciplinary examination of the function of these schools

would be conducted by a number of inspectorates identified by article 9 of the 1886 law: the national *inspecteurs généraux de l'enseignement primaire* who were nominated by the *ministre de l'Instruction publique* himself; the *recteurs* of each *académie*, each appointed by the minister, and their *inspecteurs d'ácadémie*, of which there was one for each *département* in the *académie*; the *inspecteurs* and *inspectrices de l'enseignement primaire* who reported to the *inspecteur d'académie* of their *département*; and those members of the aforementioned *conseils départementaux* and *commissions scolaires* who, deemed to not be competent regarding the pedagogical aspects of this education, were delegated to inspect only the morality and hygiene of the pupils and the material conditions and provisions in the relevant schools. Of course, in addition to these administrative inspections, teachers' assessments of pupils and the monitoring of their behaviour and attendance within each school complete this *dispositif* of examination. The reports on the function of *l'enseignement primaire* produced by these inspections, and the administrative bodies that receive them, record and constitute each *département*, *commune*, institution, teacher, and pupil, as individual cases in what Foucault would refer to as a 'reseau d'écriture' or 'champ documentaire' (SP: 221-222).

Based on the performances recorded, the *direction de l'enseignement primaire* could sanction the individual instances in this order of education accordingly, as can be seen in the case of pupils, but also that of their teachers. The performance of pupils was, of course, sanctioned either by the repetition of studies (*redoublement*), or the progression to the next class or institution, which may, at the relevant time and upon a satisfactory performance in the appropriate exams, be marked by the conferral of one of a series of

qualifications specific to *l'enseignement primaire*: the CEP, CEPS/BEPS, BE or BS. A number of articles in the *loi Goblet* (Art. 30 to 34), however, also codified a series of positive and negative sanctions, ranging from an official warning or a permanent ban to an honourable mention or a silver medal, to be applied to teachers of *l'enseignement primaire*. The asymmetrical, hierarchical power relations that these sanctions revealed was codified by article 26 of this law that states that the teachers of the primary order are responsible to the *ministre de l'Instruction publique*'s departmental representative, *l'inspecteur d'académie*, and was further underlined by the law of 19 July 1889, which, as part of defining the financial responsibilities of the state, *départements* and communes regarding *l'enseignement primaire*, stated that these teachers were now *fonctionnaires* to be directly paid by the state, rather than local authorities (Art. 1 to 4). This 1889 law also added to the normative sanctions available to be applied to the teachers of the primary order by codifying the potential career path of the successful *instituteur* or *institutrice*, the criteria for promotion and the possible ranks within each post of this career (Art. 6 to 25). The application of this range of sanctions according to the individual performances recorded through its various examinations, rewarding conformity to norms of pedagogy, curriculum and behaviour established centrally and punishing non-conformity, completed the disciplinary *dispositif* of the *direction de l'enseignement primaire*.

This administrative structure, which, with relatively minor alterations, remained in place up until the reforms of the Fifth Republic (Caplat 1984: 43-45; Chapoulie 2010: 43), and the cohesive community-centred logic that animated it, made of the primary order of education a 'citadelle [...] qui se

fortifie au fil des ans par l'importance numérique de ses agents, par la force des habitudes qu'imprime une réglementation uniforme' (Mayeur 2004: 605), a complete and self-sufficient order of education with its own self-determined ends (the various diplomas of primary education) and a strong, stable and cohesive ethos (Prost 1968: 377, 383-386; Lelièvre 1990: 112-117; Grandière 2010: 144-147), which was explicitly oriented by a community-centred disciplinary logic of education.

Responding to the *mot d'ordre* of community, the primary order of education developed to form a complete, distinct and enclosed disciplinary *dispositif* which actualised a community-centred logic of education to subject pupils to the norms of a common culture of morality and knowledge. Through the reforms of the Third Republic, the normative content of this common culture was clearly established as that of a *laïque* and republican community and the values of this culture permeated both the curriculum of these schools and the cultural worldview of its personnel, who were educated entirely within institutions of primary education that emphasised this culture. Although this culture was intended to be practical and to cultivate active citizens of the Republic, the normative orientation of this education was such that it rejected both the narrow formation of pupils to fulfil a practical or professional function and the disinterested cultivation of the individual without consideration for their place in and relation to the rest of the community. The normative enclosure of this primary order of education was particularly strong therefore and constituted a clear and distinct mould in relation to which pupils would be subjected. The separate and centralised disciplinary *dispositif* of this order of

education ensured the regularity of this primary education that subjected pupils to this normative mould. This pyramidal *dispositif* converged towards the central authority of the *direction de l'enseignement primaire* under the *ministre de l'Instruction publique* and operated through a codified and regular structure of hierarchical surveillance resulting in codified normalising sanctions based on the individual performances recorded in the examinations of individual institutions, personnel and pupils. The primary order of education constituted a distinct, enclosed, and centralised disciplinary *dispositif* animated by the *mot d'ordre* of community and actualising a community-centred logic of education, which through its regular function subjected its pupils, at all levels, to the normative mould formed by the common culture of the republican community.

II - The individual-centred logic and *l'enseignement secondaire*

Alongside this primary order, which was oriented by a community-centred logic of education that it actualised through its own disciplinary *dispositif*, there was also a complete and separate secondary order of education with its own distinct curriculum, norms, personnel, qualifications, and administrative structures and practices. The institutions of this separate disciplinary *dispositif*, the *lycées*, *collèges*, and their associated elementary classes (also known as the *petit lycée* or *petit collège*), offered a long, complete course of disinterested secondary education, taught by their own distinct body of university-educated *professeurs*, which could take pupils from the age of six through to the *baccalauréat* at the age of eighteen, a diploma that served more as a marker of cultural distinction and had no practical application, other than

opening access to further study in the institutions of *l'enseignement supérieur*, which were saturated by the same disinterested scholarly culture.[48] Restricted to a small elite, this secondary order of education primarily operated according to the *mot d'ordre* of the individual and, as such, actualised an individual-centred logic of education that sought to realise the full development of each individual pupil's potential.

This individual-centred logic of education derives from the notion that a human being is capable of remedying or overcoming their shortcomings or limitations and of developing their faculties and capacities, through education, to realise their full potential as a human being; an idea of educability that, according to Francois Jacquet-Francillon (2010b: 37-38) emerged in France with the Renaissance and flourished as a key aspect of the Enlightenment belief in progress. In his analysis Jacquet-Francillon (2010b: 42) notes that this concept is expressed in an education that

> […] ne se centre plus tant sur les traditions à transmettre […] que sur la culture des facultés individuelles, les facultés physiques, intellectuelles et morales dont la nature pourvoit tout membre de l'espèce humaine et qui sont par essence sujettes à se "développer", à se "perfectionner", d'après ce langage typique des Lumières.

[48] Although forming another separate order of education under the Third Republic, the institutions of *l'enseignement supérieur* will not be directly addressed in this thesis as they fall beyond the normal domain of school education relevant to the institution of the *collège*. The role of the university in forming the *professeurs* of the *l'enseignement secondaire* will, however, be mentioned below and the medical and legal courses of the universities that provided a more professional education will be briefly considered as part of the technical and professional education discussed in the next section.

The primary objective of the individual-centred disciplinary logic actualised in the secondary order of education was not, then, the inculcation of a set of shared practices, knowledge and values that would form members of a community, but rather the development and full realisation of each individual pupil's capacities as an individual human being. To use the distinction made by Émile Durkheim (1911) in his entry on 'Éducation' in the second edition of Buisson's *Nouveau dictionnaire de pédagogie et d'instruction primaire*, this educational logic is directed more towards the cultivation of a pupil's 'être individuel' than their 'être social'.

However, as Durkheim (1911) notes, 'chaque société se fait un certain idéal de l'homme', and so, like the norms of community actualised in the community-centred education discussed above, the actual norms of the fully realised individual that are to be actualised through the action of an education oriented by the abstract *mot d'ordre* of the individual vary in parallel with the historical culture in which they are operational. This mutability of the norms of ideal individual in relation to the historical cultural milieu is evident in the norms that were expressed in the programmes of the institutions of secondary education in the period following the 1789 revolution, which reflected the norms of community from the same periods that we considered above in the context of the community-centred primary education.

Established by a *décret* issued on 25 February 1795 and further codified in the *loi Daunou* of 25 October the same year, the *écoles centrales* reflected the Enlightenment-inspired ideological commitment of the revolutionary governments of the First Republic to a republican community of rationally self-governing citizens by positing the ideal of an active and

autonomous rational individual. This was expressed in a radical new curriculum that constituted a major break with that of the *collèges* of the *ancien régime* (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 22; Lelièvre 1990: 34; Mayeur 2004: 57). The curriculum of these *collèges* was dominated by the study of Latin, Greek, and, later, French literature, carefully curated to comply with Christian doctrine, that was considered exemplary, in terms of both its moral and intellectual content and rhetorical form. Through the acquisition and practiced, rhetoricised reiteration of the True and Good aspects of these texts, as determined and transmitted by the teacher, these institutions sought to educate each pupil to be the ideal, and avowedly timeless, *honnête homme*: an eloquent and cultivated individual of good taste, imbued with the timeless virtues of classical antiquity that formed the basis of the culture of the social elite and thereby supported the moral and political order of the time (Chervel and Compère 1997: 9-23; Compère 2006: 35-37; 2010: 280-282; Jacquet-Francillon 2010c: 269-270, 274; Lelièvre 1990: 34, 43-44; Mayeur 2004: 41-42, 553-554; Prost 1968: 52-55; Troger and Ruano-Borbalan 2010: 29-30).[49]

In contrast to this education focused on the classical humanities that was dismissed by Daunou (2000: 505) in 1795 as a 'vain simulacre de l'éducation, où la mémoire seule était exercée,'[50] the *écoles centrales* sought to form pupils in view of the ideal of the active and critical citizen capable of

[49] As Compère (2006: 35-37) notes, this education, which partly due to the patchwork of organisations running these institutions presented some variations on the standard curriculum indicated above, evidently did produce a number of individuals who were not passive exemplars of the rectitude and moral legitimacy of the *ancien régime*, as the intellectual milieu of the eighteenth century and the 1789 revolution attest, but it did inculcate a certain moral and cultural certitude regarding the status quo. Indeed, as accounts and critiques of the mechanical and repetitive manner in which this humanistic education usually operated, of which perhaps d'Alembert's 1753 entry 'Collège' in the *Encyclopédie* is the most famous, suggest, the dominant practice was one of memorisation and reproduction of the correct forms and responses. See d'Alembert (2010); Baczko (2000); Compère (2010: 280-281); Mayeur (2004: 57-58); Prost (1968: 52-54); Savoie (2010: 149).

[50] Spelling in the original quotation has been modernised.

autonomous rational thought. In the *écoles centrales* therefore pupils were to learn and practice methodical and reasoned analysis and argumentation, rather than, as was usual in the old *collèges*, somewhat passively receiving and imbibing the model truths, morals and forms put before them by the teacher, which were all potential forms of baseless prejudices born of social convention and therefore suspicious (Chervel and Compère 1997: 29-31; Mayeur 2004: 26-28). Inspired by the writings of Condorcet, the *écoles centrales*, which were one of the few concrete realisations of the many plans for educational reform produced by the governments that followed the 1789 revolution, sought to achieve this by placing a new emphasis on the natural sciences and mathematics in order to teach pupils scientific methods of observation and analysis, and formal logic that would be called upon for the study of other subjects. From a position of prestige the subjects of the classical humanities, became lesser subjects that would be studied through the master paradigm of the sciences, which were said by Joseph Lakanal (2000: 493), in his 1794 report outlining the proposed *écoles centrales*, to be superior subjects 'qui entraînent dans leur tourbillon une foule d'arts subordonnés qui sont comme leurs satellites'. Such avowedly lesser subjects as Latin and Greek, for example, continued to be studied, but were taught as part of the "scientific" study of a comparative *grammaire générale* and their pre-eminence was challenged by French and the modern languages that were new additions to a curriculum that aspired to be encyclopaedic (Chervel and Compère 1997: 30; Mayeur 2004: 57-60). Reflected in the loose pedagogical organisation of these institutions, which called upon pupils to choose when and which courses to attend within certain age-based limitations (*loi Daunou*, Titre II, Art. 2 and 3),

the secondary education of the *écoles centrales* posited a norm of the excellent individual as an autonomous, rational citizen free of irrational, unscientific dogma which paralleled the norm of a democratic, republican community (Lelièvre 1990: 34-35; Mayeur 2004: 60-62; Jacquet-Francillon 2010c: 271).[51]

The variability of the norms of the individual operational within secondary education is evident again in the establishment of the *lycées* and *collèges communaux* (*loi* of 1 May 1802 and *décret* of 17 March 1808) of Napoleon's *Université impériale*, which, in parallel to the return to a more conservative form of government and deferent norm of community, marked the reaffirmation of the classical humanities and the norm of the individual as *honnête homme* expressing what Claude Lelièvre (1990: 43) has described as 'un certain état d'esprit et une morale supposée être de tous les temps et de tous les pays'. Indeed, Napoleon himself implied that the education based on the classical humanities that he wanted to be given in the *lycées* and *collèges* would educate more deferent and obedient individuals, noting that such a 'régime des saines et fortes lectures' was 'grand , sublime et en même temps régulier, paisible, subordonné' (in Lelièvre 1990: 42, 44). The renewed dominance of the classical humanities was accompanied by the continued study of some subjects from the scientific and encyclopaedic curriculum of the *écoles centrales*, but these subjects occupied a more marginal position on the curriculum, with the possible exception of mathematics, which was initially granted equal status to Latin before this privilege was progressively withdrawn (d'Enfert and Gispert 2010: 333-334; Kahn 2010: 343; Lelièvre 1990: 43; Mayeur 2004: 556-559; Prost 1968: 55-56).

[51] For a more detailed account of the shortlived *écoles centrales*, see Mayeur 2004: 56-70

As Françoise Mayeur (2004: 556-558) notes, following the establishment of the Napoleonic *lycées*, the form of secondary education and the norm of the fully realised individual it proposed tended to reflect politics of the nineteenth century, with the place of the sciences and other subjects introduced as part of the encyclopaedic curriculum of the *écoles centrales* declining in relation to the classical humanities under conservative regimes and expanding their role under more republican regimes. Also traced by Prost (1968: 55-58), this 'mouvement pendulaire' (Mayeur 2004: 557) demonstrated an antagonism between the model of the individual as *honnête homme* educated through the traditional study of the classical humanities, which enjoyed the support of the Catholic church, and the progressive model of the individual as an autonomous rational citizen educated in the use of reason and scientific analysis (Mayeur 2004: 556-558; Jacquet-Francillon 2010c: 274). This tension would remain unresolved until an accommodation, discussed below, was made under the Third Republic at the turn of the twentieth century. Beyond the frequent curricular changes made to secondary education in the nineteenth century, which resulted in the introduction of fifteen different programmes of study over the course of the century, which added new subjects whilst maintaining the pre-eminence of the classical humanities, Mayeur (2004: 550-551) also notes, however, that secondary education demonstrated a remarkable stability in its aim: the formation of a social elite, an elite that we can understand as a collection of fully-realised individuals, i.e. individuals conforming to the norms of an ideal individual.[52]

[52] For an overview of the *culture scolaire* and its development throughout the nineteenth century, see Mayeur (2004: 550-578).

Although, as we have seen, there is a relation between the norms of the individual actualised in the institutions of secondary education and the norms of community operational in the primary schools, there is a distinct difference in the orientation of these orders of education and the operation of their norms. This difference is evident if we consider the aims of the primary schools that existed, or, bearing in mind the failure to achieve concrete reforms in primary education until the 1830s mentioned earlier, were intended to exist, alongside the secondary institutions discussed above. The, poorly organised and attended, *pétites écoles* of the *ancien régime* aimed above all to spread religious doctrine, to catechise the people and form communities with a common Christian culture (Venard 2006), whilst the *collège* sought to educate individuals as paragons of supposedly timeless Christian virtue. The *écoles primaires* outlined in the *loi Daunou* were intended to teach their pupils 'à lire, à écrire, à calculer, et les éléments de la morale laïque'[53] (Titre I, Art. 5) and thereby foster a republican community freed from the superstitions and ignorance that was said to support the *ancien régime*, but the education of ideal citizens liberated by the light of universal reason was to be achieved by the *écoles centrales*. The *pétites écoles* of the *Université impériale* were also intended to teach pupils literacy and arithmetic but were to take Catholicism and loyalty to the emperor the basis of their teaching with the intention of forming 'des citoyens attachés à leur religion, à leur prince, à leur patrie et à leur famille' (*Décret* of 17 March 1808, Art. 5 and 38). The *lycées* and *collèges* again sought to go beyond this limited ambition and educate *honnêtes hommes* who expressed some aspects of the encyclopaedic curriculum of the *écoles*

[53] Spelling in the original quotation has been modernised.

centrales that were considered desirable, but who also were predominantly educated according to the 'paisible[s]' and 'subordonné[es]' (Napoleon in Lelièvre 1990: 42, 44) principles of the classical humanities. If the two orders of educational institutions operate from within roughly the same historico-normative milieu, then, or at least the aspect of this milieu endorsed by those with authority over these schools, the way this milieu is expressed in the two educational *dispositifs* indicates the different abstract orientations or logics of education that are actualised in these schools: the institutions of primary education seek to create a community that shares certain normative values and knowledge promoted within this normative milieu, whilst the institutions of secondary education seek to educate individuals that represent the highest realisation of the individual within the parameters of the same milieu. Drawing upon Foucault's (SP: 215) discussion of the disciplinary operation of norms, we can say that whilst the norms of the primary order function primarily as a 'seuil minimal' or 'moyenne à respecter', the norms of the secondary order function more as an 'optimum dont il faut s'approcher.'

This distinction was clearly articulated in the distinctions drawn between *l'enseignement primaire* and *l'enseignement secondaire* in the official discourse of the Third Republic, as indicated above. Ferry (2010b: 656) asserted, in the programme of study annexed to the *arrêté* of 27 July 1882, that the primary school was only intended to provide its pupils with a limited culture, 'ce qu'il n'est permis d'ignorer', and had 'ni le temps ni les moyens de leur faire parcourir un cycle d'études égal à celui de l'enseignement secondaire', which was intended to be encyclopaedic in its intellectual culture. A similar distinction is also made in the same document with regard to moral

education. As mentioned above, Ferry (2010b: 657-658) writes that, '[à] l'école primaire surtout', the secular moral education of the *école primaire élémentaire* aims not to 'faire *savoir*' but rather to 'faire *vouloir*' and 'procède plus du cœur que du raisonnement'. A pupil's capacity for rational analysis and justification of this morality, which would seem to be part of the ideal of an emancipated and reasonable autonomous subject promoted by republican ideology, is implied to be a more advanced skill that, in contrast to the institutions of secondary education, the primary school is neither capable nor intended to teach. The limited ambitions of *l'enseignement primaire* for the full development of individual pupils' capacities were also evident in the distinction made by Ferry in 1881, mentioned above, between the *l'enseignement primaire supérieur* and *l'enseignement secondaire*. In stating that the EPS should be 'une école perfectionnée' rather than a 'collège dégénéré' (in Prost 1968: 346), Ferry implied the greater ambition of the secondary institutions to provide a more extensive education. Indeed, the interest in maintaining limited ambitions for the pupils of *l'enseignement primaire supérieur* so as to avoid the creation of subjects detached from their current social condition, an interest that continued to be expressed officially into the twentieth century, conjured the image of a more prestigious and extensive secondary education that, by developing an individual's capacities beyond that required by the community, would lead to such a *déclassement* (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 91; Gréard 1904: 309; Lelièvre 1990: 122). The primary education institutions of the Third Republic privileged the acquisition and completion of a limited common culture over the cultivation of the individual towards their full potential as human being through the long-term

engagement with an extensive scholarly culture that was the domain of secondary education.

Indeed, although departing from the common basis of a given historico-normative milieu, the cultivation of what Durkheim (1911) indicates as an individual's 'être individuel' requires that the individual pupil is isolated from the practical and professional demands of society. As Durkheim (1911) writes, the detached and disinterested development of an individual's intelligence is only possible 'qu'en se repliant sur elle-même, qu'en détournant de l'action extérieure le sujet qui s'y donne tout entier.' Although, as suggested above, it expresses a particular and socially determined norm of a fully-realised individual, then, the individual-centred education actualised within the institutions of secondary education pursues a disinterested cultivation of the individual pupil's capacities for their own development, divorced from the outside world and devoid of any directly practical or professional orientation or finality. This individual-centred logic of education is expressed in the secondary schools by an insistence on an abstract and disinterested *culture scolaire*, the length of secondary study detached from everyday life, and the largely cultural rather than practical value of the *baccalauréat* that, since its introduction by Napoleon's decree of 17 March 1808, has served as the normal sanction of a successfully completed secondary education.[54]

As can be seen in both the examples of a classical humanist culture and a more modern scientific, rational culture considered above, but also in the more integrated general culture that will be discussed below, the *culture scolaire* of secondary education underlines its value for the development of the

[54] For a brief account of the history of the *baccalauréat*, see Gauthier (2005) or Prost (2007: 239-246).

individual by presenting a particular *savoir* and *savoir-faire* as being timeless or universal, abstract and therefore disinterested (Dumazedier 2005: 232). The impractical emphasis and value placed on the study of Latin and virtuous exemplars drawn from antiquity clearly emphasised this detachment from "the real world", and, indeed, this detachment in itself was considered an educative value (Lelièvre 1990: 43-44). However, Lelièvre's (1990: 43) description of this classical culture as 'un certain état d'esprit et une morale supposée être de tous les temps et de tous les pays', can also be applied to the scientific culture of the *écoles centrales*, inspired by an Enlightenement belief in universal reason, and the formalist *culture générale* discussed below which presents universally valuable and transposable forms and criteria of intellectual exercise and judgement.

The separation of the pupil from the realities of adult and professional life for a long period of study, which was traditionally pursued quasi-monastically under a school's regime of *internat* until this fell out of favour in the twentieth century as secondary education was extended to greater numbers of students (Prost 1968: 48-52; Durning and Fablet 2005: 537), also served to underline the exclusion of external factors. The long and progressively organised curriculum required pupils to acquire the norms of the *culture scolaire* by what Prost (2004: 234) has described as 'une lente osmose'. The nomenclature of the classes that counted down from the *onzième* at the beginning of the elementary classes of the *pétit lycée* to the class that would now be known as *terminal* (Lelièvre 2005: 602), emphasised that this class was to be insulated from the familial or social pressures of the pupil's life beyond the school and demanded a late entry into active life.

The *baccalauréat* that sanctioned this education 'détachée de toute préoccupation directement professionnelle' (Mayeur 2004: 500) also emphasised the abstract and impractical qualities of this education. Despite the long period of study that it demanded, this diploma had no immediate practical value. It enabled access to higher education at the *universités* and *grandes écoles* but served more as a cultural marker of distinction indicating one's higher social class than any practical use, especially given the purposefully impractical and abstract nature of its study (Prost 1968: 54-55).[55]

The institutions of secondary education developed to actualise an individual-centred logic of education animated by the *mot d'ordre* of the full realisation of the individual. The norms of the fully-realised individual that it posited in its long course of study were historically mutable but sought to present an abstract ideal of the individual developed according to an abstract, cultural ideal of the individual in itself, isolated from any practical or professional demands. This would be expressed in a school culture composed of what was thereby understood as 'cette part de la connaissance qui dépasse les savoirs pour développer l'homme lui-même' (Dumazedier 2005: 232) to which individual pupils were to be subjected over a long period of study.

The development of *l'enseignement secondaire* under the Third Republic

L'enseignement secondaire of the Third Republic continued to actualise a disinterested individual-centred logic of education, positing a norm of the fully-realised individual as both a cultured and rational and autonomous

[55] This idea of the *baccalauréat* as a consecration of social capital is, of course, further analysed by the work of Bourdieu and Passeron (1964; 1970), but had been considered earlier in Edmond Goblot's 1925 study *La barrière et le niveau* (see Lelièvre 1990: 128-130).

individual, which marked what is now a widely recognised integration of the model of the cultured *honnête homme*, traditionally promoted through the classical humanities, and the more republican notion of the autonomous and rational individual, which had been promoted through the teaching of scientific, methodical analysis. The tension between these two antagonistic approaches and their divergent pedagogical methods had resulted in various institutional arrangements that established, more or less explicit, separations between them in different courses of study, expressed at the beginning of the Third Republic by both the ongoing distinction within the *enseignement secondaire classique* between two distinct qualifications, *baccalauréat ès lettres* or *baccalauréat ès sciences*, that sanctioned a complete, classical secondary education[56] and the existence, alongside this more prestigious, predominantly classical and properly individual-oriented secondary education, of a shorter and separate course of *enseignement secondaire spécial* which, established by Victor Duruy (*Instructions* of 2 October 1863 and *loi* of 21 June 1865), was distinguished by a curriculum that excluded Latin and Greek, included modern languages, French, and history and geography, and focused on the practical, and even professional, applications of the sciences and some mathematics (Belhoste 2010: 254; Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 33-36; Prost 1968: 58-60). Under the Third Republic, however, a desire to remedy what was seen by a number of detractors as the incomplete, dogmatic and

[56] This distinction was the legacy of the system of *bifurcation* introduced by Hippolyte Fortoul, the *ministre de l'Instruction publique* from 1851 to 1856, with the *décret* of 10 April and the *arrêté* of 30 August 1852. The split between the *Latin-Grec* and *Latin-Sciences* courses introduced by Fortoul followed the class of *quatrième* and these courses led to the *baccalauréat ès lettres* and the *baccalauréat ès sciences* respectively. Victor Duruy, *ministre de l'Instruction publique* from 1863 to 1869, first put the point of bifurcation back by one class to the *troisième* in 1863, before putting an official end to this system in 1864. The distinction between the titles and the related possible final inflections of a pupil's course of classical studies remained, however, until the end of the century (Mayeur 2004: 560-562; Prost 1968: 55-58).

anachronistic culture offered by the study of classical humanities that had continued to be privileged in *l'enseignement secondaire* led to a series of official instructions, reports and curricular reforms seeking to introduce a more scientific, positivist and analytical pedagogical emphasis across the curriculum, and brought the antiquity-centric classical humanities into relation with the modern world. These initiatives resulted in the reorganisation and unification of secondary education that was completed by the reform of 1902 (Chervel and Compère 1997: 26-34; Compère 2010: 283-284; Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 44-46, 48-51; Mayeur 2004: 560-562; Prost 1968: 55-58, 245-259; Savoie 2010: 153-154).

The broadened scope of secondary study, and the eventual official recognition and valorisation of the *humanités modernes*, which placed greater emphasis on French, the sciences and modern languages, as part of a complete *culture générale* that was to form the basis of secondary education, developed from the arguments of a variety of critiques which asserted that classical studies, and their associated traditional pedagogy that emphasised memorisation and rhetorical eloquence over scientific analysis and logical argument, were insufficient for the modern age and needed to adapt with new pedagogical methods and subjects (Chervel and Compère 1997: 28-29, 31-34; Compère 2010: 282-284; Prost 1968: 248-250). Such proposals were first expressed under the Third Republic in the *circulaire* of 27 September 1872, issued by Jules Simon, who was *ministre de l'Instruction publique* from 1870 to 1873. In this document, Simon argued that the study of the sciences, modern languages, history and geography was indispensable for a complete secondary education, but also maintained that the study of Latin and Greek remained a

vital cornerstone of this education. However, Simon argued that these languages had to cede some ground to French and the 'langues vivantes', especially German and English, and that Latin and Greek, as 'langues mortes', should be taught so as to be understood rather than spoken, which would require a corollary shift in pedagogy that would emphasise analysis over memorisation.

Although thwarted by conservative politicians and their allies within the Church and the *professorat* in 1874 (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 44; Mayeur 2004: 556), Simon's proposals were carried forward in the reforms of the following decades that would pave the way for the major reform of 1902 that would establish the unified, disciplinary architecture of the Secondary education of the Third Republic. Before outlining this 1902 reform, we will first consider how the reforms leading up to the new century manifested the growing recognition of the sciences and modern humanities subjects as part of a broader conception of secondary education, before analysing more specifically the integration of the science-based studies of *l'enseignement secondaire spécial* into the disinterested culture of secondary education towards the turn of the century, and then the new formalism of the *culture générale* of *l'enseignement secondaire*, which linked a new analytical approach to the classical humanities and the reasoned scientific method to form the normative matrix for the full development of the individual in the institutions of secondary education.

The status of the modern humanities and their place on the curriculum of the *enseignement secondaire classique* were improved in reforms leading up to the new century. Jules Ferry's 1880 curricular reform (*arrêté* of 2 August

1880), for example, expanded the place of the modern languages, French, history and the sciences on the curriculum while reducing that of Latin and Greek, of which the study was to commence two years later, in the *sixième* and *quatrième* respectively (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 44; Prost 1968: 246-247, 250). Although further changes to the curriculum in 1885 (*arrêté* of 2 August 1885) and 1890 (*arrêtés* of 28 January and 12 June 1890), which sought to lighten the excessive demands of the programme, partly undid some of the gains of these subjects in relation to Latin and Greek, the replacement of essays composed in Latin with essays written in French in 1890, which followed the rejection of translation from French into Latin in favour of translation from Latin into French in 1880, serves to illustrate the decline of the classical languages and the further valorisation of French in the secondary school. Furthermore, the new value accorded to the modern subjects was demonstrated in the *décret* of 8 August 1890, which did away with the distinction between the *baccalauréat ès lettres* and the *baccalauréat ès sciences* to establish a single *baccalauréat de l'enseignement secondaire classique* that would sanction a common programme, which would only split into mathematics and philosophy sections after the *seconde*. The growing acceptance of the sciences and modern humanities that omitted the study of Latin and Greek and their integration within a complete secondary education was also indicated by the *décret* of 4 June 1891 which renamed *l'enseignement secondaire spécial* as *l'enseignement secondaire moderne* and altered the nomenclature of this modern education's classes to match that of the classical, long course of study (Prost 1968: 250-252, 254).

The new name of the *enseignement secondaire moderne* achieved what we might call the "secondarisation" of these science-based studies, which, beginning in 1880, saw them eventually divorced from their practical or professionalised applications, indicated, for Duruy, by the adjective *spécial* (Prost 1968: 59), and integrated within the culture of secondary education due to the growing recognition of the value of the scientific method for the disinterested development and realisation of the pupil as an individual as part of a wider *culture générale*. As Briand and Chapoulie (2011: 372-386) show, this process was partly the result of the recognition amongst policy-makers that the new EPS and CC of *l'enseignement primaire* were intended to offer a more limited and practically oriented education similar to that which had been offered by the *enseignement secondaire spécial* and their consequent attempts to distinguish the offer of this lesser secondary education and thereby avoid competition with the EPS and CC and maintain its own clientele. When the EPS and CC were being established with concentric programmes designed to enable the early abandonment of studies that would still be complete within themselves, a series of decrees in 1881 and 1882 replaced the previously concentric programmes of *l'enseignement secondaire spécial* with progressive programmes within the separate three and two year *cycles* that composed the, now, five year course of this education and created a new normal sanction for the completion of these studies in the form of a *baccalauréat de l'enseignement secondaire spécial*. This new qualification, like the *baccalauréats* of *l'enseignement secondaire classique*, enabled holders to pursue studies at university, although only in either the sciences or medicine. In 1886 the length of the *enseignement secondaire spécial* was increased by

another year and the distinction of two *cycles* of study was dissolved, resulting in a long progressive course of study that, although one year shorter, resembled those of the *secondaire classique*. It is this resemblance that enabled the 1891 integration of these studies, under the title of *secondaire moderne* and sanctioned by a similarly renamed *baccalauréat moderne*, with the more prestigious classical, secondary courses (Prost 1968: 253-254). As Prost (1968: 253) notes, this creation of a long and cumulatively organised course of study produced another shift towards a new pedagogical orientation, also reminiscent of the classical secondary course of study, in which 'on se donne du temps, on envisage une formation de l'esprit pour elle-même.' Indeed, following the 1902 reform that will be considered below, Louis Liard, the *directeur de l'enseignement supérieur* from 1884 to 1902 and *vice-recteur de l'académie de Paris* from 1902 to 1917, wrote in 1904 to highlight that the study of the sciences had their own contribution to make to the general and abstract education of the individual's capacities that was the proper aim of a secondary education. He described this contribution as being that of developing the individual's capacity to employ general methods, such as 'observation , comparaison, classification, expérience, induction, déduction, analogie,' which enable the individual to discover and understand 'la verité positive' and thereby awaken and develop within the individual 'ce sens de réalités et des possibles' that will help guide their judgement and make them, not a passive memoriser of, potentially erroneous, knowledge, but an autonomous agent 'capable d'agir' (2010: 748). Abstracted from their practical applications, which were left to the institutions of *l'enseignement primaire* and the nascent EPCI and ENP of *l'enseignement technique,* the tools of scientific analysis

became, within secondary education, part of a disinterested general culture that exceeded the realm of scientific study to contribute towards the development of the individual as a human being capable of free and rational thought and action. As Prost (1968: 257) said of the fate of the *enseignement secondaire spécial*, '[n]e pouvant être secondaire en tant que spécial, il devint secondaire bien que spécial, et vite secondaire tout court.'

The integration of this, previously shorter and practically oriented, course of study based on the sciences and the modern humanities subjects, such as modern languages, as part of the long and disinterested classical secondary studies, which traditionally privileged the timeless culture of Latin, and Greek, literature and language, was facilitated, as a number of researchers have noted (Jacquet-Francillon 2010c: 274; Kahn 2010: 344-345; Prost 1968: 247-249, 254-257), by the development of a new consensus towards the end of the nineteenth century around a broader, encyclopaedic *culture générale* that would bring together the various contributions of different subjects to the general intellectual education of the individual. This broad church of secondary culture was enabled by a new emphasis on the educative value of forms of study and intellectual exercise over their specific content, which both accompanied a renewal of pedagogical practices in secondary education that emphasised an analytical approach, redolent of the valorisation of scientific method in the *écoles centrales*, and outlined a modification of the norms of the excellent, fully-realised individual to which pupils were to be subjected in *l'enseignement secondaire*.

This shift in pedagogical practices, that reflected Simon's call, in his *circulaire* of 27 September 1872, for a renewed teaching approach to ensure a

reflective understanding of not only Latin and Greek literature and culture but also subjects such as history, for example, was promoted in the curricular reforms of 1880 and 1890 and supported a pedagogy which rejected the memorisation that had prospered in the traditional, classical literary studies, and instead emphasised the critical and methodical reflection upon an object of study, a pedagogy that implied the republican norm of the fully-realised individual as an autonomous individual capable of independent, reasoned thought. Perhaps the clearest example of this deliberate change of methods is the 'leçon de choses', a positivistic, empirical analysis of an object of study, which, as Sachs (2014: 37) shows, 'crystallizes in pedagogical terms a complex set of beliefs and values at the core of republican culture' through an emphasis on the pupil's autonomous exercise of reason instead of their simple submission to the authority of the *professeur*.[57] This pedagogy was called upon to be the basis of all teaching in the slogan, attributed to Jules Ferry, which accompanied the 1880 reform of secondary education discussed earlier: 'la leçon de choses' à la base de tout'. The concrete realisation of this slogan in the teaching of various subjects, including classical literature, beyond the sciences with which it would appear to have the most evident affinity, served to reorient the study away from the admirative yet passive acquisition of timeless bodies of knowledge and eloquent rhetoric, which had been the traditional pedagogical model of classical study, and towards a more active and reflective engagement with subject matter. This enabled the co-existence of the culture of classical secondary education and scientific culture within a larger general culture that was no longer built upon the privileged formative status of

[57] For a more detailed discussion of the pedagogical model of the *leçon de choses* and its relation to republican values, see Sachs (2014: 28-52).

knowledge from one narrow subject culture, but, as Jean Château (2010: 938-939) would write in 1964, the abstracted traits of various disciplines 'qui, tout en dirigeant l'attention vers l'humain, restent assez souples pour être susceptibles de transposition.' With the 1890 reform of secondary education, the *leçon de choses* was translated into literary or philosophical studies, for example, by the prescription of the new exercise of the *explication de textes*, which, described in the official instructions as 'une véritable leçon de choses morales professée par des écrivains de génie' (in Prost 1968: 248), demanded a critical analysis of the ideas presented in the text in question, and of how they are presented, rather than a laudatory commentary. The privilege of the form of study over its specific content also served to justify the preservation of more classical exercises, such as the translation of Latin or Greek to French, as a sort of intellectual gymnastics that was valuable in itself, beyond the knowledge of Latin, Greek or French that it demonstrated, for the cultivation of the individual's intelligence and its potential application to other situations (Prost 1968: 247-249). The unified general culture which underpinned the secondary education that developed under the Third Republic brought together its disparate disciplinary cultures through a new appreciation of the various abstract and transposable, formal traits that each discipline could contribute to the general education of the individual pupil beyond the particular or functional content of their subject knowledge. Indeed, this formalist idea of a general culture was expressed in the phrase 'la culture, c'est ce qui reste quand on a tout oublié', which is often attributed to Edouard Herriot, who was *ministre de l'Instruction publique* from July 1926 to November 1928 (Lelièvre 1990: 43; Prost 1968: 249).

This unification of the various disciplinary aspects in a single *culture générale* of secondary education, and its educative ambition for the full development of the individual as an active and independent subject was expressed in the major 1902 reform of secondary education (*décrets* and *arrêté* of 31 May 1902) enacted by Georges Leygues, *ministre de l'Instruction publique* from 1898 until 7 June 1902,[58] which established the architecture of this order of education that, with a few modifications in the inter-war period, would last until the Fifth Republic. In considering this 'véritable refondation de l'enseignement secondaire' (Savoie 2010: 154), we will first draw upon Leygues's letter of January 1902, addressed to Alexandre Ribot, the president of the *commission de l'enseignement* who had produced a report on secondary education in 1899 that informed this reform, which outlined the key aspects and motives of the 1902 reform to show how it reaffirmed the individual-centred logic of education and depicted the norm of a fully realised individual to be achieved as a cultured and reasonable autonomous individual, before showing how the reorganisation of the structures of *l'enseignement secondaire* instituted by this reform and completed by the subsequent reforms of the inter-war years manifested the unified culture and abstract orientation of this order of education.

Georges Leygues's letter outlining the 1902 reform confirms the individual-centred educational logic of the secondary school and delineates the norm of the excellent individual to which it seeks to subject its pupils. His description of the 'premier devoir' of this secondary education as being that of developing 'les qualités intellectuelles et morales qui stimule l'initiative

[58] Leygues also held this position from May 1894 to January 1895.

individuelle, font les esprits justes et libres, les consciences droites et les volontés fortes' (Leygues 2014: 88) underlines the individual-centred logic of education that would continue to be actualised within this secondary order. This emphasis on individual initiative and the development of a strong independent will as part of the perfection of individual moral and intellectual faculties suggests a republican norm of the excellent individual as an autonomous and rational individual, who has learnt the supposed moral lessons offered by antiquity not by passively committing them to memory but, adapting the tools of scientific analysis, rather by the active examination and justification of these morals. Indeed, reflecting the concord of classical and scientific cultures expressed in the new *culture générale*, Leygues argues that the 'esprit classique' is not incompatible with the 'esprit moderne' and contributes to the exercise of the individual's rational judgement as 'le culte de la raison claire et libre, la recherche de la beauté harmonieuse et simple dans toutes les manifestations de la pensée' (87). For Leygues, then, 'tout enseignement secondaire digne de ce nom doit être à la fois classique et moderne' (91), with the abstract formalism that enabled the classical and the modern, scientific cultures to converge in a single educative general culture and exceeded, to a certain degree, their subject specific contents underlined in Leygues's statement that the value of this education is that, through its long course of study, it is able 'non seulement de munir l'intelligence de connaissances multiples, mais d'agir profondément sur les habitudes et les facultés mêmes, de faire en un mot l'éducation de l'esprit' (85-86).

What Leygues (2014: 89) referred to as 'l'unité fondamentale de l'enseignement secondaire' was expressed in this reform through the

reorganisation of the various courses of secondary education as variations within a single course of study sanctioned by a single *baccalauréat*, a reorganisation that was modified to strengthen this unity in 1925. In place of the different courses of modern and classical study mentioned above, which were of different lengths and sanctioned by different, classic or modern, *baccalauréats* of unequal value,[59] this reform established a seven-year course of secondary study (in addition to the years of study in the *classes élémentaires*), which expressed the unification of classical and scientific culture within the new *culture générale* and would be sanctioned by a single *baccalauréat* enabling access to all courses of university study. This course of study provided what Louis Liard referred to at the time as 'l'unité dans la diversité' (in Lelièvre 1990: 152) as it presented within itself four sections (A, B, C, and D) of concentration between which pupils could choose at the end of a first *cycle* of education completed by the class of *troisième*: A) Latin with Greek, B) Latin with modern languages, C) Latin with sciences, or D) modern languages and sciences (*décret* of 31 May 1902, Art. 6). The *baccalauréat* awarded at the successful completion of study would be, as Leygues put it in his 1902 letter, 'un seul diplôme portant, *à titre de renseignement*, des mentions différentes, suivant l'option du candidat entre les différentes matières offertes à son choix' (2014: 90, emphasis added). As Viviane Isambert-Jamati has noted, this diversity of courses of study marked 'la diversification de la culture secondaire normale' (in Lelièvre 1990: 152), no longer completely dominated, at least officially, by the traditional prestige of the study of classical antiquity. This 1902 reform did, however, maintain the unofficial

[59] As noted above, the *baccalauréat classique* enabled its holder to attend any course at university whilst the *baccalauréat moderne* only enabled access to the study of medecine or the sciences at university.

distinction between classical and modern studies by providing within this system an education devoid of the study of Latin in the first *cycle* preceding pupils' choice of section and in section D of the second *cycle* of study, resulting in the continued disdain for this modern course amongst the social elite and the majority of the body of *professeurs*, who subscribed to a belief in the merits of a classical culture (Prost 1968: 256-257, 366-367).

A reform of 1925 (*décret* of 13 May and *arrêté* of 3 June 1925) that modified the structures established by the 1902 reform, pursued the unificatory spirit that had inspired this reform. Developed under François Albert, the *ministre de l'Instruction publique* from June 1924 to April 1925, but enacted by his successor in the role, Anatole de Monzie, who would hold the position for only six months, this reform appeared to recognise more clearly the difference between classical and modern studies by replacing sections A, B, C, and D with three new sections, of which two, A: *latin-grec* and A': *latin-sciences*, maintained the study of Latin and therefore the traditional classical culture of secondary education, whilst the third, B: *langues vivantes-sciences*, omitting Latin and Greek, represented the modern humanities tradition. However, the *baccalauréats* awarded for the completion of these studies remained the same diploma of equal official value, and between all three sections there was a shared common programme of study, running from the *sixième* to the *première* and encompassing French, history, geography, modern languages, mathematics and the sciences, amongst others, in which all pupils were taught together, marking a more concrete realisation of the professed commitment of policy-makers to reduce the barriers between modern and classical secondary studies and their respective pupils. Furthermore, the

official instructions that accompanied the new *plan d'études* explicitly insisted on the necessity of bringing together the classical and scientific studies: 'Si "l'honnête homme" du 17e siècle [...] était obtenu par une éducation toute latine, l'homme cultivé du 20e siècle ne peut être produit que par l'étroite association des disciplines littéraires et des disciplines scientifiques' (in Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 88). The greatly increased time allocated to the sciences in the timetable of the classical A and A' sections in this reform, relative to that which had been designated for them in the equivalent 1902 sections, A and B, attested to the more thorough integration of these cultures as part of a single secondary education that sought to fully realise the capacities of individual pupils. (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: Prost 1968: 257-259)

The secondary order of education of the Third Republic continued to actualise an individual-centred logic of education over a long course of abstract and disinterested studies intended to mould fully-realised individuals. This fully realised individual was expressed in the norm of a cultured and reasonable autonomous individual capable of independent analysis and judgement, which was produced from a new *culture générale* of secondary education that incorporated both the cultural distinction of the traditional classical culture and the independence and rational self-governance of the scientific culture.

The disciplinary *dispositif* of *l'enseignement secondaire*

The distinct and separate disciplinary *dispositif* of *l'enseignement secondaire*, with its own inspectorate, personnel, institutions and diplomas,

was established much sooner than that of *l'enseignement primaire* (Prost 1968: 21-31). This is largely derived from the invention of *l'Université impériale* at the beginning of the nineteenth century, which established the institutions of secondary education, the basic administrative structure of this organisation, the personnel who would teach, administer and inspect this education, and the sanctions that could be awarded or applied to performances within this organisation. The disciplinary *dispositif* as a normalising mould was also strengthened by the cultural unity of the personnel of this education, which derived from the commitment to the abstract and disinterested culture of this education, and by the various means by which the integrity and separation of this institution and its educational logic from other orders and logics were maintained. In the following, we will first consider the various ways in which the Napoleonic administrative apparatus of *l'enseignement secondaire* and its subsequent modifications throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries produced durable structures that assured a complete disciplinary administration of *l'enseignement secondaire*, before setting out a number of mechanisms and policies that maintained the disciplinary enclosure of its institutions. It will be seen that *l'enseignement secondaire* too was constituted as a hierarchical organisation operated by a single individual-centred educational logic, as analysed above, which formed a disciplinary mould under the central authority of the education minister.

With the law of 1 May 1802 and the decrees of 1806 and 1808 that created Napoleon's *Université impériale*, the entirety of French education was supplied with 'une architecture administrative autonome et pyramidale que les régimes politiques suivants conserveront et amplifieront' (Troger and Ruano-

Borbalan 2010: 60). This Imperial University was organised by the decree of 17 March 1808 as an administration under the central authority of the G*rand-Maître* (Art. 29), a position that would evolve to become that of *ministre de l'Instruction primaire* in 1828 (Caplat 1984: 43), with a monopoly over all public education in France (Art. 1).[60] This *Grand-Maître* chaired the governing body of this education system, the *Conseil de l'Université* (Art. 61), which would undergo a number of changes in name to become, after the Second World War, the contemporary *Conseil supérieur de l'éducation nationale* (Simon et al. 2010: 97-98), and picked its members from among the members of the *Université*. This *conseil* would consider reports, examine projects of reform proposed by the minister, and decide upon disciplinary sanctions to be applied within the organisation of secondary education. The written record of these meetings would be sent to the minister (Art. 76 to 84).

The actual administrative control claimed by the *Université impériale* was, in effect, only exercised over higher and secondary education, however, and, as modifications were made to the structure of central administration over the course of the nineteenth century, *l'enseignement secondaire*, like the other degrees of education, eventually received its own integrated central administration within the *ministère de l'Instruction publique* at the beginning of the Third Republic and formed a distinct order of education. As we have discussed earlier, the institutions of primary education only came to be developed and organised later, and so the Napoleonic administrative structure,

[60] Officially, education was in fact part of the responsibilities of the *ministère de l'Intérieur* at the time and yet it was organised separately in the form of the *Université* presided over by the *Grand-Maître* and not a government minister. Indeed, it was only sixteen years later and after the Bourbon restoration that the title of *Grand-Maître* was conferred upon the *ministre des Affaires ecclésiastiques et de l'Instruction publique* in 1824. It was another four years before a separate Ministry of *l'Instruction publique* was established and its minister was granted the prerogatives of the *Grand-Maître* (Caplat 1984: 42-43).

in effect, only managed the institutions of *l'enseignement secondaire* and *l'enseignement supérieur* (Chapoulie 2010: 42). Indeed, as we will see, the universities are culturally and functionally linked to the institutions of secondary education: the *baccalauréat* was initially, and remained in the decree, the first grade of university education (*décret* of 17 March 1808, Art. 16; Prost 2007: 239-240), for example, and the universities played a role in providing the institutions of secondary education with teaching personnel. From 1847, however, the three divisions of education (primary, secondary and higher) were each given autonomous organisations and in 1870 became separate orders with their own administration within *l'Instruction publique* (Caplat 1984: 44). From the beginning of the Third Republic therefore, and until the 1960s, *l'enseignement secondaire* was administered by a central *direction de l'enseignement secondaire* which integrated and administered all the personnel, institutions and teaching functions relevant to this order of education (Chapoulie 2010: 43).[61]

From its inception, although under the central authority of the State due to the power of the head of State to nominate the minister or *Grand-Maître* atop the administrative edifice of *l'Instruction publique* or later *l'Éducation nationale*, the administration of secondary education enjoyed a relatively large degree of autonomy,[62] relying on its own administrative structures beyond the usual organisms of central government and its own separate, hierarchically organised body of personnel united by their common scholarly, secondary

[61] This became the *direction de l'enseignement du second degré* following Jean Zay's 1937 administrative reform but continued to function according to its original vertically organised function, as will be briefly considered at the end of this chapter.

[62] Prost (1968: 25) notes the autonomy of the *Grand-Maître*. He quotes Napoleon's words to Jean-Pierre-Louis de Fontanes, the first holder of the title: '"je vous fais chef d'ordre, lui aurait dit Napoléon, choisissez vos hommes, cela vous regarde"'. This relative autonomy is also noted by Lelièvre (1990: 39; 2008: 167).

culture who took a significant role in managing their own affairs. As Lelièvre (2008: 167) notes the *Université*, and thus, by the subsequent reinforcement of this initial *dispositif* that they inherited, any administration of secondary education that followed, was to be 'dirigée de façon spécifique, autonome, et par les siens.'

This independent and separate organisation was already clear in the establishment of the basic administrative sub-division of the national *Université impériale* into a number of regional *académies* each under the authority of a *recteur* (*décret* of 17 March 1808, Art. 4 and 94), which persists as the basic administrative structure of the French education system to this day. The *recteur* was to be directly appointed by the *Grand-Maître* (*Décret* of 17 March 1808, Art. 94 and 95), and continues to be directly appointed by the *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* today, as his[63] direct representative and agent in a given *académie*. This *recteur* was responsible for the oversight of the institutions and personnel of the education system in his or her *académie*, for ensuring that they apply the policy and directives of the central ministry, recording and passing on to their superior the performance of these institutions and personnel with any relevant recommendations of positive or negative sanction, and assuring the correct conduct of exams and the award of relevant diplomas (*Décret* of 17 March 1808: 96 to 99; Simon et al. 2010: 190-192). The *recteur* would also meet with a *conseil académique* (Art. 85) made up of people chosen from among the members of the *université impériale* within the *académie*, which would meet at least twice a month to consider the function of

[63] The first woman to be the French Minister of Education was Najat Vallaud-Belkacem, who was only appointed to this position on 26 August 2014.

the institutions in this area and any complaints, and would address a written account of these meetings to the central authorities.

It is notable that, despite having created, in 1800, the position of *préfet* as regional agent and representative of the central government in the standard administrative territorial sub-divisions of the *départements*, which had been first established in 1790, Napoleon created these distinct positions and territorial divisions. The areas encompassed by the *académies* did not coincide with the circumscriptions of the *départements* and continue to not match these or those of the *régions* which were officially established later in the twentieth century (Lelièvre 2008: 167; Simon et al. 2010: 183-184). In this system the hierarchy of the administration of secondary education bypasses that of the main state apparatus, and the institutions of secondary education are responsible to the *recteur* of their *académie*, who is in turn responsible to the central authority of the education system.

The 1808 decree organising the *Université impériale* also established a national and hierarchical body of teaching and administrative personnel employed by the State and therefore subject to this central authority and the disciplinary sanction of advancement or punishment depending on their performance.[64] Article 29 of the 1808 decree established a complete hierarchy of positions within the *Université impériale*, ranging from the *Grand-Maître* himself to the lowly *maîtres d'études*, by way of the *inspecteurs de l'Université*, *recteurs*, *proviseurs* and *professeurs des lycées* amongst others (see Prost 1968: 70-72). This was accompanied by a description of the

[64] As Mayeur (2004: 507-508) notes, this status of salaried and pensionable *fonctionnaire* was granted to the personnel of *l'enseignement secondaire* much earlier than it was to those of *l'enseignement primaire*, who, previously employed by local authorities, only gained this status in 1889.

qualifications required to fulfil each of these roles (Art. 31). This organised hierarchy of positions within public education enabled the pursuit of a career within this organisation. Indeed, article 30 of this decree stated that 'nul ne pourra être appelé à une place qu'après avoir passé par les places inférieures' and that '[l]es emplois formeront ainsi une carrière qui présentera, au savoir et à la bonne conduite, l'espérance d'arriver aux premiers rangs de l'Université impériale.' The responsibilities of the personnel of the *Université* are codified in Articles 39 to 42 and 44 of this decree, and the variety of positive and negative sanctions for either satisfying or failing to satisfy this norm, resulting in their career progression or otherwise, were also codified (Art. 32 to 36, and 47 to 49). As Lelièvre (1990: 41) notes, '[e]n avançant dans le siècle, la hiérarchie enseignante se diversifie et se renforce' enabling incredibly nuanced means of career advancement through a good performance of one's role within the hierarchy. The personnel of *l'enseignement secondaire* were fully integrated within a hierarchical and normalising disciplinary *dispositif* under the single gaze of the State as represented by the *ministre de l'Instruction publique* and his *directeur de l'enseignement secondaire*.

The establishment of this autarkic body of *fonctionnaires* within *l'enseignement secondaire* has also been described by Prost (1968: 25) as the creation of 'une corporation laïque, presque une congrégation', and indicates the intention to form a unified culture, a single normative mould, for the institutions of *l'enseignement secondaire*. Indeed, as Lelièvre (1990: 37) states, this 'corporation publique' of personnel of secondary education constituted 'un organisme concourant à la réalisation d'une même fin et ayant une unité morale et une inspiration commune'. This culture was in fact one which placed

an emphasis on the abstract and disinterested culture of secondary education that we have considered above and was shared by the personnel of these institutions because, as teachers of secondary education they would have all completed these secondary studies, which would have been strengthened further by the study of *lettres* or *sciences* in *l'enseignement supérieur* completed by those appointed as *professeurs*, who by the end of the nineteenth century would have increasingly also completed the *agrégation*. For a certain rare élite amongst this *corps enseignant*, study at the *école normale supérieur* established on *rue Ulm* in Paris would have completed this thorough acculturation (Lelièvre 2008: 167-168; Prost 1968: 71-72, 353-355). This culture was a common denominator amongst this personnel, partly explaining the high value that continued to be placed on classical studies within secondary education into the twentieth century noted above, and resulted in a certain social isolation of this personnel from the world beyond this secondary culture (Prost 1968: 77-82 and 360-367). Through this shared culture and the common cultural and social separation of the personnel from the, "uncultured", world beyond their institutions, the personnel of this order of secondary education helped complete the normative mould actualised in this order of education, and reinforce the enclosure of this disciplinary *dispositif*.

The secondary order of education was also provided with its own national inspectorate to ensure the regularity of the disciplinary *dispositif* of secondary education through the surveillance of institutions and personnel within the structures of *l'enseignement secondaire* and the completion of reports producing these persons and institutions as individual cases within a disciplinary 'réseau d'écriture' (SP: 222). The *inspecteurs généraux*, first

established by Article 17 of the law of 1 May 1802, were recruited from the elite personnel of *l'enseignement secondaire* and travelled around the country to examine the state of all secondary institutions and their equipment, and the performance of every *enseignant* and *proviseur* within these institutions, and assess to what degree they complied with the official pedagogy, programmes and policy set out in laws and regulatory texts. From these examinations, the *inspecteur* would write up reports detailing their findings, recommending any positive or negative sanctions that were considered apt, and send this to the minister for consideration in the *Conseil de l'Université*, or later the *Conseil supérieur de l'Instruction publique*. From the beginning of the Third Republic, these inspectors would, after a reorganisation of the *Inspecteurs généraux de l'Instruction publique*, be recruited as experts in a specific subject discipline and focus on the evaluation of the teachers of these subjects and their performance. This system of hierarchical and normalising inspection in the institutions of *l'enseignement secondaire* was maintained until the Fith Republic (Gerbod 1983: 31-33; Prost 2007: 129-131).

Enacting the individual-centred logic of *l'enseignement secondaire*, however, was, of course, the most important structure of this secondary order of education established by Napoleon: the *lycée*, an institution that persists to this day. Described by Jean-Noël Luc (2008: 450) as 'la pièce maitresse de l'enseignement secondaire', the Napoleonic *lycée* was created by the education law of 1 May 1802 and, given their initially limited number, their network was completed by less prestigious, municipal *collèges* with slightly less qualified teaching staff, that were defined in Article 5 of the 17 March 1808 decree as 'écoles sécondaires communales' teaching only elements of ancient languages

and the first principles of history and the sciences. As the nineteenth century progressed, these *collèges* were increasingly transformed into *lycées* as they prospered and a sharp increase in the number of *lycées* and *collèges* in the latter half of the century meant that a full network of secondary institutions was in place by the turn of the twentieth century (Lelièvre 1990: 49-50; Mayeur 1980: 506-507; Prost 1968: 32-40).[65]

Initially excluding them from these institutions, the disciplinary *dispositif* of secondary education was further expanded to educate girls following the creation of *lycées* for girls by the *loi Sée* of 21 December 1880. This law was followed by the creation in 1881 of the *École normale supérieure de Sèvres* to train female *professeurs* for these institutions. At first, providing only an education in the modern humanities, excluding Latin and Greek, the studies available in these *lycées* were shorter and excluded the possibility of achieving the *baccalauréat* without recourse to private tuition at the end of this course of study. Very few girls therefore achieved the *baccalauréat*. This situation was redressed after the First World War. A *décret* issued on 25 March 1924 by Léon Bérard, who was *ministre de l'Instruction publique* from January 1921 to March 1924 after a brief period in this same position at the end of 1919, assimilated the course of study for girls with the full programme which had been established for boys, unifying these two previously distinct courses of secondary education. By extending the application of the

[65] The former Parisian *collège Louis-le-Grand*, known at the time as the *Prytanée français*, served as a model for the new *lycées* of Napoleon I's *Université Impériale*, itself later becoming *lycée Louis-le-Grand*. Following the Bourbon Restoration, the term *collège* was again briefly used to refer to both of these institutions, with *lycées* and *collèges* being renamed as *collèges royaux* and *collèges communaux* respectively before returning to their previous appellations following the 1848 revolution. The distinction in prestige between these two types of institution of secondary education held throughout the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century (Lelièvre 2005: 185-186; Troger and Ruano-Borbalan 2010: 12-15; Prost 1968: 22-23, Prost 2009:11).

disciplinary *dispositif* to a greater number of people this constitutes an intensification of its action that operated in the service of an individual-centred logic of education to subject individuals to a norm of individual excellence embodied by a broad and extensive *culture générale* (Lelièvre 1990: 124-127; Prost 1968: 261-265).

If, as Philippe Raynaud (2012: 3) notes, the Third Republic holds in the popular French imaginary 'l'image d'un âge d'or de l'institution scolaire', the school system of the Third Republic was also, in the words of Vincent Troger and Jean-Cluade Ruano-Borbalan (2010: 22), 'une école à deux vitesses', in which the separate secondary order of education distinguished itself from *l'enseignement primaire* in not only its objectives, but also a number of organisational differences that established financial and practical obstacles maintaining an enclosed culture and a limited number of students compared to the insititutions of *l'enseignement primaire*. Indeed, the policies of the Third Republic served to reinforce the enclosure of the secondary order of education.

The first of these obstacles that closed the institutions of *l'enseignement secondaire* in upon themselves was the fact that they were fee-paying. This evidently served to reduce the potential clientele of these institutions to those few that were relatively well-off, precisely those elements of society who tended, due to their more elevated socio-economic milieu, to share some of the cultural values of the disinterested and abstract culture of these institutions and could endure the cost of a long course of study leading only to the largely impractical *baccalauréat*, with, unlike the primary schools, no qualification intervening between the commencement of studies and this final sanction (Prost 1968: 32-34, 54-55). It was only with the finance law of

16 April 1930 (Art. 157) that the progressive removal of fees from the normal secondary course of study, starting with the class of *sixième*, began (Prost 1968: 415-416). In response to the influx of pupils resulting from this measure, however, an *arrêté* of 1 September 1933 established a new entry exam for pupils hoping to start in the class of *sixième* of an institution of *l'enseignement secondaire* (Ibid. 417).

Furthermore, the secondary order of education separated itself from the primary order by offering its own elementary classes for pupils from the age of six, which despite the progressive removal of fees for the normal course of studies in the *lycées* and *collèges* from 1930 onwards, remained fee-paying (Ibid. 412). These *classes élémentaires*, often referred to as the *petit college* or *petit lycée*, had developed over the course of the nineteenth century to welcome pupils in classes named according to the convention of a long secondary education leading to the *baccalauréat* that marked their distinction from the predominantly short studies undertaken in *l'enseignement primaire*: the first class for pupils from the age of six years old was named *onzième*, indicating the countdown to the final year of the *lycée*, *terminale*, when the pupil would take the examinations for the award of a *baccalauréat*. The programmes of these schools, with the completion of a long, secondary education as a clear aim, were fixed alongside the curriculum of the rest of *l'enseignement secondaire* (the *arrêté* of 2 August 1880, is one such example of this) and were thus distinct from those of the *écoles primaires élémentaires* of the primary order of education, and even the teaching personnel were different (Lelièvre 2005: 185-186; Prost 1968: 412-420). This was a division that had been strengthened by Jules Ferry himself.

Although the *loi Ferry* of 16 June 1881 established the free access to education within the *l'enseignement primaire*, it did not affect the elementary classes of secondary education, which remained fee-paying, and earlier that year Ferry had issued a decree which further distinguished this secondary education from that of the primary school by creating a specially distinguished body of teachers for the *petit lycées*. This was the *décret* of 8 January 1881 that introduced an annual *concours* to recruit a special body of *professeurs des classes élémentaires de l'enseignement secondaire* distinct from the *instituteurs* that were to teach in the elementary schools of *l'enseignement primaire*. This *concours* was only open to those who were highly qualified when compared to those who could become *instituteurs*, as it was demanded that they hold a *baccalauréat* or at least a *brevet supérieur* (Art. 2). Those who succeeded in the *concours* would receive a *certificat d'aptitude aux fonctions de professeur des classes élémentaires de l'enseignement classique* and, again, the commitment to the disinterested secondary culture, sanctioned by the *baccalauréat*, of these *professeurs* would contribute to the *encadrement* of this secondary education by a *culture scolaire* that formed the normative mould of superlative individual qualities to which the pupils of *l'enseignement secondaire* would be subjected.

Although, official measures were passed in the 1920s to remove both the distinction between the teachers (*décret* of 12 September 1925) and the curricula (*arrêté* of 11 February 1926) of these schools (the *professeurs des classes élémentaires* were to be assimilated to the body of *instituteurs*, whilst the programmes of the *classes élémentaires* became those of the *écoles primaires élémentaires*), the distinction remained due to the selective and fee-

paying nature of the *petits lycées* and the secondary culture of the *professeurs* who already served in these schools. Despite the issuing of an *ordonnance* on 3 March 1945, these *petits lycées* continued to exist as distinct institutions of elementary education oriented towards the long, secondary education of cultured and reasonable individuals into the 1960s when they eventually disappeared from the records of official statistics (Prost 1968: 412-413).

These obstacles seeking to distinguish *l'enseignement secondaire* from *l'enseignement primaire* highlighted Ferry's conviction, noted earlier, that this secondary education was only intended for those deemed 'capables de le recevoir' (in Chevallier and Grosperrin 1971: 266), i.e. those considered to be capable of meeting the normative demands of the disinterested school culture and fully realising themselves as the cultured and rational autonomous individual that this culture prescribed. With the exception of the few *boursiers*, referred to by Ferdinand Buisson as 'exceptions consolantes' (in Robert 2015: 26), this in effect meant the children of the upper classes who already, from their upbringing and socio-economic milieu, had some contact with this culture and the means by which to pursue this long course of education. The narrow and prejudiced conception of merit and capacity that Ferry's position rests upon, led to the less well-off children of the lower classes being assumed to either not have the potential to succeed in the secondary order or to risk being *déclassés* by receiving this education. Through this strictly selective filter the disinterested school culture of secondary education tended to insulate itself and exclude other external elements, be they uncultured "poor taste" or the need for a practical or professional orientation that would pervert the, supposedly, disinterested nature of these studies. As Prost (1968: 331) notes 'le

malthusianisme de l'enseignement secondaire est une véritable politique, de 1880 à 1930', and the distinction between the primary and secondary institutions is clearly established so that '[c]haque ordre a ses diplômes (le baccalauréat d'un côté, le certificat d'études et le brevet de l'autre), ses enseignants et sa coutume pédagogique; chacun, surtout, a sa clientèle: l'école des notables s'oppose à celle du peuple' (Prost 2013b: 13). The contention within this thesis is that these separate diplomas, teaching personnel and pedagogies, and the difference in clientele of these orders of education result from the different *mots d'ordre* that make them function, the divergent logics of education that are expressed through these disciplinary *dispositifs*.

The secondary order of education constitutes a disciplinary *dispositif* that actualises an individual-centred logic of education to subject its pupils to a norm of the fully-realised individual, a norm that under the Third Republic had come to be posited as a cultured and rational individual capable of reasoned autonomous thought and judgement. This norm is constituted with reference to a *culture générale* that emphasises abstract formalism of transposable *savoirs* to effect something of an integration of the classical cultures and scientific cultures that had been considered antagonistic and irreconcilable at the beginning of the nineteenth century. This norm of the realised individual is compatible with the ideals of rational self-governance present in the norm expressed in the common culture of the community-centred *enseignement primaire* but is posited as an optimum to be achieved for itself rather than a minimum requirement for the creation of a community of shared values and practices. The individual-centred logic of *l'enseignement secondaire* promotes

the realisation of the individual in itself without reference to any specific function or external goal by reference to an abstract culture that constitutes a normative mould for subjects within a long education cut off from practical considerations. It is this culture that is expressed in the programmes of this education and that is shared by its administrative and teaching personnel. Organised under the regular and hierarchical disciplinary *dispositif* that was first established by Napoleon and added to by subsequent governments, this order of education subjects its pupils to the accepted norm of the fully-realised individual. As Alain Boissinot (2013: 195) notes of the Napoleonic *lycées*, the institutions of *l'enseignement secondaire* 'accueill[aient] dès les premières classes un public étroitement trié pour délivrer un enseignement fondé essentiellement sur les humanités classiques, avec une finalité culturelle plus qu'opérationnelle.' This order of education forms a distinct disciplinary *dispositif* that actualises an individual-centred logic of education.[66]

III - The economy-centred logic and *l'enseignement technique et professionnel*

Neither the community-centred education of *l'enseignement primaire*, nor the individual-centred education of *l'enseignement secondaire* was intended primarily to form subjects to fulfil an economic function, to be economically productive. This was instead the objective, the *mot d'ordre* of

[66] That this abstract culture of disinterested self-development forms a common culture among those that have completed this secondary education presents a certain irony. The production of such a common culture is, however, a by-product of this culture that values the individual's autonomy and excellence above all, as the truculent and quarrelsome individualism that tended to characterise the personnel of *l'enseignement secondaire* attests. See Prost (1968: 78-82, 364-370).

economic productivity, that guided the action of the institutions of *l'enseignement technique et professionnel*[67] as an actualisation of what we will call the economy-centred logic of education. This order of education is unlike the other two orders discussed in that it did not have its own elementary classes, instead recruiting its pupils mainly from those having completed their compulsory education at the *écoles primaires élémentaires*, and was the last of the three orders of education considered in this chapter to be constituted as a complete disciplinary *dispositif*. Nonetheless, by the end of the Third Republic it had clearly been established with its own norms, institutions, centralised administration, personnel, and diplomas subject to the economy-centred logic of education. Due to the focus of this thesis on the development of the *collège*, it will be this organised order of technical education, which existed alongside and competed with the *lycées* and *collèges* of *l'enseignement secondaire* and the EPS and CC of *l'enseignement primaire*, that will be the focus of this analysis rather than those more prestigious institutions of a higher level, such as a number of *grandes écoles*, which also completed this economy-centred function, but existed at another level of education.[68] The *cours professionnels* that would take place at the workplace will only be considered in relation to this order of education operating according to an economy-centred logic with its own separate institutions.

In considering this order of education, we will first consider the normative orientation produced by the economy-centred logic of education, before considering the emergence of State institutions that sought to actualise

[67] I will use the terms technical and professional and their French equivalents relatively interchangeably.

[68] For a thorough account of the competition between the institutions of *l'enseignement technique* and those of *l'enseignement primaire*, especially EPS, see Briand and Chapoulie (2011: 175-234).

this logic in Third Republic. Finally the organisation of these institutions and their associated structures will be analysed to show the operation of a distinct disciplinary *dispositif* guided by the *mot d'ordre* of economic productivity.

This economy-centred logic of education is that which is narrowly focussed on preparing pupils to fulfil an economic function, on subjecting the pupil to the norms of the economic activity in question. As Prost (1968: 299) notes of *l'enseignement technique*, the education oriented by this logic 'ne se définit pas à partir d'une conception *a priori* de l'éducation, mais en fonction de débouchés précis'. To refer once again to Émile Durkheim's (1911) entry on 'Éducation' in Ferdinand Buisson's *Dictionnaire de pédagogie et d'instruction primaire*, this economy-centred logic of education is that which attends to the fact that 'l'enfant doit être préparé en vue de la fonction qu'il sera appelé à remplir' and so focuses on the preparation of the pupil for a particular narrow aspect of professional activity, rather than the fostering of the broad *être social*, as is the case in the community-centred institutions of primary education, or the cultivation, seeking to exclude practical and social concerns as far as possible, of the *être individuel*, as seen in the individual-centred institutions of secondary education. As Durkheim (1911) states, '[c]haque profession [...] constitue un milieu *sui generis* qui réclame des aptitudes particulières et des connaissances spéciales, où règnent certaines idées, certains usages, de certaines manières de voir les choses', and so it is these particular elements, oriented towards economic activity, that make up the professional norms to which the pupil is subjected in this order of education. Given their specialised nature, these norms too are mutable depending on the technical skills, knowledges and aptitudes required for a given profession. The

abstract orientation of all of these norms, however, remains the economy-centred logic of education that responds to the *mot d'ordre* of economic productivity.

The disciplinary *dispositif* of *l'enseignement technique*

Such a specialised technical education had a limited institutionalised existence until the Third Republic. For the vast majority of the population in rural France, this education was historically completed by the child's direct entry into economically active life through the imitation of his or her peers and adults who were already competent with this given activity. Beyond this, from the middle ages, a number of guilds had been organised around different skilled trades and these *corporations* would organise for a limited number of apprentices to be trained in a trade. However, these *corporations*, which tended to be inefficient and exploitative, were abolished and banned by the *Loi Le Chapelier* of 14 June 1791 as a symbol of the injustice of the *ancien régime* and as an obstacle to the freedom of trade and labour (Troger 2006a: 69-72). Thereafter the training of skilled manual labour was left largely unorganised by the State until the reforms introduced by the Third Republic (Troger and Ruano-Borbalan 2010: 75-79).

There were, of course, a number of courses of technical or professional education which formed the professional elite that had been established by the time of the Third Republic, such as the medicine and law courses of the universities, accessible to those who had completed a secondary education, or the various *grandes écoles* such as *l'École polytechnique*, accessed via a

concours, or the fee-paying *École des hautes études commerciales*. Indeed, the development of these public and private elite institutions was such that, as Prost (1968: 305) notes, '[à] la fin du XIXe siècle, l'enseignement technique de niveau supérieur ne présente donc pas de lacune majeure.' (Prost 1968: 299-305; Troger and Ruano-Borbalan 2010: 79-81)

One example of these advanced institutions, which will be referred to again later due to the role it gained in relation to *l'enseignement technique*, were the three *écoles des arts et métiers* that had been established by the time that the Third Republic was founded, following the creation of the first of these schools by the Duc de Rochefoucauld in 1780. These schools which were authorised to welcome 300 pupils each in 1841 were intended to form a supply of technologically skilled professionals and its successful pupils often became engineers. These institutions came to be known as *écoles nationales des arts et métiers* under the Third Republic and would eventually serve as a sort of higher education institution for the order of technical education that would subsequently be established (Prost 1968: 302-303; Lelièvre 1990: 157).

The training of workers for skilled intermediate positions that were increasingly required as industrialisation began to take hold over the course of the nineteenth century was, however, disorganised and left to various private, charitable or municipal initiatives that were often of limited success. The more practical educations offered by the intermediary *enseignement secondaire spécial*, which would soon be joined by the EPS, offered a partial State-driven response to this problem but they remained institutions of general education offering a *préapprentissage* at best. As the recourse to an English workforce to build the first railway lines earlier in the century demonstrated, France was

suffering from a widely acknowledged and debated ‘crise d’apprentissage’ by the end of the nineteenth century, that urgently needed to be addressed (Prost 1968: 305-307; Troger and Ruano-Borbalan 2010: 79-81).

The first development of a centralised disciplinary *dispositif* of technical education, showing the state seeking to take charge of the formation of qualified workers, was that established by the law of 11 December 1880, which incorporated locally developed technical apprenticeship schools and those CC that had emerged locally to offer a technical education to establish *écoles manuelles d’apprentissage*. These schools were explicitly intended to ‘développer chez les jeunes gens qui se destinent aux professions manuelles la dextérité nécessaire et les connaissances techniques’ (Art. 1). These institutions were initially part of *l’enseignement primaire*, but were also placed under the *tutelle* of the *ministère du Commerce*. This shared responsibility for these schools, and therefore the relative ambiguity of their normative framework that applied to them, led to some debate but would be resolved in favour of the *ministère du Commerce*, as will be seen later (Prost 1968: 290-291, 308-309).

This normative confusion regarding the initial orientation and status of the EPS and CC that affected the creation of *l’enseignement primaire supérieur*, which will be more fully considered later, also resulted in the creation, following the 11 December 1880 law, of a number of more advanced technical institutions, which would become the *écoles nationales professionnelles* (ENP). These were established at first to constitute models for the development of the EPS and CC, but were clearly oriented towards professional education and therefore diverged from the subsequent development of the EPS (Lelièvre 1990: 156-157; Prost 1968: 308).

The conflict over the administrative control, and thus normative orientation, of these institutions was settled in favour of the *ministère du Commerce* in a number of decisions at the end of the nineteenth century, and thereby the basis of a unified order of education separate from *l'enseignement primaire* was established. The ENP were eventually made the sole responsibility of the *ministère du Commerce* by the finance law of 13 April 1900, joining the *écoles manuelles d'apprentissage* and those few EPS which had developed more specifically to offer technically or professionally oriented courses, which had been attributed entirely to the *ministère du Commerce* and collectively renamed as *écoles pratiques de commerce et d'industrie* (EPCI) by the finance law of 26 January 1892. This established an *enseignement technique* composed of the EPCI and ENP under the authority of the *ministère du Commerce*, which sought to thoroughly prepare its pupils to do a given job, rather than prepare them generally so as to later learn this job as had been the general orientation demanded by the personnel of *l'enseignement primaire* (Lelièvre 1990: 153-156; Prost 1968: 308-310).

As Claude Lelièvre (1990: 155-157) explains, the EPCI and ENP had their own course of study leading to a specific diploma of technical education. According to a *circulaire* that followed their creation in 1892, the EPCI were 'destinées à former des employés de commerce et des ouvriers aptes à être immédiatement utilisés au comptoir et à l'atelier' (in Lelièvre 1990: 157). As such they usually had both a business and an industry section and its pupils specialised from the beginning of their course, which led some of these institutions to establish a preparatory year of study examining more general technical skills. The timetable and curricula of these courses were elaborated in

relation to a national framework adopted in 1908, but, although requiring subsequent central approval, were locally determined in relation to the economic demands of the locality by each institution's *Conseil de perfectionnement*, which was to be composed mainly of representatives of local business and industry (*loi* of 25 July 1919, Art. 18 and 24). They recruited their pupils by an entry exam from the age of twelve years old and the standard course of study was three years, which could be sanctioned by a *certificat d'études pratiques* (renamed *brevet d'études pratiques* in 1934). Some EPCI also offered a fourth year of study serving to prepare pupils for the *concours d'entrée* of the *écoles des arts et métiers* and other similar technical schools. The ENP, on the other hand, had a section of study explicitly intended to prepare its pupils for these *concours* as part of its normal four-year course of study. This course of study was composed of two cycles: two years of general education followed by two years of study within a specialised section, of which that preparing pupils for the *concours* was one option. Its pupils were recruited from the age of twelve years old, and later thirteen years old, by regional *concours* that were nationally standardised and its four years of study were sanctioned by the *diplôme national d'élève breveté des écoles nationales professionnelles*. As the longer course of study and explicit intention of preparing its pupils for the *concours* suggest, the ENP were more prestigious then the EPCI. This can be seen in the more ambitious official goal of the ENP codified in a *décret* of 13 February 1903: 'Les ENP ont pour but de former des ouvriers instruits, aptes à devenir contremaîtres et chefs d'ateliers.' (Lelièvre 1990: 155-157; Prost 1968: 309-310)

These institutions were taught by their own body of teachers, separate from those of the other orders of education, who had their own culture that valued technical knowledge and skills and enacted a pedagogy that was entirely centred on the economically valuable skill being taught. These teachers were specially trained in *sections normales* which were established in the *école nationale des arts et métiers* of Châlons in 1891 for those preparing to teach industrial disciplines, and in the *l'école des hautes études commerciales* and the *école de commerce* of Lyon in 1894 for commercial disciplines. Indeed, in 1912 a dedicated, separate institution was even established to form these teachers of *l'enseignement technique* that was later named the *école normale supérieure de l'enseignement technique* in 1934 (Prost 1968: 310). As Prost (1968: 314-315) notes, the teachers of this technical and professional order of education formed a closed group that valued the educative nature of the technical culture that they transmitted, which had technical and professional activity at its centre to be mastered. This cultural emphasis on the value of the technical and professional skills being taught within these institutions was expressed in a pedagogy that was narrowly focused on these economically valuable skills as means of education. This commercial and industrial, i.e. economic, focus of this education can be seen in the 1926 instructions for a class in drilling tools written by the then director of technical education, Edmond Labbé:

> Notre but est de former de bons ouvriers; ne le perdons pas de vue un seul instant. […] C'est pourquoi nous demandons *que la profession soit le pivot et le centre de tout enseignement*, aussi

> bien de l'enseignement moral et civique que de l'enseignement technique proprement dit. *Tout par la profession et pour la profession*, tel doit être notre principe essentiel. (in Prost 1968: 319)

Through the training, culture and pedagogy of the teachers of these institutions, all focused on the primacy of the economically useful technical and professional skills, knowledge and practices to be taught, *l'enseignement technique* established a distinct normative mould that responded to the *mot d'ordre* of economic productivity and actualised the economy-centred logic of education through a variety of programmes that subjected pupils to the norms of a given trade, career or role.

The centralised disciplinary *dispositif* of this education was codified, although not created,[69] in the *loi Astier* of 25 July 1919, which has been described as 'la charte fondamentale de l'enseignement technique' (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 80). The first article of the *loi Astier* affirms and reasserts the economy-centred logic of education that this order of education is intended to provide and which will animate the function of its various disciplinary structures organised in the rest of the law:

> L'enseignement technique, industriel ou commercial a pour objet, sans préjudice d'un complément d'enseignement général,

[69] As Lelièvre (1990: 166) and Prost (1968: 312) note, four of the five sections of this law merely codify the pre-existing mechanisms that had been established in the preceding years of the Third Republic and formed the status quo. In codifying these dispositions this text does, however, demonstrate the organised, regular, and hierarchical nature of this *dispositif* of technical education that had been established.

> l'étude théorique et pratique des sciences et des arts ou métiers en vue de l'industrie ou du commerce. (Art. 1)

This law established a hierarchical organisation for this order of education under the *ministère du Commerce et de l'Industrie*, which would, less than a year later, be durably transferred to a new central authority, the *sous-secrétariat d'État au ministère de l'Instruction publique chargé de l'enseignement technique*, that would make it another separate order within the Ministry of Education (*Décret* of 20 January 1920). To simplify the analysis of this law therefore, I will replace references to *ministre* or *ministère du Commerce et de l'Industrie* with *sous-secrétaire* or *sous-secrétariat* where appropriate. As Vincent Troger (1989: 596) notes, however, the time that the administration of this technical order of education had spent under the control of the *ministère du Commerce* helped forge a durable and economy-centred culture, 'un esprit particulier, fondé sur des liens étroits établis avec certains milieux professionnels'.

The 1919 law organised a complete disciplinary *dispositif* to regulate the *enseignement technique* by establishing a number of hierarchically organised structures, its own body of inspectors and a system of sanctions to be applied to personnel of this order of education depending on their performance. This structure converged towards the central authoritative figure of the *sous-secrétaire de l'enseignement secondaire*, who is in turn under the authority of the State represented by the Minister of Education. It is the *sous-secrétaire* who presided over the *Conseil supérieur de l'enseignement technique*, codified in articles 5 and 6 of the law, that would advise the *sous-secrétariat* and

examine policy proposals. This *conseil* was to include, alongside personnel of *l'enseignement technique* itself, representatives from business and industry, further ensuring the economically oriented culture of this order of education (Lelièvre 1990: 170). Article 7 of the law codified an *Inspection de l'enseignement technique*, which was hierarchically organised into distinct bodies of general, regional and departmental inspectors by a *décret* of 17 February 1921, that would exercise surveillance over the performance of the various institutions and personnel of the order of technical education and produce reports for consideration by the *sous-secrétaire*. These reports would be added to by annual reports on the local state of technical education addressed to the *sous-secrétaire* by the *comités départementaux de l'enseignement technique*, which would themselves receive reports from the *comités cantonaux de l'enseignement technique* where they existed. Articles 19 to 23 of this law also established the statuses of the personnel of this order of education and, importantly, in article 22, outlined the variety of sanctions that could be applied to them depending on their performance, following a disciplinary hearing of the *comité départmental* or, where necessary, the *conseil supérieur de l'enseignement technique*. These hierarchical lines of authority and the constitution of a network of writing that established individual, sanctionable cases within this system of technical education indicate the establishment of *l'enseignement technique* as a regular disciplinary *dispositif*.

The *loi Astier* also marked an attempt to intensify the action of this disciplinary *dispositif* in response to the ongoing *crise d'apprentissage* by seeking to introduce *cours professionnels* for the vast majority of the

population who would not have received a technical education before beginning their working lives. These free *cours professionnels*, of at least four hours per week within normal working hours (Art. 44), were intended to be obligatory for both boys and girls under the age of eighteen years old who were employed in commerce or industry (Art. 37 and 38) and to be sanctioned, after a course of three years, by a *certificat d'aptitude professionnelle* (CAP)[70] (Art. 47). Indeed, this, attempted, expansion of the field of application of this discipline of *l'enseignement technique* beyond its current institutional boundaries was the main motive for this new item of legislation, which hoped to provide a technical education to the mass of workers who were not given a formal technical education (Lelièvre 1990: 163-166). The EPCI and ENP of *l'enseignement technique* only welcomed a relatively small number of pupils that they would train for relatively advanced roles in business and industry. As Prost (1968: 310) observes, the elite workers trained in these institutions at a rate of roughly 9,000 per year were just 'une goutte d'eau dans la mer de l'emploi.'

Although the generalisation of these *cours professionnels* was unsuccessful, largely due to the fact that the implementation of these courses was left to the initiative of the employers of the pupils concerned, such a less specialised course of technical education was later established within the disciplinary *dispositif* of *l'enseignement technique* in 1939 within new *centres de formation professionnelle accélérée*, which were initially annexed to EPCI and other technical schools. These institutions, which would, after three years of study, lead to a CAP, were maintained by the Vichy government, but under

[70] This was a renaming of the *certificat de capacité professionnelle* that had been established by a *décret* of 24 October 1911.

the shorter name of *centres de formation professionnelle* (Lelièvre 1990: 166-169).

Following the Liberation of France the *direction de l'enseignement technique* was again given administrative control of these institutions, which were renamed as *centres d'apprentissage* (CA) and codified by the law of 21 February 1949. Still composed of three years of study leading to a CAP, this law specified that the CA 'ont pour objet de former des ouvriers, ouvriers qualifiés et employés aptes à exercer les métiers et à remplir les emplois à caractère industril, commercial ou artisanal' (Art. 1). With the establishment of these lower level courses alongside the higher level EPCI, which were renamed *collèges techniques* by the Vichy government, and ENP the disciplinary *dispositif* of *l'enseignement technique* had expanded to serve a greater number of pupils and satisfy a wider range of economic demands (Lelièvre 1990: 170-171; Prost 1968: 316).

Over the course of the Third Republic, then, a distinct order of technical and professional education that operated according to an economy-centred logic had been established. Responding to the *mot d'ordre* of economic productivity, this order of education sought to subject its pupils to the specific norms of a variety of professional activities rather than to norms of a community member or to norms of a disinterested realisation of the individual. The disciplinary *dispositif* constructed to enable the subjection of the pupils of this institution to these norms demonstrated its enclosure and normative regularity through its own separate administrative structures, institutions, sanctioning diplomas, personnel, pedagogy, programmes and culture which

emphasised technical skills, knowledge and capacities. *L'enseignement technique* developed under the Third Republic, therefore, constituted a hierarchically organised disciplinary institution functioning according to an economy-centred disciplinary logic, which formed a distinct mould in which its pupils would be subjected to norms of professional and technical knowledge and skills that respond to the *mot d'ordre* of economic productivity.

IV - A case study of distinct disciplinary enclosure: *L'enseignement primaire supérieur*

Having established the existence of three separate disciplinary orders of education operating according to distinct logics of education to subject pupils to their specific norms through their own hierarchically organised disciplinary *dispositifs*, we will now consider a particular case study that illustrates the careful and persistent separation of these different orders of education at the beginning of the twentieth century. The development of the EPS and CC of *l'enseignement primaire*, especially during the inter-war years, demonstrates a considerable degree of reorganisation of these institutions which correspond, in terms of the age-range of pupils, with the contemporary *collège*. It will be seen that the division between the different orders of education and their disciplinary logics of education is maintained with relation to the development of these institutions throughout this period. When certain parts of a disciplinary edifice begin to respond to a different *mot d'ordre* to that which is supposed to animate it, the deviant aspect is reassigned to the order of eduction that is

animated by the relevant logic of education and the enclosure and distinction between the disciplinary orders of education concerned is reasserted.

As institutions that welcomed pupils from the age of twelve or thirteen for a normal course of study of two or three years,[71] the EPS and CC of *l'enseignement primaire supérieur* constitute predecessor institutions, within the primary order, of today's four-year *collège* for pupils aged eleven to fifteen, and are therefore worthy of particular attention in this study. Usually drawing their pupils from the lower-middle classes and the better off parts of the working class who could afford the income lost from their children's delayed entry into the job market, these primary institutions competed with institutions of the secondary and professional orders of education (*colleges* and *lycées*, and *écoles pratiques du commerce et d'industrie* (EPCI) or *écoles nationales professionnelles* (ENP) respectively) that also served pupils of the same age range. However, like the other disciplinary institutions of *l'enseignement primaire*, these schools and classes were distinct from the other orders of education by their actualisation of the community-centred logic of education.

[71] This course length could vary significantly. Firstly, although initially limited to a maximum of two years by the *décret* of 18 January 1887 (Art. 30), the length of study available through CC could vary considerably from one elementary school to the next, being perhaps as short as one year or as long as four, even before the official repeal of the limit in the *décret* of 18 August 1920. The *décret* of 18 January 1920 (Art. 30) stated that the EPS had to offer a minimum of two years study but would only be said to be 'de plein exercice' if it offered three or more years of upper primary education, and, in fact, some EPS also came to prepare pupils for the *brevet supérieur*, normally prepared in the *écoles normales primaires*, over an additional three years of study added to the normal course of three to four years of study. Secondly, the concentric organisation of the EPS and CC's curriculum, in which the same material was revised and treated in greater depth each year, facilitated a pupil's cessation of these post-compulsory studies. Indeed, it appears that only a fraction of pupils (never more than half during the Third Republic) that attended these institutions went on to receive one of the recognised qualifications to which these classes were intended to lead. This concentric organisation was common to all parts of the primary order until the introduction of progressive programmes, in which the curriculum introduced new material at each stage of the course of study, in 1920 and 1923, by which time the premature ending of one's studies had become less common. See Briand and Chapoulie (2011: 6-7, 20, 83-113, 235-265) and d'Enfert and Jacquet-Francillon (2010: 232-234).

Initially established by the *loi Guizot* of 1833 (Art. 1 and 10) in order to offer 'une culture un peu plus relevée' without introducing its pupils to 'des goûts et des habitudes incompatibles avec la condition modeste où il leur faudrait retomber' (the *exposé des motifs* of the law quoted in Lelièvre 1990: 108-109), the *enseignement primaire supérieur* offered a continuation of the elementary primary education oriented towards the creation of a national community united by a common practical culture, as indicated by its extension of the elementary primary school's curriculum to include applied notions of science and elements of geography and history, 'surtout de l'histoire et de la géographie de la France' (*loi Guizot*, Art. 1). However, with the exception of a small number of institutions, largely in urban centres, that survived into the Third Republic in various guises that deviated from the initial intention of these institutions to a greater or lesser extent, the EPS created by the *loi Guizot* were largely short-lived, due to the lack of popular demand at that time for such an extended primary education, and had effectively disappeared by the time of the ill-fated Second Republic when it was effectively dissolved by the 1850 *loi Falloux* (Prost 1968: 289-290; Mayeur 2004: 566-571; Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 26-42).

Under the Third Republic, however, significant public funding was made available to construct EPS for boys in 1878 and EPS for girls in 1879 and the EPS and CC were given a new official status, curriculum and organisation with the *décret* and *arrêté* of 15 January 1881. Supported by this funding, a national network of EPS, completed by the more readily created CC, which were upper primary classes that took place within existing *écoles élémentaires* and enabled an extension of this disciplinary *dispositif* beyond

large urban centres, was quickly established before the end of the century. (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 6-7, 40-81; Chapoulie 2006: 114-116; Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 40-42; Prost 1997: 86; 2007: 138). This extension of the field of action of the community-centred disciplinary logic to pupils beyond the age of compulsory schooling in all parts of France constituted an intensification of the exercise of disciplinary power of which the objective is to ensure a more thorough subjection of its pupils to the norms of *l'enseignement primaire*.

Indeed, the official intention behind the development of this network of upper primary institutions under the Third Republic remained faithful to that expressed by Guizot in 1833 and the community-centred logic that would animate elementary primary education: these schools were to provide the general public with a more in depth general education that remained practical and rooted in the common culture taught in the elementary primary schools. In his report of 29 October 1881 regarding the organisation of this *enseignement primaire supérieur*, Ferry stated that the EPS should constitute a superlative primary school, 'une école perfectionnée', 'le large couronnement d'une éducation primaire menée à bien', rather than a 'collège dégénéré', a *collège* at that time being an institution of *l'enseignement secondaire* (in Prost 1968: 346; Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 40). This aim of a higher primary education, described by Ferry in his report as being 'd'affermir le savoir plus encore que de l'étendre, de l'approfondir et non de le disperser, et de donner à l'esprit une trempe forte plutôt qu'un brillant vernis', was reflected in the programmes of study for the EPS and CC defined in the *arrêté* of 15 January 1881. These programmes demonstrated a remarkable similarity with those of

l'enseignement primaire indicated in article one of the law of 28 March 1882, and, through their emphasis on civic and moral instruction; French language and limited examples of French literature; the history, geography and, eventually, economy of France; and limited notions of mathematics and the sciences and their practical applications, they continued to propose a limited and practically oriented national culture in the spirit of the community-centred logic of education. This close relationship of the EPS and CC to the primary education of the elementary schools was considered to be very important and, in the aforementioned report, Ferry stressed that if *l'enseignement primaire supérieur* were to separate itself, by its curriculum, teaching staff or otherwise, from its roots in the common primary school of the people then it would lose both 'le meilleur de sa substance' and its 'raison d'être' (in Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 40-41). As Briand and Chapoulie (2011: 100) have noted, *l'enseignement primaire supérieur* constituted a direct prolongation of the elementary primary education, with which it demonstrated '[…] nulle discontinuité entre les programmes, les critères d'évaluation de la compétence scolaire, les méthodes pédagogiques.' Indeed, they observe that this was particularly true in the CC, which, although following the programme of the EPS as far as possible, could be taught by the same *instituteurs* who taught in the *école élémentaire* to which the CC were annexed.

This continuity of *l'enseignement primaire supérieur* extended to its close relationship to the community-centred disciplinary logic of the primary school and the primary school's related task of educating (good) citizens who shared in a (republican) common culture. As Lelièvre (1990: 112-117) highlights, the EPS and CC functioned as 'matrice d'une sorte de corps d'élite

républicaine', with the future *ministre de l'Instruction publique* (1885-1886) René Goblet's newspaper *Le Progrès de la Somme* declaring in 1878 that the EPS was 'l'école des sous-officiers de la démocratie' intended, above all, to form 'des citoyens' (in Lelièvre 1990: 112). This theme would reappear in reports and speeches of the following decades through references to those who had studied at the EPS as a determined republican youth or a solid and resistant core of republican society, often associated with an expanding middle class who were increasingly drawn from these institutions (Ibid. 112-113). As Octave Gréard (1904: 172) wrote in his 1878 report on primary education in Paris, *l'enseignement primaire supérieur* constituted 'un enseignement démocratique par excellence [… qui] élève le niveau de l'instruction et de la moralité de la petite classe moyenne […] sans surexciter les prétentions aveugles, aussi décevantes pour les individus que fatales à la société.' Although referring to the upper primary education given in a number of Parisian institutions that would serve as models for the subsequent development of the EPS and CC, in this description, Gréard highlights a number of important continuities of this higher primary education that link it to the community-centred logic of education. Firstly, the CC and EPS, as extensions of the free and obligatory elementary primary school, were to remain popular institutions that could provide a free upper primary education to all citizens, a distinction that earned the EPS, in particular, the nickname 'les collèges du peuple' (Briand and Chapoulie 2011). Furthermore, the education these institutions offered was to continue to emphasise the needs and republican morals of the Republic through a limited curriculum that was

oriented more by concerns for the cohesion of the national community than an interest in the advancement or full realisation of individual pupils' capacities.

Actualising the same community-centred disciplinary logic and providing a short general education intended primarily to strengthen, or intensify, the subjection of its pupils to norms of the primary school's relatively limited common culture, the EPS and CC were not primarily intended to serve individual development or the economy. Indeed, as Guy Vincent has recognised (1972: 72), when certain institutions of primary education began to function more according to one of these other logics, the distinctively general and practical nature of the *l'enseignement primaire* would be reaffirmed through the removal of these deviant institutions from the *tutelle* of the primary order and their transferral to that of either the secondary or the technical and professional order. This can be seen in the case of vocationally oriented EPS in the 1890s and that of the EPS that increasingly resembled the institutions of *l'enseignement secondaire* in the 1930s, eventually leaving the CC as the sole institution of higher primary education by 1941.

A brief period in the 1880s saw some ambiguity and debate regarding the relationship of these post-compulsory institutions of *l'enseignement primaire* to vocational education. This was expressed in the fact that the *ministère de l'Instruction publique* and the *ministère du Commerce* shared the administrative oversight of both the number of more vocationally oriented institutions created in Vierzon (in 1881), Voiron and Armentières (both in 1882), which were intended to serve as models for the new EPS, and the limited number of vocationally oriented institutions that became *écoles manuelles d'apprentissage* with the law of 11 December 1880 (Prost 1968:

308-310; Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 180-181). After these "model" EPS had been opened to their first pupils, a commission formed in 1887 to address the question of vocational education in the EPS demonstrated the opposing views of the *ministère du Commerce*, whose representative decried the emphasis on a general education in these schools and called for these schools to focus on the development of professional skills to form workers, and the *ministère de l'Instruction publique*, for which Buisson defended the merits of a programme of education that develops 'les aptitudes pratiques qui font l'ouvrier' as part of a general education that also fosters 'les aptitudes intellectuelles qui font l'homme' (in Prost 1968: 308-309, 317-319). The uncertain position of the EPS in this regard was, however, settled over the course of the following decade.

The distinction between the more general *enseignement primaire supérieur* and a technical or professional education was made clear through the amputation of the more vocational institutions of education oriented by the demands of the workplace from *l'enseignement primaire*. With article 69 of the finance law of 26 January 1892, the *ministère du Commerce* was given full authority over the *écoles manuelles d'apprentissage* as well as the relatively limited number of EPS that had developed a more vocational programme of studies since their creation and both became *écoles pratiques du commerce et d'industrie* (EPCI). Additionally, those few vocationally oriented institutions which had been established as models for the future development of EPS became *écoles nationales professionnelles* (ENP) fully under the authority of the *ministère du Commerce* following the finance law of 13 February 1900 (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 70-75, 178-182; Prost 1968: 308-310, 317-319).

The division between these institutions, in terms of administration, curriculum and general objectives, continued to be upheld, even when it became common to have an EPCI twinned with an EPS during the inter-war period (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 219-220, 229).

Although, for its successful pupils, *l'enseignement primaire supérieur* enabled access to mid-level white-collar jobs and a number of *concours* for entry-level posts in the civil service, as well as the *concours d'entrée* for the primary order's *écoles normales*, this higher primary education, like the primary education of the elementary school, was not directly vocational and was rather to be considered, as a decree of 7 July 1881 (in Prost 1968: 308) put it, 'préparatoire à l'apprentissage' (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 6-7; Prost 1968: 291-292; Prost 1997: 88; Lelièvre 1990: 112-113, 159-162). Indeed, the programme of studies of the CC and EPS and the general underdevelopment of those aspects of pre-professional education, and the lack of relevant equipment, that constituted part of the general education of *l'enseignement primaire supérieur* attested to this difference from the institutions of vocational education. For example, Prost (1968: 309) cites a study of technical education in a pair of EPCI and EPS from 1905 that shows that pupils of the EPCI spent more than thrice as much class time in their school's workshop each week than those of the EPS, and that the workshop of the EPCI was much bigger and better equipped. In fact, the *ministère de l'Instruction publique* provided only limited funding for the development of the equipment and facilities for vocationally oriented education in the EPS and CC, and only began to provide sums comparable to those given to the EPCI by the *ministère du Commerce* in the years leading up to the First World War (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 206-

220). Indeed, even though the *ministère de l'Instruction publique* came to first encourage, in 1893, and then require, with the *décret* of 26 July 1909, the creation of vocationally oriented *sections spéciales* within the EPS, and those CC that extended beyond two years of study, the vast majority of pupils (86.4% in 1908, for example) remained in the *sections générales* and, eventually a decree of 5 June 1934 demanded that the vocational sections of the EPS be removed from the auspices of *l'enseignement primaire* and made into EPCI (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 193-194, 429; Lelièvre 1990: 162; Prost 1968: 291-292). *L'enseignement primaire supérieur* retained the general nature of the primary education and distanced itself from the economy-centred logic of technical and professional education.[72]

The EPS and CC were also distinct from the institutions of *l'enseignement secondaire* and their individual-centred logic of education. Although *l'enseignement primaire supérieur* offered a general education that was more in-depth than that of the elementary primary school, policymakers were concerned that it should resist the ambitions of the abstract general culture of secondary education and remain practical, lest the school form overly ambitious pupils detached from their correct position in society, what Buisson and Gréard would refer to as 'déclassés' (in Lelièvre 1990: 122). This concern to prevent such a *déclassement* of pupils was present when the EPS were being re-established by the Republican government and remained a point of reference in the inter-war years. In 1878, for example, Octave Gréard (1904: 309) wrote that the proper aim of EPS was to enable talented pupils to 's'élever dans leur sphère, mais non à en sortir', thereby ensuring that their

[72] For a more thorough account of the relationship between *l'enseignement primaire supérieur* and *l'enseignement technique* in the Third Republic, see Briand and Chapoulie (2011: 175-234).

aspirations remained 'conforme à l'intérêt public'.[73] An example of how this concern persisted after the First World War can be seen in the official instructions of 18 August 1920, in which Paul Lapie, the *directeur de l'enseignement primaire* from 1914 to 1925, again referred to the need for pupils to remain grounded and the importance of the community, stating that CC should be readily available to any group of 'jeunes gens qui, *attachés au sol natal*, désirent *sans se déraciner*, continuer leurs études jusqu'après l'âge scolaire' (in Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 91, emphasis added). It is significant that Lapie should be referring to the CC here and not the EPS, which, as will be seen below, moved closer to the institutions of secondary education and their individual-centred logic following the First World War. However, that the development of individual capacities was again subordinated to the supposed interests and needs of the community in these institutions continued to demonstrate the persistence of the orientation of an *enseignement primaire supérieur* regulated by the same community-centred logic that oriented the institutions of the primary order of education and animated the development of the EPS and CC in the nineteenth century.

The distance between the community-centred EPS and CC and the individual-centred *collèges* and *lycées* was evident in their different curricular programmes and the types of study that these enabled. The concentric curriculum of *l'enseignement primaire supérieur* sought to deepen pupil's knowledge of a limited and practical general culture, what Decaunes and Cavalier (1962: 42) have referred to as a '*culture usuelle*', which built upon that taught in the elementary primary school. This contrasts with the

[73] See Dubois (2007) for more examples from this period.

progressively structured cumulative curriculum of the secondary order of education, which followed on from and added to the studies of the *classes élémentaires* of the *lycées* and *collèges*, contributing to pupils' acquisition of a disinterested and abstract general culture, which traditionally included Latin, through what Prost (2004: 234) describes as 'une lente osmose'.

The way that the organisation of these curricula affected what successful courses of study were possible, also serves to show the divergence of these two sets of institutions. The concentric curriculum of the EPS and CC, which reviewed the same material in greater detail each year, enabled pupils to cut short their studies, which, because these studies were not merely an insufficient portion of a larger and incomplete whole, were complete within themselves. Additionally, a range of diplomas could be obtained at different stages over the extended course of primary education, which could attest to the education of those that had successfully passed the relevant exams and, in some cases, enable access to certain professions: first the *certificat d'études primaires* (CEP) that marked the successful completion of studies at the elementary primary school and could be passed from the age of eleven, then, after study at the EPS, or some CC, the *certificat d'études primaires supérieures* (CEPS, which after 1918 became the BEPS, *brevet d'études primaires supérieures*) could be passed from the age of fourteen; the *brevet élémentaire* (BE), which enabled access to entry-level positions in the public sector and a career as an *instituteur*, could be passed from the age of fifteen, and was often passed at the same time as the CEPS; finally the *brevet supérieur* (BS) could be passed from the age of eighteen, after study at an *école normale* or, exceptionally, an EPS, and enabled the holder of this award

to teach in the EPS and opened access to higher level positions in the public sector and elsewhere (Belhoste 2010: 256-257; Briand and Chapoulie 1981: 89-90; 2011: 6-7).

In contrast to the multiple diplomas and thus clear and complete exit points from studies that were offered within the institutions of *l'enseignement primaire*, with concentric programmes, the institutions of *l'enseignement secondaire*, with progressive programmes of study, required a full seven years of study (excluding its usual elementary classes or *petit lycée*) before this course of study could be sanctioned, from the age of eighteen, by the *baccalauréat*. Additionally, the institutions of secondary education, unlike those of primary education, remained fee-paying and pupils from the elementary schools of the *collèges* or *lycées* usually entered the first year of full secondary education, *sixième*, at the age of ten. This confronted pupils studying at an *école primaire élémentaire* and aspiring to attend a *collège* or *lycée* with the choice of either completing their studies to sit the exam for the *certificat d'études primaires*, which could be done at the age of twelve at the earliest, and therefore starting the seven years of secondary study as an older pupil, further postponing their entry on the job market, or of taking the risk of not completing a sanctioned primary education and starting at the *lycée* or *collège* at the normal age of ten, with no qualifications, in the hope of successful secondary studies. The risky and expensive aspect of the more prestigious, abstract and, supposedly, disinterested secondary education for the less well-off, when compared to the more certain and less expensive options provided by the practical and limited *enseignement primaire supérieur*, helped maintain the distinction between these institutions (Prost 1968: 326-328).

Particularly talented pupils in the primary school might gain access to a *lycée* or *collège* through the limited number of *bourses* but these were, as Buisson put it in 1910, 'exceptions consolantes' to the general division between the clientele of each educational order (in Robert 2015: 26). Indeed, as Prost (1968: 327-328) notes, the *bourses* available were frequently not distributed on the basis of a pupil's academic merit or the wealth of their family, with some being awarded to state employees in lieu of a promotion or bonus, and *demi-bourses*, which would only partially cover the cost of attendance at an institution of *l'enseignement secondaire* and thereby did not offset the cost for poorer families, were more readily awarded. The EPS and CC were institutions that did not primarily seek to develop individual capacities, which was rather the objective of *l'enseignement secondaire*, as we have seen above, but rather to develop pupils' capacities only insofar as they contributed to the maintenance of the community as part of the study of a limited and practical general culture (Prost 1968: 292; 1997: 88; Lelièvre 1990: 116-122).

In the inter-war period, however, the distinction between the general sections of the EPS and the secondary order's *collèges* and *lycées* became less clear, resulting in their own divorce from the primary order of education, which would thereafter solely persist at the intermediate level in the form of the CC attached to the primary elementary schools. Similarities between the content of the general EPS curriculum and that of the modern, as opposed to classical, humanities course in the *lycées* and *collèges* were already widely recognised at the turn of the century, with the clearest difference being a lack of modern language study in the EPS, but it was only in the 1920s that the

distinction between these institutions based on the different spirit and organisation of their programmes of study and the obstacles to accessing the secondary order of education began to be eroded and the attraction of the more prestigious *enseignement secondaire* came to be felt by policymakers and personnel of the EPS. Indeed, after 1924, and influenced by elements of the growing movement for an *école unique* that will be considered at the beginning of the following chapter, it became increasingly rare to come across the public defence of the particular benefits and advantages of a separate *enseignement primaire supérieur* in political or academic circles. Buisson himself stated that *l'enseignement secondaire* should be taken as a model for the further development of EPS during a parliamentary debate in 1920 and Lapie wrote an article, under a pseudonym, in 1922 that, although expressing reservations regarding the abstract pretensions of a long secondary education, condemned the inefficient division between educational orders, asserted that the principal difference between the EPS and the *collèges* and *lycées* was the social class of their pupils, and proposed the creation of a single institution that would also incorporate the EPCI and take pupils to the age of fifteen, after which they could choose to pursue further studies at a *lycée* (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 380-383, 415-422; Prost 1968: 291-293, 407-409).[74]

Perhaps a first manifestation of the fading distinction between the EPS and the *collèges* and *lycées* in this period were curricular reforms enacted during Lapie's time as director of primary education. Two *arrêtés* and a *décret* issued on 18 August 1920 disposed of the concentric programmes, which had been a hallmark of the primary order of education, for *l'enseignement primaire*

[74] In his anonymous article, Lapie gave the name *collège* to these intermediary institutions that he proposed. We can see the name and structure of the contemporary *collège* prefigured to a certain extent in this text (Prost 1968: 409).

supérieur and the *écoles normales primaires* and replaced them with progressive programmes like those of the secondary order of education. The move away from a concentric to a progressive curriculum was extended to the primary elementary schools in another series of *arrêtés* issued on 23 February 1923.

This reorganisation of the primary curriculum could be considered to merely suggest an intensification of the disciplinary *dispositif* of *l'enseignement primaire*, which thereby adhered more closely to the disciplinary principle of the organisation of geneses posited by Foucault (SP: 183-190) through the detailed codification of cumulative stages leading to a more complex normalised whole. Indeed, the report dated 14 August 1920 annexed to the *décret* of 18 August, which was signed by André Honnorat who was briefly *ministre de l'Instruction publique et des beaux-arts* from 20 January 1920 to 16 January 1921, indicated the intention of making primary education in the EPS and *écoles normales* more efficient through a more detailed delineation of the individual, normal stages in this education and the cumulative organisation of these stages: 'Lacunes d'une part, doubles emplois de l'autre, telles sont les défectuosités que l'on espère faire disparaître en établissant des programmes qui, pour chaque année, de 12 à 18 ans, marquent l'étape à franchir et le progrès à réaliser.'

However, this reorganisation of the curriculum of the EPS alongside various other measures that increased the length of study and improved the status of the BS tended to favour, as Briand and Chapoulie (1981: 88-89) note, the 'élévation formelle du niveau des études et [...] leur rapprochement avec les études secondaires modernes.' The course of study in the EPS came

increasingly to resemble that of the secondary order in its organisation, length, normative orientation, and sanction. The progressive nature of these curricula firstly emphasised a longer course of study which had to be considered as a whole and thereby militated against shorter, incomplete courses of study. Indeed, these reforms resulted in the increasing development of extended courses of study in EPS that would lead to the BS, which, combined with the development of preparatory years of study in the EPS, codified by article 39 of the *arrêté* of 18 August 1920 modifying the *arrêté* of 18 January 1887, that would take the place of the final *cours supérieur* of the *école primaire élémentaire*, resulted in a course of study equal to that of the *collèges* and *lycées* that would take pupils from the age of eleven years old to the age of eighteen years old (Briand and Chapoulie 1981: 104-105). In addition, changes to the status of the of the BS and also the *baccalauréat* resulted, by the end of the 1930s, in the recognition of a general equivalence between this higher sanction of *l'enseignement primaire* and the prestigious sanction of *l'enseignement secondaire*. From 1926, *bacheliers* became eligible to take on the role of *instituteur* and a number of measures between 1924 and 1927 enabled holders of the BS to access study at the universities, which was a privilege previously limited to *bacheliers* (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 427-429). This recognition and the less practical and more cultural emphasis on the disinterested pursuit of individual development that it implied has been recognised by Prost (1968: 292-293) as marking the new disinterested cultural orientation of the studies in the EPS, which no longer sought to provide a practical common culture. Given the recognition of the BS as being of generally equivalent value to the *baccalauréat*, this cultural reorientation was

strengthened by the desire amongst the *professeurs* of the EPS for greater official recognition, and pay, leading to demands to be integrated within the body of *professeurs* of the *lycées* and *collèges* (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 419-422). The gradual introduction of free access to the classes of the *lycées* and *collèges* that began with the finance law of 16 April 1930, also served to remove a distinction between the EPS and the institutions of the secondary order of education that would make the integration of these institutions all the more logical (Prost 1968: 415-416).

The result of these reduced distinctions of course, status and access, and the apparent reorientation of the EPS towards an individual-centred logic emphasising the development of individual excellence in relation to a disinterested culture, rather than the development of a limited and practical common culture was the reassignment of the EPS to *l'enseignement secondaire* in 1937 as part of the administrative reorganisation of the education system carried out by Jean Zay, who was *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* from 4 June 1936 to 10 September 1939.[75] The *décret* of the 1 June 1937 joined the EPS alongside the *lycées* and *collèges* to the renamed *direction du second degré*, which had lost the administration of the *classes élémentaires* of the secondary order to the, also renamed, *direction du premier degré*. The attributions of the *direction de l'enseignement technique* remained unchanged by this decree. (Prost 1968: 418-419)

The attachment of the EPS to the *second degré* was the first step in a process of assimilation that, after the unification of the programmes of the EPS

[75] The name of the Ministry had changed to *ministère de l'Éducation nationale* from *ministère de l'Instruction primaire* in 1932. With the exception of during Valéry Giscard d'Estaing's *septennat* when it was called the *ministère de l'Éducation*, the name of this Ministry has not changed to the present day.

and *lycées* and *collèges* in 1938, led to the reclassification of these institutions under the Vichy regime. The law of 15 August 1941 passed by Jérôme Carcopino, who was *secrétaire d'État à l'Éducation nationale et à la Jeunesse* from February 1941 until April 1942, renamed these institutions *collèges modernes*, which would prepare pupils for the *baccalauréat*, which took the place of the BS (Briand and Chapoulie 1981: 107; 2011: 438-439; Lelièvre 1990: 140).

The CC, however, were not reassigned in 1937 and remained under the control of the *direction du premier degré*. These institutions, that continued to both share the same locale as an *école élémentaire* and be taught by *instituteurs*, did not develop the extended courses or disinterested culture of the EPS in the inter-war period, but continued to offer a short course of limited and practical education. After 1937 and through until the creation of the Fifth Republic, the CC continued to provide a short supplementary education, closely linked to the community-centred logic of the primary schools, which transmitted a practical and limited culture. During the years of the Fourth Republic they were very popular, developing a very large student body as the network of these institutions continued to expand (Briand and Chapoulie 1981: 105, 107; 2011: 438-442; Lelièvre 1990: 173-174; Prost 1968: 420; 2013: 80-81).

The development of the institutions of *l'enseignement primaire supérieur* point to the careful separation of the different disciplinary logics that responded to distinct *mots d'ordre* in separate institutional *dispositifs*. Those institutions or sections of this upper primary education that demonstrated an orientation towards the realisation of economically oriented technical skills

were detached from the community-centred order of primary education and joined to the disciplinary *dispositif* of *l'enseignement technique*, which responded to the *mot d'ordre* of economic productivity. Similarly, when the EPS began to demonstrate a new orientation towards the disinterested realisation of a cultivated individual, they were detached from the *dispositif* of community-centred primary education to become integrated within the *dispositif* of secondary education animated by the *mot d'ordre* of the individual. Each disciplinary *dispositif* oriented by a different logic of education maintained its enclosure against the operation of logics other than their own.

Conclusion

We have shown in the preceding analysis that the school of the Third Republic was, in fact, constituted by a number of individual orders of education that actualised different disciplinary logics responding to distinct *mots d'ordre* through separate disciplinary *dispositifs*. Each of these orders of education conform to the two images of discipline that Foucault depicts, that of the 'discipline-blocus' or closed institution that excludes those elements that are contrary to its purpose, and that of the 'discipline-mécanisme' as a mechanism that ensures the positive and effective exercise of disciplinary power (SP: 244).

This system of separate orders of education indicates that the school system that had emerged by the beginning of the twentieth century represents

an organised disciplinary system of education and establishes the historical background from which the contemporary *collège* emerges.

Animated by the *mot d'ordre* of community, the order of primary education actualised a community-centred logic of education to subject pupils to a limited and practical common culture of values and knowledge. The norms of this shared culture were fixed under the Third Republic to present the ideal, *laïque* and republican community of reasonable and patriotic citizens. Largely autarkic through the recruitment and training of its personnel from within its own institutions, this order of education ensured a strong, enclosed normative mould dedicated to this republican ideology. This order of education could award a variety of different diplomas for those completing successful studies of varying lengths within a variety of institutions representing different levels of study. The regularity of the function of this order of education was assured by a disciplinary *dispositif* converging towards the centralised *direction de l'enseignement primaire*, later the *direction du premier degré*, which effected a hierarchical surveillance of all aspects of this order of education through a specific body of *inspecteurs* and local representatives of the Ministry of Education, which could lead to the application of codified positive or negative sanctions depending on the performances recorded.

The order of secondary education responded to the *mot d'ordre* of the realisation of individual capacities and therefore actualised an individual-centred logic of education to subject its pupils, over a long, cumulatively organised curriculum, to a supposedly disinterested and abstract culture that sought to enable the cultivation of the individual for him or herself, without reference to any particular purpose. The norms of this culture were eventually

established as that of a cultured, independent and rational individual, imbued with the virtues of classical culture, but free from unexamined prejudice and capable of reasoned analysis. The basis of the centralised disciplinary *dispositif* of secondary education was built upon the firm foundations that were established by the *Université impériale* founded by Napoleon at the beginning of the nineteenth century and the regularity of the education given in the *lycées, collèges* and *classes élémentaires* of this order was assured through the local representatives of the *ministre* in each *académie* (the *recteurs*), a body of *inspecteurs généraux* and a strictly codified series of grades and sanctions that could be applied to positive or negative performances.

The youngest of the three orders of education was the technical and professional order of education that actualised an economy-centred logic in response to the *mot d'ordre* of economic productivity. This technical order of education sought to subject its pupils to norms that represented the skills, knowledge and aptitudes demanded in a number of given professions. These institutions, with their own specially trained personnel and culture that placed special value on technical and professional expertise, offered a variety of technical and professional diplomas sanctioning various levels of study. The disciplinary *dispositif* of this order of education converged towards the central *direction de l'enseignement technique* and ensured the regularity of this technical education through their own inspectorate and code of sanctions.

These orders of education formed the sort of 'moulages distincts' and 'milieux analogiques distincts qui convergent vers un propriétaire' that Deleuze (PP: 242, 245) would recognise as indicative of disciplinary institutions and they each survived largely intact, with their own normative

culture, personnel, examinations, centralised and hierarchical administrative structures, sanctioning diplomas and enclosed locales, up to the foundation of the Fifth Republic.

These disciplinary *dispositifs* are the manifestation of an intensification of the exercise of power in response to particular strategic imperatives or *mots d'ordre*. However, as Foucault (SP: 246) noted, the disciplinary mechanisms of these institutions 'ont tendance à se "désinstitutionnaliser", à sortir des forteresses closes où ils fonctionnaient et à circuler à l'état "libre". It is these attempts to further intensify the exercise of these powers that respond to diffferent *mots d'ordre* and extend their field of application beyond the current limitations of their institutions, which will be examined in the next chapter to show how this education system based on three distinct disciplinary *dispositifs* develops to produce the contemporary *collège* at the confluence of their disparate disciplinary logics.

3. The emergence of the *collège* as an institution of control

While the previous chapter traced the emergence of the three distinct disciplinary *dispositifs* of the Third Republic education system through the intensification of the exercise of power animated by the *mots d'ordre* of community, the individual and the economy, this chapter will trace the emergence of the *collège* from the continued development of this education system as a *dispositif* that no longer operates according to the diagram of disciplinary power, but rather that of control.

Just as the previous chapter traced the emergence and consolidation of the three disciplinary *dispositifs* of the Third Republic education system that each operated under the primary orientation of one of the *mots d'ordre* of community, the individual and the economy as a process of what Nealon (2008) would refer to as a process of the intensification of the exercise of power or what Foucault (2001: 299-300) would indicate to be the '[p]rocessus de perpétuel remplissement stratégique' of *dispositifs* in response to their given strategic objective, this chapter will examine how the same ongoing efforts to intensify the action of these *dispositifs* actualising community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education in response to their apparent limits produce changes in the education system that eventually results in the establishment of the contemporary *collège* whose initial constitution and subsequent development will be shown to mark the emergence of a *dispositif* of control in the French education system.

Initiatives to intensify, i.e. render more expansive and thorough or achieve greater saturation of a field, the disciplinary action of the various

educational logics responding to their given strategic imperatives or order-words as they identify and encounter the limits of their action will be seen to lead them to seek to extend beyond their own established disciplinary enclosures and into the spaces that had been enclosed by others, thereby undermining this enclosure and establishing the conditions for the creation of the *collège* as an institution of dividual control at the fluctuating confluence of these distinct disciplinary logics. An analysis of the legal and regulatory texts relating to the objectives and normative orientation of this institution will show that the *collège* is not an individual institution whose action responds to one dominant *mot d'ordre*, like those that preceded it, but rather the dividual site of a continuous normative modulation of different disciplinary logics, in which the *mots d'ordre* of community, individual and economy have become *chiffrés* and shifting *mots de passe*. An examination of the structures and practices of governance that have developed since the establishment of the *collège* in the 1970s, in particular the operation of the *collège* as an *établissement public local d'enseignement* (EPLE) and the *orientation* of pupils in educational quasi-markets, will further show that, through the decentralisation of powers and the solicitation of stakeholder input seeking to improve the efficiency of this institution, a modulatory mode of governance emerges that makes the institution an 'entreprise qui n'a plus que des gestionnaires' (PP: 245) and marks a shift from a disciplinary *assujettissement social*, based on the hierarchical imposition of forms and content, to a control process of *asservissement machinique* where forms and content are immanently and continuously produced through the operation of cybernetic feedback loops (MP: 570-573). This new configuration of the discourses, practices and

function of the *collège* indicates the 'liquidation' of the school as a disciplinary institution, implied by Deleuze in 1990 (PP: 237), and marks the emergence of a dividual and modulatory institution of control within the French education system.

We will first consider how the intensification of the disciplinary exercise of power, which had led to the consolidation under the Third Republic of the separate disciplinary *dispositifs* each oriented towards a distinct *mot d'ordre* or strategic objective, identified in the previous chapter, continues through the inter-war period and into the post-war period and eventually leads to the emergence of the *collège* at the confluence of divergent disciplinary logics as they reach beyond the limitations of their preceding enclosures. This process of intensification manifests itself in the various efforts to extend the reach and efficiency of the action of each of these distinct disciplinary logics within French society beyond the limits of their respective disciplinary organisations. These limits will be shown to be first identified and problematised in public discourse in the pre-war period, with new concepts, including the notions of individual aptitudes, *orientation*, and, most importantly, an *école unique*, informing this debate in the inter-war years and highlighting the significant tensions that remain between the various logics of education. Proposals of this period would deploy these new concepts with the intention of intensifying the exercise of power in service of the various disciplinary logics but only some limited reforms referencing such proposals would be effected before the Second World War. Alongside broader economic demands on the education system in the context of post-war economic development in light of nascent theories of human capital, the immediate post-

war period saw a consolidation of the consensus that had emerged around the concept of an *école unique*, but dissensus regarding the nature of this single school system that reflected divergent objectives and led to political inaction during the Fourth Republic that was only broken with the dynamism of the new Fifth Republic. The 1959 Berthoin reform and the subsequent Fouchet-Capelle reform of 1963 that reorganised the *premier cycle* of secondary education, which corresponds to today's *collège*, represented an effort to intensify the exercise of power in service of the community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education that responded to the post-war consensus for reform, but also maintained the division of the school into separate disciplinary enclosures, which each responded to one of these logics, that had been seen in the separate disciplinary orders of the Third Republic. Alongside these reforms, the disciplinary structures and mechanisms of the education system were also developed throughout the 1960s, with the intention of ensuring the efficient function of the education system in such a way that they perfected a hierarchically organised *dispositif* converging towards the central authority of the state. However, despite these reforms, sociological accounts, such as those of Bourdieu and Passeron (1964; 1970), the spirit of the events of May 1968, and the new demands of the economic situation inspired critiques expressing the order-words of community, the individual or the economy to be directed towards the education system into the 1970s. These critiques increasingly highlighted the continued division of pupils between separate enclosures that actualised different disciplinary logics as an obstacle to the further intensification of the exercise of power in service of these order-words in response to these critiques and a broad consensus for the realisation of an

école unique emerged by the mid-1970s. These developments set the scene for, and make possible, the creation of the *collège* under Valery Giscard d'Estaing's presidency with the *loi Haby* of 11 July 1975.

If the *collège* is produced at the confluence of the community-centred, individual-centred and economy-centred disciplinary logics of education it does not, however, serve as a point of complete convergence for these logics, which remain divergent, and is durably marked from its creation as a dividual institution of control by a continuous modulation of these divergent logics that takes place within, and even defines, its institutional space. This enunciative refrain of a continuous modulation of different disciplinary logics will be shown to be present in the founding text of the *collège*, the *loi Haby* of July 1975, and the political and regulatory texts related to it, before its repetition is traced in subsequent policy texts and curricular developments, which all affirm the continuing importance of community-, individual- and economy-centred logics. The consistent re-affirmation of these conflicting disciplinary logics does not constitute a new disciplinary mould of the sort that developed under the Third Republic, however, as these logics seem, at least partially, incommensurate and the competition between them serves to perpetually undo such a distinct enclosure, as the continuing polarising debates frequently, and simplistically, depicted as being between various shades of supposed *républicains* and *pédagogues*, will show in their appeals to the order-words of community, individual and economy. This indistinct normative discourse that recurs in the frequent reforms of the *collège*, in which the distinct *mots d'ordre* of discipline become *mots de passe* and their separate disciplinary logics become 'figures chiffrées [...] d'une même entreprise' (PP: 243-245), points

towards the development of the *collège* as a dividual institution of control which remains, to use Jean-Luc Delahaye's (2013: 175) formula, 'une construction inachevée' with, to cite the *Haut Conseil de l'Éducation* (2010: 18), a poorly defined identity.[76]

This ambiguous definition of the *collège* by the central powers of the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale* will also lead us to consider how, since the establishment of this institution in the late 1970s, the *collège* develops a mode of operation that has departed from the model of hierarchically determined, fixed contours of an enclosure that converges vers 'un propriétaire' that is typical of a disciplinary institution and moved towards an irregular, localised model of governance that seeks and legitimises the input of stakeholders beyond the traditional agents of the centralised administration, a cybernetic organisation of control, produced and regulated by feedback loops, that operates as 'une même entreprise qui n'a plus que des gestionnaires' (PP: 245). Having underlined the desire to intensify the operation of the *collège* in the face of difficulties accommodating the unprecedented size and heterogeneity of its new pupil population that underpin this administrative reorganisation that reveals a shift from discipline to control, we will consider how certain measures promoting the delegation, decentralisation and localisation of school governance and the solicitation of previously external influences enacted since the 1980s introduce new dynamics of an emergent control system that operates through multiple cybernetic feedback loops. We will first consider how the reorganisation of *collèges* as *établissements public locaux d'enseignement* (EPLE), first fully codified in 1985 (Art. 15 of *loi 83-633*, modified by Art. 9

[76] For a brief overview of reforms of the *collège*, see Bulle (2012a) or Delahaye (2013).

of *loi 85-97*; *Décret 85-924*) and no longer responsible only to the central authority of the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale*, has encouraged a shared governance in association with each institution's local *communauté éducative*, notably through the regularly produced *projet d'établissement*, that has contributed to greater variation between *collèges* across France. Secondly, we will contrast the development of a quasi-market and encouragement of consumer activity within the education system since the 1980s, through which families express their own values and varying priorities, with the hierarchically organised *orientation* practices established in the early 1960s in order to underline the shift away from the disciplinary system predominantly functioning through *assujettissement social* and towards one of control operating primarily by *asservissement machinique* where the *collège* is modulated locally through feedback loops. This produces what Choukri Ben Ayed (2009) has called a 'nouvel ordre éducaitf local' and what Philippe Périer (2010) refers to as 'l'ordre scolaire négocié'.

The emergence and development of the *collège* will be seen to mark and manifest the shift from a number of distinct, individual disciplinary institutions actualising distinct normative mouldings to a single indistinct and constantly negotiated dividual *dispositif* of the modulation of control heralded by Gilles Deleuze. The product of the intensification (Nealon 2008) of the disciplinary exercise of power through initially distinct *dispositifs* oriented by separate order-words, what Foucault (2001: 299) understood as the process of 'perpétuel remplissement stratégique' of a *dispositif* in response to its over-determined strategic objectives, the *collège* constitutes a break with its antecedent disciplinary *dispositifs* in a number of ways. Firstly, as the result of

the confluence of divergent disciplinary logics of education, this institution no longer responds to a single distinct order-word but rather an unresolved and indistinct modulation of these *mots d'ordre* become *mots de passe*. Secondly, the pursuit of policies of decentralisation and the solicitation of user input that were intended to intensify the action of this new institution departs from the strict hierarchical organisation of the disciplinary edifice of the education system by establishing a new constantly negotiated and cybernetically modulated model of governance in the *collèges*. The new discursive and practical configuration of this school's *dispositif* thus indicates the 'liquidation' of the school, considered as a disciplinary institution, noted by Deleuze in 1990 (PP: 237).

I - The intensification of the three disciplines of education and the emergence of the *collège*

In this section of the chapter, we will examine the further development of the three disciplinary *dispositifs* of education that had emerged by the end of the Third Republic and that separately actualised the community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education responding to their distinct order-words and how the *collège* emerges in 1975 as the product of the same process of the intensification of the exercise of power (Nealon 2008), or 'perpetuel remplissement stratégique' of *dispositifs* of power (Foucault 2001: 299-300), that had previously produced these three disciplinary orders of education as shown in the previous chapter. A unified *école unique* for all pupils that had been posited as a means of intensifying the exercise of power in service of the

mots d'ordre of community, the individual and the economy since the inter-war period, the *collège*, when it is created in 1975, appears to offer a *dispositif* of power that could respond to the limitations on these exercises of power that had been identified and encountered by preceding *dispositifs*. Although the product of the continued intensification of disciplinary strategies of power, the *collège* will be shown in the following concluding section of the chapter to constitute a *dispositif* of power that no longer operates according to the diagram of disciplinary power, but rather actualises a diagram of control.

The following analysis will highlight how the intensification of the disciplinary exercise of power contributes to a reconfiguration of the disciplinary *dispositifs* of power themselves. For example, efforts to extend the disciplinary enclosure of one *dispositif*, through various mechanisms, so that its normalising action and gaze apply to a larger area, or a longer period of time, and a greater number of subjects, will be seen to encounter similar efforts from other such *dispositifs* responding to different order-words. These encounters will be seen to lead to a consensus regarding the deployment of certain strategies of power, such as organised practices of *orientation* or the idea of a common school for all pupils, but tensions regarding the order-word to which they should respond. This is the sort of undermining of the enclosure and hierarchical operation of the distinct moulds of disciplinary institutions by the disciplines of other institutions resulting from the intensification of disciplinary powers that we noted, in the first chapter, would eventually result from the tendency, identified by Foucault, for the strategies of disciplinary institutions to 'se "désinstitutionnaliser", à sortir des forteresses closes où ils fonctionnaient et à circuler à l'état "libre"' (SP: 246). The limitations

encountered following the creation of a, typically disciplinary, hierarchically organised central administration and the growing emphasis on the disciplinary principle of the modulation of sanctions according to individual cases to produce the greatest desired force or result will also be seen to contribute to the emergence of an institution of control as an intensification of disciplinary power is sought.

This analysis will be conducted in four parts that indicate different stages preceding the creation of the *collège*. First, we will examine the period preceding the Second World War that saw the emergence of a number of critiques of the tripartite education system of the Third Republic and important ideas for future reform. Second, the immediate post-war period up to the establishment of the Fifth Republic in 1958 will be examined as a period of intensive debate that built upon the ideas of the inter-war period and saw the emergence of a partial consensus for reform of the education system. Third, we will consider the period from the beginning of the Fifth Republic up to the mid-1960s in which the first major post-war reforms of the education system took place and examine how they intensified the operation of the educational *dispositif* while maintaining its disciplinary character. Fourth, the period from the mid-1960s to the creation of the *collège* in 1975 will be considered in order to highlight the critiques of the recent reforms and the emergence of a consensus leading to the creation of this unified French middle school.

The pre-war and inter-war periods will be examined together as the point at which a number of critiques of the limitations of the tripartite education system and proposals for its reform, seeking to intensify the exercise of power oriented by the *mots d'ordre* of community, the individual or the

economy, came to the fore, with the new concept of an *école unique* prefiguring the eventual emergence of the contemporary *collège* as an institution for all French pupils traversed by divergent disciplinary logics. Pre-war critiques identified the limitations on the exercise of power in service of these abstract strategic objectives through this system of education based on separate orders, in particular the limited reach of an underdeveloped technical education and the malthusian separation of a small elite from the rest of the community in an exclusive *enseignement secondaire*, and prompted the elaboration of proposals addressing these limits in the inter-war years. Amongst these proposals we will note the deployment of new notions, such as the idea, promoted by the theories of *l'Éducation nouvelle*, of the unique individuality of every child, who has their own unique interests and aptitudes, and the practice of, initially professional, *orientation* of pupils in response to their aptitudes, but we will give particular attention to the idea of an *école unique* to be attended by all French pupils. Focusing especially on the 1918 proposals of the *Compagnons de l'Université nouvelle*, we will highlight how plans for an *école unique*, by seeking to intensify the action of each of the community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education in one institutional arrangement serve to blur the carefully established boundaries between the different logics of education actualised in the separate educational *dispositifs* of the Third Republic as arguments oriented by the different order-words of these logics overlap in places to intersect on certain points. We will complete our consideration of this period by briefly detailing the dissensus regarding the various visions of an *école unique* brought forward that indicates

the continuing conflict between the three disciplinary logics considered, and the limited reforms achieved ahead of the Second World War.

Next, we will consider the immediate post-war period running from 1944 to 1958, in which the imperative of reconstructing the education system after the damage of the Second World War and the Vichy regime, and in the face of new demographic and economic pressures of post-war growth, rekindled the inter-war debates about educational reform that had centred upon the idea of an *école unique*. While, this new debate, which saw the proposal of fourteen projects for educational reform in as many years, did not result in any major reform of the education system at this time due to continuing rivalries between different orders of education, particularly the primary and secondary orders, and, to a lesser extent, political instability, it did contribute to a new consensus regarding the necessity of a reform of the education system and the principles that would guide it. We will examine the emblematic Langevin-Wallon plan of 1947 as a blueprint for the development of the education system and note how it places a renewed emphasis on a democratisation of education that does not just broaden potential access to more prestigious courses of education, but one which seeks to realise the individual potential of all pupils, and how it, again, prefigures a single *école unique* that actualises all the disciplinary logics of education within a single pedagogical space. We will then compare the various reform proposals of this period and present the consensus regarding the prolongation of compulsory education and the introduction of a *cycle d'orientation* for all pupils, based upon a partial or complete common core curriculum (*tronc commun*), that would enable the aptitudes of each pupil to be observed and used as a guide for their future

orientation within the education system, which would serve as the basis for future reforms. Finally, we will consider the adaptations of the different orders of primary, secondary and technical education that were enacted by regulatory texts in response to the massive increase in longer school studies of this period before highlighting the increasing emphasis placed on better education for economic growth, in light of emerging theories of human capital, and the scale of the ongoing inequalities revealed in this education system that underlined the consequent need for a rational and efficient system of *orientation* of pupils that would enable the simultaneous intensification of the exercise of power in service of the order-words of community, the individual and the economy.

Thirdly, we will examine the major educational reforms that were finally undertaken at the beginning of the Fifth Republic and show how they constituted an intensification of the exercise of power in service of the community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education through the completion of a unified, hierarchical and centrally administered disciplinary *dispositif* of education that integrated the three separate orders responding to the order-words of community, the individual, and, above all, the economy as still distinct enclosures within a unified system of education and organised the *orientation* of pupils between the various enclosures of the school system in function of these order-words. We will first show how the Berthoin reform of 1959 provided a somewhat minimal response to the consensus for reform established in the preceding decade by extending compulsory education to the age of 16, and by introducing an organised system of *orientation* that operated upon the basis of the observation of each pupil's individual aptitudes in a two-year *cycle d'orientation*, with a short and partial *tronc commun*, over the first

two years (*sixième* and *cinquième*) of the *premier cycle* of secondary education, which would continue to be taught in separate institutions responding to the divergent order-words of the preceding separate orders of education, a compromise measure in the face of continued rivalry between these orders. This new organisation will be shown as an effort to intensify the exercise of power in service of each of the community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education, but especially the third of these due to an emphasis on optimising human capital investments. We will note, however, the emergence of critiques of the system instituted by this reform, noting in particular that the all too brief period of observation and *orientation* in relation to a *tronc commun*, the separation of pupils across different institutions that maintained their separate character and the variable geographic spread of these institutions, contributed to an apparent failure of the *orientation* system to operate properly that perpetuated social inequalities. We will then show how the Fouchet-Capelle reform of 1963 sought to address these shortcomings and further intensify the exercise of power in service of the various, aforementioned logics of education through a new organisation of the *premier cycle du second degré*, which extended the process of observation and *orientation* to encompass all four of its years of study, and the introduction of a new a single polyvalent institution for the *premier cycle du second degré*, the *collège d'enseignement secondaire* (CES), which would bring together all pupils in a single institution, but maintain their separation amongst three distinct *filières* of study that continued to correspond to the three separate orders of education that each responded to a distinct order-word.

We will conclude the analysis of this period by highlighting the development, alongside these two reforms, of an integrated, hierarchically organised *dispositif* of administration and inspection that converged towards the central authority of the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale*, which indicated an intensification of the exercise of disciplinary power intended to operate in service of all three of the disciplinary logics actualised in the sytem of education that it administered. We will focus in particular on the administrative *quadrillage* of the French territory to construct a *carte scolaire* that would serve as a tool both to ensure the standardisation of the education system across France and to control the flow of pupils between the various enclosures of this system. This disciplinary *dispositif* of *orientation* will be seen to cut across the distinct disciplinary enclosures of the education system to ensure a distribution of pupils that responded to the order-words of community, the individual and the economy, and accorded with central recommendations, derived from the forecasts of the *Commissariat général du Plan*.

Finally, we will consider the period following these reforms, which begins in the mid-1960s and leads up to the creation of the *collège* in 1975. In this period we will trace the development and intensification of critiques of the disciplinary *dispositif* produced by the above reforms, as well as that of the proposals and reforms formulated to respond to these critiques, to show how the institution of a *collège unique*, which disposes of the distinct internal disciplinary enclosures actualising different logics of education that had persisted from the three separate orders of the Third Republic education system through to the separate *filières* of the CES, appears in 1975 as the necessary reform that would be able to intensify the exercise of power in service of the

order-words of community, the individual and the economy. We will begin by highlighting how the mid-1960s work of the *Institut national d'études démographiques* (INED) and of Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron, in particular, revealed how the school, through the cumulative effect of judgements and *orientations* of pupils in relation to a *culture scolaire* that expresses the culture of the dominant social group, served to advantage those from more privileged backgrounds and disadvantage those from less privileged backgrounds and thereby reproduce social hierarchies. We will then emphasise how the institution of the CES, by bringing all the *filières* together in one location, made these inequalities more visible and highlighted the least-favoured, vocationally-oriented third *filière* of the *premier cycle du second degré* as a course of relegation. Next we will consider the broader movement for educational reform revealed at the Amiens colloquium of March 1968 that had developed alongsde these critiques and which denounced the selective, authoritarian process of *orientation*, the separation of *filières* within the education system and the traditional models of pedagogy and *culture scolaire* derived from *l'enseignement secondaire*, promoting instead the removal of divisions between *filières*, an opening up of the school and its curriculum to its environment and the adoption of pedagogies that are adapted to the needs and interests of pupils. We will then analyse governmental efforts to develop pedagogical and curricular reform in response to these critiques that had been initiated before the events of May 1968, before examining the continuation of these efforts thereafter, which served notably to remove barriers between the first and second *filières* of the CES.

Although a conservative reaction followed the radical, reformist spirit of the events of 1968 and, as we will show, resulted in some efforts under the Pompidou presidency to reassert the hierarchical authority of the Ministry of Education and the normative divisions between the *filières* of the *premier cycle*, it will be shown that the effect of these attempts were minimal and that the general movement of reform, which continued to promote curricular reform, as well as the abolition of distinct *filières*, and deployment of more active pedagogies, inspired by *L'Éducation nouvelle* continued nonetheless. Indeed, it will be shown that in the early 1970s, in the context of intensified critiques regarding the divisive operation of the school and renewed reflection upon the economic contribution of education, a political consensus regarding the creation of a unified middle school as the means of further intensifying the operation of the educational *dispositif* in service of the order-words of community, the individual and the economy had developed, even if it continued to face the opposition from those agents invested in separation of the different orders of education. It is in these circumstances, following Valéry Giscard d'Estaing's promise of such a reform during his successful presidential election campaign in 1974, that the *loi Haby* of 11 July 1975 that would establish the contemporary *collège* was devised and promulgated. The constitution and development of this *collège* as an institution of control rather than discipline will be presented in the final section of the chapter.

Pre-war and inter-war periods: Identifying the limits of discipline and developing strategies of intensification

As previously demonstrated in relation to the development of the EPS, the inter-war period that would constitute the final years of the Third Republic saw the consolidation of community-centred primary education, individual-centred secondary education and economy-centred technical or professional education in distinct institutional enclosures that were carefully maintained separate in the years between the First and Second World Wars. However, in this period and the decades immediately preceding the First World War, we can also see the beginning of serious debate regarding the organisation of public education in France into separate disciplinary *dispositifs* that divided different sections of France's youth amongst themselves and the initial formulations of an *école unique* that would be attended by all French pupils, regardless of socio-economic background; an idea that would eventually find expression in the form of the *collège* established by the *loi Haby* of 1975.

The debates that take place in this period will be shown to express a continuation of the same efforts to intensify the exercise of power in service of the three logics of education, guided by the *mots d'ordre* of community, the individual and the economy, that had produced the distinct disciplinary orders of the system that it now put into question, as critiques identified the delimited field of action of these various logics within their current disciplinary boundaries as a restriction to be overcome or extended and sought to mobilise new and more efficient strategies and discourses to intensify the action of these logics. This leads to the emergence of proposals for an *école unique* for all pupils that indicates the tendency for the divergent logics of education, each

seeking to intensify their operation by extending beyond their initial enclosures, to eventually overlap in a single space that prefigures the problematic of today's *collège* as a modulatory, dividual institution of control.

In the following we will examine the pre-war period and inter-war period in turn. We will first highlight how the pre-war decades saw the identification of limits on the exercise of power in service of the order-words of community, the individual and the economy in the disciplinary *dispositifs* whose development we traced in the previous chapter and the initial proposals to intensify the exercise of power guided by each of these educational logics that were presented in this period. We will then examine the intense debate regarding reform of the educational system to better respond to the *mots d'ordre* of community, the individual and the economy that took place in the inter-war years, focusing in particular on the various proposals for an *école unique* that promised to achieve such an intensification. The points of consensus regarding such a unified school will be highlighted, as well as those points of divergence between different plans for such reform before, with reference to the proposals of the *Compagnons de l'Université nouvelle*, we underline both the tendency for divergent logics of education to overlap as the exercise of power in their service intensifies represented by the concept of an *école unique* and the divergent tensions within such an institution that prefigure the emergence of the *collège* as a modulatory *dispositif* of control. How this debate saw the development of new discourses and practices that were mobilised towards these ends of intensification, notably those of *orientation* and *l'Éducation nouvelle*, will also be discussed and the concrete reforms undertaken before the outbreak of the Second World War will be

examined in relation to the problematic of the intensification of the exercise of power. In each period we will highlight the political and pedagogical divisions that frustrate major reform and ultimately leave the question of educational reform to be returned to in the post-war Fourth Republic.

A - Pre-war critiques and the identification of limits to the order-based status quo

As Prost (1968: 406) and Chapoulie (2010: 275-290) indicate, although serious public debate regarding an alternative to the tripartite construction of the education system would only really commence after the First World War, critiques of this system and its unequal outcomes had begun to emerge at the turn of the century. These critiques setting the scene for such future debates were expressed from perspectives responding to the order-words of community, the individual and the economy by partisans of the various orders of education actualising a disciplinary logic oriented by these *mots d'ordre*, *l'enseignement primaire*, *l'enseignement secondaire* and *l'enseignement technique ou professionnel* respectively, and identified the major limitations on these *dispositifs* that constituted obstacles to the intensification of these logics as the various orders of education competed with each other to extend their field of action (see Chapoulie 2010: 180-187). Beginning with technical education before moving on to the secondary and then primary orders of education, we will consider in turn what obstacles were identified to the intensification of the each disciplinary logic actualised by these institutions and the responses to them that were formulated in the final decade of the nineteenth century and the first fourteen years of the twentieth century.

In the context of an apparent *crise d'apprentissage* that indicated a shortage of skilled labour and was increasingly debated into the new century (Lembré 2016: 41-42), the limited development of professional or technical education and the failure of both primary and secondary education to cater for the needs of the industrialising economy led to arguments in favour of the more regular organisation and further extension of economy-centred vocational education, which would eventually bear fruit in the establishment of *l'enseignement technique et professionnel* as a distinct and centrally organised order of education in the inter-war years, shown in the previous chapter. As we will see, this development of technical education was built upon a more radical ambition that sought the orientation of the entire education system towards economic demands.

The years preceding the First World War saw a continuation of the rivalry between the *ministère de l'Instruction publique* and the *ministère du Commerce et de l'Industrie* regarding the control and nature of post-elementary education, in which the latter sought to expand the economy-centred *enseignement technique et professionnel* to provide a predominantly technical education responding to the demands of the economy and the former promoted *l'enseignement primaire supérieur* and its predominantly general education (Lembré 2016: 41-47; Prost 1968: 308-310; Lelièvre 1990: 153-165; Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 180-195). The full transfer of the control of the most vocationally oriented EPS to the *ministère du Commerce et de l'Industrie* as EPCI that ended the shared governance of these institutions in 1892 did not end this competition between the orders of primary and technical education for

pupils with each ministry seeking to convince local authorities to pursue the transformation of their local EPS into an EPCI, or vice versa, to extend their network of institutions (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 181-182). June 1902 saw the creation of the *Association française pour le développement de l'enseignement technique* (AFDET), which brought together parliamentarians, civil servants, industrialists, workers and others who were partisans of technical education under the authority of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry to produce coherent policy platforms, and to promote a technical education organised under its own distinct and explicitly economy-oriented administration rather than a general education organised by the *ministère de l'Instruction publique* (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 183-184; Chapoulie 2010: 246-252; Lembré 2016: 46). The 1902 creation of an opposing force to the AFDET in the form of a *Groupe de l'enseignment* in the *Chambre des deputés* that would support the order of primary education and seek to frustrate the initiatives of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry underlined this continuing rivalry (Chapoulie 2010: 285-286).

The period preceding the Great War also saw the proposal of the reform responding to the limited capacity and efficiency of technical education that would eventually become the 1919 *loi Astier*, which had been developed by Placide Astier in relation to his vision of an extension of the economy-centred logic to the whole education system. As seen in the previous chapter, this law consolidated various pre-war innovations, such as the CAP (Art. 47), initially created under the name of *Certificat de capacité professionnelle* by a *Décret* of 24 October 1911, the inspectorate of technical education (Art. 7) organised by the *Arrêté* of 9 December 1899, and the local *comités de*

l'enseignement technique (Art. 8 and 9) instituted by a decree of 24 October 1911, to codify a centralised disciplinary organisation of *l'enseignement technique et professionnel*, and also sought to extend this order of education to include compulsory *cours professionnels* for those under 18 years old employed in business and industry with the aim of addressing the perceived insufficient technical education of those leaving primary education (Lelièvre 1990: 163-166; Lembré 2016: 45-47). This law was the fruit of parliamentary debates that took place between 1900 and 1916 and carries the name of Astier,[77] who, as a *député*, had been the active and committed *rapporteur* of the *projet de loi* seeking to organise and extend vocational education that had been proposed by the *ministre du Commerce, de l'Industrie, des Postes et Télégraphes* Fernand Dubief in 1905 and, as a senator, had continued to pursue this issue, proposing, in 1913, the project developed from Dubief's initial proposal that would become the *loi Astier* in 1919, after Astier's death in 1918 (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 80; Prost 1968: 312; Chapoulie 2010: 252-253).

As Claude Lelièvre (1990: 164-166) suggests, Astier's crucial engagement with this issue expressed his preoccupation with orienting the action of the education system in general towards the needs of the economy. Summarising the argument he made with his co-author and close collaborator Isidore Cuminal in a 1909 text on technical education in France and elsewhere, Astier argued in the *Revue politique et parlementaire* of December 1913 that '[l]'intérêt bien entendu de la nation commande […] de constituer fortement tous les cadres de l'armée économique' and outlined how various degrees of education would be oriented towards this goal:

[77] Placide Astier (1856-1918) was an ex-pharmacist who served as a *député* for the *Parti radical* from 1898 to 1910 when he became a senator, a position he held until his death on 6 March 1918 (Chapoulie 2010: 252).

> L'enseignement technique supérieur […] formera les officiers supérieurs, ingénieurs, chimistes, physiciens, chefs de maison, exportateurs, banquiers […] L'enseignement secondaire formera les sous-officiers, contremaîtres, petits patrons, artisans, représentants de commerce […] collaborateurs précieux qui assurent l'harmonie entre la production et la consommation, entre le capital et le travail. L'enseignement élémentaire formera la foule innombrable des soldats […] ouvriers de toutes professions, employés de toute catégorie […] dont l'activité naturellement intelligente pourrait, servie des connaissances appropriées, donner de merveilleux résultats et recevoir aussi une meilleure rémunération. (quoted in Lelièvre 1990: 165)

Astier and Cuminal's 1909 text presenting this militarised vision of a general mobilisation of educational institutions for economic production was one of the works most cited by partisans of technical and professional education in the debates leading to the passage of the *loi Astier* (Chapoulie 2010: 245; Lelièvre 1990: 165). Although this law merely belatedly established the centralised and codified *dispositif* of *l'enseignement technique et professionnel* and sought to extend this economy-centred education to those under 18 years old in employment, the arguments responding to the *mot d'ordre* of economy that animated the pre-war debates leading to this reform already demonstrated an implicit critique of the tripartite structure of the Third Republic education system that limited the application of an economy-centred logic of education.

In addition to these arguments for the intensification of an economy-centred education through the extension and more complete and regular organisation of *l'enseignement technique,* the pre-war years also saw tensions regarding the limitations and extension of the community-centred *enseignement primaire* and the individual-centred *enseignement secondaire*. The rivalry between these two orders of education, which each seemed to present the other as an obstacle to its own development and flourishing, saw the emergence of arguments from each side that questioned the legitimacy of their competitor and argued for the maintenance or extension of their own disciplinary enclosures to intensify the actualisation of their own distinct disciplinary logics of education.[78]

The development under the Third Republic of a complete and separate order of primary education, offering classes for pupils aged from 6 to 18 years old in its various institutions, alongside the longer established institutions of secondary education meant that the two separate groups of institutions had to compete with each other for pupils. In this contest, the free and less abstract education of the *l'enseignement primaire*, which offered multiple diplomas to sanction varying lengths of study, tended to prove more attractive and plausible for many families than the elitist, expensive, selective and long education leading to the *baccalauréat* offered by the institutions of *l'enseignement secondaire*. The popular success of the institutions of primary education left many high-level administrators and policymakers concerned for the maintenance of a national network of *collèges* and *lycées* into the twentieth century (Lelièvre 1990: 130-133).

[78] For a more thorough account of the debates described in the following paragraphs, see Dubois (2007) and Mole (2007).

Viviane Isambert-Jamati (1985) shows that personnel and advocates of *l'enseignement secondaire* responded to this competition in the 1890s by reaffirming the superiority of the *culture scolaire* of secondary education as the only proper education that can fully realise a pupil's potential in contrast to the supposed mediocrity of primary education and the dogmatism, incompetence and ignorance of its teachers, a pattern that, she argues, would continue throughout the twentieth century whenever the elite secondary tradition of education was felt to be at risk of supposed contamination from primary education and a consequent "lowering of standards." Advocates of the legitimate division into separate orders of those considered the most capable pupils and those considered less capable argued that the full realisation of individual pupils' capacities could only be achieved by the long and abstract *enseignement secondaire* and would just be frustrated by *l'enseignement primaire* whose curriculum and mix of pupils could only result in a limited and mediocre development of the best pupils (Dubois 2007; Mole 2007: 25-26). An E. Valran writing in the *Revue de l'enseignement secondaire* in 1891, for example, noted therefore that the EPS drained away 'une partie des élèves capables de suivre les lycées et collèges' and should therefore be considered 'nos adversaires, voire nos ennemis [… qui] usurpent audacieusement la place d'un enseignement qu'ils affectent de traiter en rival' (quoted in Isambert-Jamati 1985: 63).

In accordance with this argument supporting both the enclosure and the individual-centred vocation of secondary education a number of ministerial and local actions sought to both reinforce this enclosure and recruit more talented pupils in this period. The *ministère de l'Instruction publique* took

measures in the 1890s to favour the recruitment of the best pupils to *l'enseignement secondaire*, such as the reform of the means by which *bourses* were attributed from 1893 onwards and the *proviseurs* of *lycées* and *principaux* of *collèges* undertook local recruitment campaigns in conjunction with appeals from the inspectorate to orient talented pupils towards *l'enseignement secondaire* (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 378-380; Chapoulie 2010: 277; Lelièvre 1990: 131). The incorporation with equal status of the modern humanities, which had developed from the shorter and more practical course of *l'enseignement secondaire spécial* established in the 1860s by Victor Duruy that emphasised the sciences and modern languages over the classical study of Latin and Greek, into the *baccalauréat*-sanctioned courses of *l'enseignement secondaire* that was achieved by the decree of 4 June 1891 and the 31 May 1902 reform of secondary education can also be considered as part of efforts to intensify the action of the individual-centred logic of education enacted by this secondary order in that it assured that this modern course of study, which, as Maurice Couyba argued as part of the parliamentary commission on secondary education that prepared the 1902 reform, had proven to be more popular with families than the classical course of secondary education and thereby broadened the appeal of *lycées* and *collèges* to families considering sending their children to EPS, was fully integrated into *l'enseignement secondaire* (Chapoulie 2010: 131-135, 227-228). These arguments and actions indicate a critique of other orders of education as incapable of achieving the full realisation of the individual pupil, and a wish to intensify the action of *l'enseignement secondaire* in French society, ensuring the enclosure of the secondary schools against competing disciplinary logics

while extending its individual-centred disciplinary logic to more pupils who were considered capable at the expense of *l'enseignement primaire* and *l'enseignement technique et professionnel*.

Also at the turn of the century, partisans of the community-centred disciplinary logic of education actualised in *l'enseignement primaire* began to dispute the separation of the two orders of education, defended and asserted by the advocates of secondary education, on the basis that the segregative *enseignement secondaire* impeded the fostering of community that was the primary goal of *l'enseignement primaire* and so sought to intensify the action of disciplinary power in service of the *mot d'ordre* of community through the extension of this primary order of education. The inequality reproduced by the isolation in the institutions of *l'enseignement secondaire* of a relatively small, and largely privileged, segment of French society able to afford the long, abstract and fee-paying course of secondary education prompted partisans of *l'enseignement primaire* to argue for *l'égalité devant l'instruction*, notably through an integration of the *classes élémentaires* of the *lycées* and *collèges* into the free elementary primary schools and a better articulation of longer secondary studies with this primary education, to achieve a more thorough and extensive actualisation of the community-centred disciplinary logic that gave this order of education its primary orientation (Chapoulie 2010: 275-290).

The startling inequality to which those advocating the extension of primary education were responding is evident in the stagnation between 1881 and the start of the First World War of the number of pupils attending the post-elementary classes of *l'enseignment secondaire* in the context of a wider increase in the number of pupils attending classes beyond the compulsory age

of thirteen and the tiny proportion of each age group in this period gaining the prestigious *baccalauréat*. In 1881 there were 73,500 boys and girls attending the public post-elementary classes of *l'enseignement secondaire* and although this number had increased to 85,100 in 1911, this later figure is inflated by the large increase in the number of girls attending these classes since the creation of public secondary education for girls by the *loi Sée* of 21 December 1880 and the number of boys in these classes in 1911 had in fact fallen by 6,200 to 67,000. In the same period, the number of boys and girls attending post-elementary classes in EPS and CC increased almost fourfold from 24,200 in 1881 to 87,900 in 1911, a figure to which we might add the 12,800 pupils attending EPCI in 1911 (Prost 1968: 328-329, 346).[79] The restricted access to *l'enseignement scolaire*, indicated by this stagnation in numbers in the context of an increasingly schooled population, and the inequality this creates is all the more apparent when we consider the large number of pupils in an age group who did not pursue education at all beyond the compulsory age of thirteen and the tiny proportion of each age cohort that achieved the prestigious qualification of the *baccalauréat*, which was required for access to the most prestigious civil service positions and institutions of higher education and could only be achieved at the age of eighteen at the end of a long education in *l'enseignement secondaire*.[80] In 1881 only 1% of an age cohort received the *baccalauréat* and this figure had only risen to 1.1% of the cohort in 1911 (Lelièvre 1990: 128-129).

[79] Figures for the number of pupils attending equivalent institutions to the EPCI in 1881 are not available in Prost's (1968: 346) data, but there were 1,700 male and female pupils in EPCI in 1893, the earliest date given.

[80] Edmond Goblot famously referred to the *baccalauréat* as 'la barrière et le niveau' that distinguished the French bourgeoisie in his 1925 text of the same name. See Lelièvre (1990: 129); Prost (1968: 331-332).

The separation of this small privileged group who attended *l'enseignement secondaire* from the rest of the nation's children that resulted from the division of the education system into three separate orders came to be identified as an obstacle to the actualisation of the community-centred logic of education that guided primary education as the nineteenth century entered its last decade and lead to proposals, in the first decade of the twentieth century, that sought to address this problem by extending *l'enseignement primaire* at the expense of the enclosure and jurisdiction of the *lycées* and *collèges* of secondary education. Dubois (2007: 18) credits Édouard Maneuvrier as the first to publish a critique of the organisation of education by separate orders that had developed under the Third Republic as an organisation contrary to the democratic, egalitarian principles of the Republic. In his 1887 text *L'Éducation de la bourgeoisie sous la République*, Maneuvrier argued against the order-based organisation of education which demands a separation of children from an early age in schools offering different educations and prospects, thereby undermining the cohesion of the community: 'Ainsi, on prépare l'antagonisme des classes et on perpétue la règne de la discorde sociale' (in Dubois 2007: 17). He affirmed instead that '[l]a condition même de la démocratie, c'est la fusion des classes dans la grande idée de la patrie et de la solidarité communes' (in Dubois 2007: 18) and therefore proposed teaching all children up to the age of fourteen in an *école primaire* that would enable seamless entry to further secondary studies.

Ferdinand Buisson eventually built upon his 1887 appreciation of Maneuvrier's contribution as 'une sorte d'idéal encore lointain' (in Dubois 2007: 18) and would become the first major figure in the founding of the

republican school of Jules Ferry to argue against the social segregation enacted by the distinction between primary and secondary orders of education, going on to propose, just before the First World War, the first reform outlining a wholesale reorganisation of the education system composed of separate orders that intended to extend the community-centred logic of *l'enseignement primaire* at the expense of secondary education, which was depicted as an obstacle to forging the republican community (Barreau and Garcia 1998: 7; Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 394-398; Chapoulie 2010: 275-276, 288). Having left in 1896 the position of *directeur de l'enseignement primaire* to which Jules Ferry had appointed him in 1879, Buisson gave evidence in 1899 to the parliamentary commission on *l'enseignement secondaire,* which was preparing what would become the 1902 reform of secondary education, and stated that the current division between the orders of primary and secondary education was illegitimate and based upon the criteria of socio-economic status rather than merit, which left the secondary order of education only accessible to 'des enfants d'une certaine condition' (in Chapoulie 2010: 275-276). Becoming a *député* for the *Parti radical-socialiste* in 1902, a role he would hold until 1914 and again from 1919 to 1924, Buisson built upon this critique and went on to unsuccessfully propose a reform in 1910 that envisioned a transformation of the education system into a system built upon three successive *cycles,* in which the first *cycle* for pupils aged 6 to 11 years old would take place for all pupils in one type of institution, an 'école d'égalité' (in Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 396) requiring the closure of the elementary classes of the *lycées* and *collèges,* and opening access to a range of varied institutions of the second *cycle* that would provide a variation on an education described as 'générale et commune'

(in Mole 2007: 29) up to the age of 14 years old, thereby completing the extended period of compulsory education, which could be followed by more specialised studies in the optional third *cycle*. This proposal sought to ensure an equal respect for every child's right to a 'développement normal' unencumbered by obstacles, such as the elitist division between secondary and primary education, that it described as unjust and antisocial (in Mole 2007: 29) by teaching all pupils in the first *cycle* in the same classrooms. This measure was intended to enable a more intense and extensive actualisation of the community-centred logic of education through the fostering of what Buisson describes as 'un sentiment d'égalité que la dissemblance des carrières ne détruit pas' (in Mole 2007: 31). This 1910 proposition failed to even pass to a parliamentary debate and met again with the same failure in 1913 when it was re-proposed with only the slightest of alterations by Buisson (Mole 2007: 32; Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 394-398), yet it demonstrated the development of arguments and proposals in the pre-war period that sought to surpass the current limitations on the action of *l'enseignement primaire* and intensify the exercise of power in service of the *mot d'ordre* of community that oriented this primary order of the Third Republic education system.

The debates considered above demonstrate the continuing development of arguments and proposals that seek to intensify the exercise of power in service of the given *mots d'ordre* of community, the individual and the economy, which, as discussed in the previous chapter, had earlier produced the disciplinary *dispositifs* of *l'enseignement primaire*, *l'enseignement secondaire* and *l'enseignement technique et professionnel* to actualise the community-centred, individual-centred and economy-centred logics of education

respectively. In each of the arguments, debates or proposals above, the agencies invested in and by the discourses and practices of each of these *dispositifs* seek to more fully realise the strategic objective or *mot d'ordre* that guides them by extending the field of operation of the relevant disciplinary *dispositif* or ensuring a more thorough saturation of its field of operation. For the economy-centred technical and professional education this included the extension of technical education to a wider segment of society through the development of more EPCI and of *cours professionnel*, the development of a hierarchically organised and enclosed *dispositif* of technical education with a specifically technical or professional curriculum in its institutions, and suggestions of extending the economy-centred logic of education to the whole education system. For the individual-centred secondary education this involved measures to ensure a broader recruitment of the best pupils from primary education to pursue secondary education and the assertion of the superiority of the *culture générale* of this education against any concessions to the supposed mediocrity of a primary education thought to constitute an obstacle to the objective of achieving the full realisation of each individual pupil. Finally, for *l'enseignement primaire* oriented by the order-word of community this was manifested in the promotion of EPS against EPCI and *lycées* or *collèges*, and the proposal of disposing of the elementary classes of *l'enseignement secondaire* to teach all pupils together in an institution of primary education.

These debates demonstrating a concern for the intensification of the exercise of power in service of community, the individual and the economy would continue to develop in the following decades, but resulted in few alterations of the established system in the pre-war period, with the exception

of the groundwork completed for the organisation of *l'enseignement technique et professionnel* under what would become the 1919 *loi Astier* and perhaps the 1902 reform of secondary education. This lack of concrete action can partly be understood as a consequence of the antagonism between the partisans of each order of education, indicated above in the competition between the primary and secondary orders of education for pupils and the rivalry between the *ministère de l'Instruction publique* and the *ministère du Commerce et de l'Industrie* for the extension of EPS or EPCI, but also finds further explanation in the political landscape of the time.

Indeed, the question of such reform of the school was overshadowed in the opening years of the twentieth century by more pressing concerns regarding the issue of *laïcité* in light of the recent Dreyfus affair and the separation of church and state in December 1905,[81] but a lack of political consensus also constituted an obstacle to reform. As Mole (2007: 23-27) notes, despite significant interest and support from parts of the *Parti radical*, educational reforms in this period, such as those proposed by Buisson in 1910 and 1913, also faced the challenge of political positions on the left and right that supported the order-based status quo and sought to maintain the enclosure of the separate disciplinary *dispositifs* of the tripartite system. Indeed, conservative republicans saw the inequalities reproduced by the division

[81] The exclusion of any members of religious congregations from running or teaching in any private or public primary or secondary school introduced by the laws of 1 July 1901 (Art. 13 to 18) and then of 7 July 1904 can be seen as an intensification of the exercise of power in servce of the community-centred logic of education, by asserting the central authority of the state over the space of the school and seeking to exclude the influence of another authority and their alternative norm of community in favour of the Republic and its republican norm of community. As our concern here is to trace the intensification of the exercises of power actualising different logics of education in the public education system that is dominant today, however, the question of the development of private education, including religious institutions is a subject too large to be comprehensively covered within the scope of this study. For more on the debates regarding *laïcité* and their relation to education in the pre-war period see Ozouf (1963: 191-255) and Prost (1968: 202-210).

between these orders of education to be the legitimate and inevitable result of the naturally unequal distribution of talents in society and thought that each of the orders of education provided an education appropriate to the talents of the pupils attending it, thereby helping to prevent the perils of *déclassement*, briefly discussed in the previous chapter, where pupils might unsuccessfully seek to escape their class or position of origin to gain another position for which they are not suited, sufficiently talented or acceptable. The socialist Left were also wary of *déclassement*, but as a drain on the strength of the working classes or a betrayal of one's class for individual gain, and, in the absence of a revolution that abolished social hierarchies and ensured respect for the dignity of all work, the SFIO, by default, defended the organisation of the education system by separate orders as the integrity of the *école primaire* as a school for the working class had to be preserved (Mole 2007: 24-27).

B - Inter-war debates: Emergent discourses and practices for a postponed *école unique*

The question of major educational reform only became a topic of concentrated and serious public debate and political reflection following the shock of the First World War and the publication at the end of the war of a number of texts calling for such reform that drew their inspiration and urgency from their authors' experience of this conflict. The proposals of these texts coalesced around the idea of an *école unique* that would ensure a democratisation of education, understood at this time as the extension of access to all courses of education to all pupils and the just selection of elites through this education, not based on one's socio-economic background but rather on

individual merit (Prost 1997: 52-53). These plans for reform demonstrated some points of consensus, but also presented conceptualisations of an *école unique* that differed significantly on numerous points of ambition, organisation and orientation. In order to achieve the goal of a democratisation of education, these proposals drew upon emerging ideas regarding the pupil as an individual with unique aptitudes and interests and the *orientation* of pupils according to these aptitudes, which would highlight new and enduring tensions between community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education. Each of these projects for education reform will be seen, however, to constitute an effort to intensify one, two or all three of these logics of education beyond the limits identified in the pre-war period above and also demonstrate a significant tendency for these divergent logics to overlap in the single space of an *école unique* as one seeks to extend the exercise of power in service of these beyond the limits of their initial disciplinary enclosures. This project of an *école unique* and the tendency towards the overlapping of divergent disciplinary logics in its single space would be pursued after World War Two and eventually lead to the creation of the contemporary *collège*, but less than unanimous support for such reforms and the re-iteration of a number of opposing arguments from the pre-war period meant that there would only be limited and temporary realisations of this project in the inter-war period before the defeat of the Third Republic and the installation of Marshall Philippe Pétain's *État français*.

The inter-war debate regarding educational reform was made both possible and necessary by the impact of the First World War, which served to soften some opposition to reform and underlined the limitations of the current

system that needed to be addressed. The experiences and suffering of those who served in the trenches alongside each other in an army that cut across boundaries of class, politics and religion strengthened a sense of national community beyond these divisions and led to both widespread calls for a more equal and just school, sometimes thought of as a debt of social justice owed by the nation to those who fought in the war, and a temporary softening of the debates regarding *laïcité* that had dominated issues of education at the turn of the century (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 403-404; Prost 1968: 406-407). Furthermore, the death of over 1.3 million French soldiers, including a disproportionate number of officers, who represented the intellectual and cultural elite and many skilled professionals, such as engineers and teachers, posed the challenges of developing technical education to help revive the post-war economy, broadening the recruitment of *l'enseignement secondaire* to rebuild the intellectual and cultural elite, and devising a more efficient organisation of education to operate, at least temporarily, with a reduced body of teaching personnel (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 404; Talbott 1969: 35-36; Lembré 2016: 57-58).

Public debate developed, however, from the publication of a number of articles calling for educational reform that provoked serious debate throughout the inter-war period, in particular a number of articles written in favour of an *école unique* by a group of young *professeurs* from secondary and higher education who had served together as officers during the war and called themselves *Les Compagnons de l'Université nouvelle*.[82] These articles, first published in 1918 and then subsequently collected into two volumes in 1918

[82] For more on the composition and initial work of the *Compagnons*, see Talbott (1969: 34-44).

and 1919 under the title *L'Université nouvelle*,[83] were not the only contributions calling for the establishment of an *école unique* to be published directly after the war, but the *Compagnons*' articles reached a large audience, imposing the common reference to the term *école unique*, which had been adapted from the German term *Einheitsschule* that had developed in similar debates regarding German education before the First World War (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 402-403), rather than the pre-war terminology of *égalité devant l'instruction*, and fostered public debate on the issue (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 403-408; Chapoulie 2010: 290-293; Prost 1968: 406-407).

The broad nature of this debate and the seriousness of reflection on the issue of structural reform of the education system is attested to by the range of state and non-state actors that took part in this debate. Noting that student and parent associations, teachers' unions, Masonic and catholic organisations, political parties and the press all made their own contributions to this debate, Barreau and Garcia (1998: 8) quote one commentator named Jean-Albert Bédé writing in 1931 about the wide participation in this debate between 1919 and 1924 in particular: 'profanes et spécialistes, candidats et électeurs, chacun se crut le droit et le devoir de donner son opinion.' The engagement of political figures, often, but not only, of the *Parti radical*, which pronounced itself in favour of an *école unique* at its 1920 congress in Strasbourg, such as Hippolyte Ducos,[84] Édouard Herriot[85] and, of course, Ferdinand Buisson,[86] as well as

[83] For information on these articles and collected volumes, see Chapoulie (2010: 290-293); Decaunes and Cavalier (1962: 59-60); and Barreau and Garcia (1998: 5-6).

[84] Ducos reported on debates regarding the *école unique* whenever the education budget was debated, but Prost (1968: 407, 410, 428) doubts his commitment to reform, citing his later support for the order-based status quo in a 1932 text.

[85] Herriot, future leader of the first *Cartel des gauches* in power from 1924 to 1926, was amongst the first to contact the *Compagnons* in support of their project. *Rapporteur* of the *Parti radical*'s programme at its 1907 Nancy conference that had been supportive of more equal access to education, he repeated this commitment when he became leader of the party in

administrators, such as Paul Lapie, the *directeur de l'enseignement primaire* from 1911 to 1925, ensured that this debate would have a bearing on the formulation of policy, especially when the *Cartel des gauches* came to power in 1924 and both launched a number of initiatives and founded, in March 1925, a *Comité d'études et d'action pour l'école unique* presided by Buisson, which also included René Capitant, who would go on to be the Minister of Education in the post-war provisional government from August 1944 to November 1945, and Paul Langevin, who would head the post-war commission on educational reform that would, in 1947, publish the highly influential *Plan Langevin-Wallon* after his death (Barreau and Garcia 1998: 9). Thirty-three associations would contribute to the work of this committee before its proposals, which Decaunes and Cavalier saw as a less ambitious adaptation of the ideas of the *Compagnons*, were published in 1927, only to be subsequently overlooked (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 72-75).

As we will reassert below, there was not universal support for such a reform and not all participants in these debates supported the same ideal of an *école unique*, however, amongst those that did support the movement for reform, there were a number of points of consensus that, alongside references to the aftermath of the First World War as the authors' motivation, would feature in every proposed reform. These agreed aspects of the *école unique* underlined an interest in intensifying the exercise of power in response to the

---

1919. He dedicated a chapter to the question of an *école unique* in his 1919 book *Créer* and supported a reconstruction of the school during the education budget debates of 1921 (Barreau and Garcia 1998: 9; Talbott 1969: 54-57).

[86] As its president, Buisson led the *Ligue de l'enseignement*, an organisation, largely oriented by the community-centred logic of education, which had been established to promote *laïcité* in education in 1866 and still exists today, to adopt the principles expressed by the *Compagnons* in 1919 and assured the support of the *Ligue des droits de l'homme* for such reforms as president of this organisation in 1921 (Barreau and Garcia 1998: 8).

challenges of the period and also indicated the ground upon which further debate regarding the *école unique* would take place.

Firstly, all those supporting an *école unique* critiqued the current division of the French school into separate competing orders as irrational, wasteful, and pedagogically illegitimate and supported its replacement with a more rational organisation based on successive degrees. The boundaries of these degrees would, however, remain a subject of debate and vary from project to project (Prost 1968: 408). Perhaps the clearest instance of this critique can be found in Paul Lapie's contribution to the debate, published in 1922 in the *Revue pédagogique* of February 1922 under the pseudonym André Duval, in which, having reformed the EPS curriculum to bring it closer to that of the modern humanities course of the *lycées* and *collèges* with his own *arrêtés* and *décret* of 18 August 1920 as we saw in the previous chapter, he questions the distinction between the modern humanities courses of *l'enseignement secondaire* and the general course of *l'enseignement primaire supérieur*, and that between the EPCI of *l'enseignement technique* and the, largely underfunded, vocational sections that EPS had been required to open since 1909, also discussed in the previous chapter (see Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 193-194; Lapie 1998: 75-76). Decrying what he sees as such an excessive separation of orders in the education system, Lapie (1998: 76) goes on to ask rhetorically '[s]ans la séparation des "ordres", croit-on que nous aurions tant de doubles emplois dans nos programmes, notre matériel et notre personnel?' In place of this Lapie (1998: 78-79) proposes the organisation of education according to four successive levels that extend from the beginning of elementary education to the completion of higher education, which are based

on pupils' psychological development as indicated by their age. This line of thought addresses the challenge of a reduced body of teachers following the First World War and also serves the purpose of intensifying the exercise of power, as understood by Nealon (2008: 32), by lowering the cost of duplicated effort and thereby increasing the efficiency of the exercise of power. The division of the time of education into a cumulative series of individual stages of increasing complexity organised as a function of the final strategic objectives also responds more closely to the model of disciplinary power outlined by Foucault (SP: 185-188).

Secondly, having noted the inefficient separation of orders of education, advocates of an *école unique* favoured the unification of elementary education as a *premier degré* where the irrational duplication of efforts was most evident in the separation between the *école primaire élémentaire* and the elementary classes of *l'enseignement secondaire* (Prost 1968: 408). This consensus regarding the primary degree of education echoed Buisson's 1910 proposals and represented a movement towards the intensification of the community-centred logic of education in that it would mean giving all pupils at this level a common education leading to the same opportunities in a *second degré*. Although there was agreement regarding an initial period of common, unified education, the various proposals for an *école unique* did not, however, agree regarding how far this period of common education would extend into the *second degré* and proposed various different points at which this common education would end and diversify into different courses.

Thirdly, the critique of the organisation of the school into separate orders brought forward by partisans of an *école unique* was also based on the

illegitimate socio-economic basis of these divisions, previously identified by Buisson amongst others in the pre-war period, and so the end of fees for secondary education also became part of the reformers' consensus as a means of ensuring a more democratic and meritocratic school and selection of society's elites (Prost 1968: 408). Again, this responded to the immediate aftermath of the war by proposing to open up recruitment to secondary education and thereby enable the replenishment of a cultural and intellectual elite that had been greatly damaged by the losses suffered by France. This move could therefore constitute an intensification of the individual-centred logic of education by addressing the limited and class-based recruitment of pupils to the individual-centred *enseignement secondaire* identified before the war as an obstacle to the development of the exercise of power oriented by this individual-centred logic. This measure could also be read as another intensification of the community-centred logic of education in that it offers the same possibilities of educational course to all members of the community regardless of their socio-economic status. The ambiguity of the normative orientation of this proposal, perhaps underlined due to the abstract positing of this principle here outside of the discourse articulating the rationale for any particular reform, points to the tendency, which we will highlight below, of a growing overlap of the disciplinary logics of education as one seeks to intensify their action beyond their initial enclosures and limits to maximise their reach, to apply them to all pupils in a single school for all, an *école unique*.

As Prost (1968: 407) notes, the agreement upon some principles of an *école unique* did not mean an agreement on all aspects and amongst the

partisans of reform ‘une unanimité de façade masque des désaccords profonds.’ The various advocates of an *école unique* differed as to the nature of the education to be given in this school, the extent to which the course of education would be unified for all pupils, and how the proposed system would respond to the post-World War One demand for social justice by ensuring the democratisation of education, understood at this time as access to the various streams of education regardless of one’s socio-economic background and the meritocratic selection of elites through this system of education.

Some *école unique* proposals demonstrated the author’s predilection for one of the existing orders of education and would propose the extension of this model of education to the full period of compulsory education (Prost 1968: 409-410; Barreau and Garcia 1998: 10-12). The plan set out by Jean Devolvé, a lecturer in the Literature faculty of the university of Montpellier, in 1928, for example, argued for an extension of the model of *l’enseignement secondaire* to all institutions so that all French pupils could be educated, ‘chacun selon son pouvoir’, according to what he referred to as ‘la forme de la culture la plus précieuse en soi et la plus haute, celle qui, toutes fins utiles négligées, met qui l’obtient en possession des biens de l’esprit, seuls véritables, auxquels tous les autres sont relatifs’ (Devolvé 1998: 89-90). Published a few months after that of the *Compagnons* in 1918, the plan produced by Ludovic Zoretti, a lecturer in the faculty of sciences of the university of Caen and a trade unionist who had co-founded the CGT’s federation of teachers of secondary and higher education that came to be known as the *Fédération Zoretti*, proposed, in contrast, the extension of a unified *enseignement primaire* for all pupils up to the age of 15 or 16 years old that was composed of two cycles, the second of

which beginning at the age of 10 years old and adopting the curriculum of the EPS from the age of 12. Beyond this compulsory education Zoretti envisaged an optional two to three year cycle of education that would present diverse course options that were vocational or secondary in nature (Chapoulie 2010: 293-294).

The diversity of course options at the end of an extended and unified course of education in Zoretti's plan would be emphasised, to a greater or lesser extent, in other plans that promoted a perhaps more minimal conception of an *école unique* and valued the continued enclosure of the separate orders of education as a means of ensuring the proper operation of these distinct courses of education in pursuit of their separate objectives thought to respond to the educational needs of different groups of pupils destined for different social roles (Prost 1968: 409-410). Hippolyte Ducos, for example, saw the unification of a compulsory primary degree of education (the *école primaire élémentaire* and the elementary classes of the *collèges* and *lycées*) and free access to *l'enseignement secondaire* as the only necessary elements of educational reform and spoke of the necessity of preserving the specific character of each type of separate education, *primaire supérieur*, *secondaire* and *technique ou professionnel*, after the elementary classes. He found support for this position from Francisque Vial, the *directeur de l'enseignement secondaire* from 1924 to 1936, and Edmond Labbé, the *directeur de l'enseignement technique* from its inauguration in 1920 to 1933, who argued in 1928 that classes should not group together pupils of the same age but rather pupils 'qui tendent au même but et ont même vocation' (Prost 1968: 409-410). Paul Lapie's 1922 plan also preserved this variety of enclosures, although he deferred the orientation of

pupils towards one of a variety of optional technical and secondary courses in these enclosures until the end of a unified first cycle of secondary education for those aged 11 to 15 years old.[87] This retention of distinct courses corresponding to the different established orders of education after a certain period of unified education was to be made consistent with the demand for the democratisation of education through a democratic, that is to say properly meritocratic, selection, which would ensure the just distribution of pupils according to their talents and aptitudes (Prost 1968: 410-411).

The question of how to ensure such a democratic and just process of selection was one that would have to be addressed by all proposals for an *école unique* and some projects suggested their own means of achieving this process. With the possible exception of Devolvé's 1928 plan which does not outline anything beyond a long course of secondary-style education for all that would be followed insofar as one's capacities allowed (1998: 89-90), every project for an *école unique* included a point where the unified course of education would end and pupils would have to be rationally distributed according to their merits amongst a diversity of courses of further study or directed towards an appropriate exit from the education system. Indeed, Chapoulie (2010: 292) describes such a process of selection as the 'pièce maîtresse' of the plan proposed immediately after the war by the *Compagnons*, who stated in their

[87] Amongst the various proposals of this period, we may recognise a distant blueprint for the contemporary *collège* most clearly set out in Paul Lapie's 1922 proposal of an institution of this name as the first cycle of a second degree of education. Lapie's *collège* for those approximately aged 11 to 15 would 'brasser' and 'amalgamer' the primary, secondary and technical courses of this level to produce a single course of study sanctioned by a *brevet* and opening onto the optional second cycle of secondary education in a variety of technical and secondary courses, each leading approximately to the age of 18. In this plan, however, a selection of pupils would be operated at the end of each cycle of education based on their intellectual capacity or their intended economic role and only the *premier degré* of this planned education was intended to be compulsory. Although favoured by Paul Langevin, this proposal had little impact on public debate (Prost 1968: 409; Barreau and Garcia 1998: 10-12; Lapie 1998: 79; Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 415-417).

manifesto that '*L'École unique résout simultanément deux questions: elle est l'enseignement démocratique et elle est la sélection par le mérite*' (1998a: 67). The *Compagnons* proposed a single course of primary education up to the age of 13 or 14 years old, after which pupils could be directed towards an apprenticeship, or courses that extended from a traditional secondary education leading to the *baccalauréat* to more vocationally oriented professional studies (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 62; Chapoulie 2010: 291-292). The *orientation* of pupils between these various options would, for the *Compagnons*, be based upon entrance exams (Compagnons 1998a: 67; 1998b: 71) and the observations of the teacher during the second cycle of this compulsory primary education that would begin at the age of 11 (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 62), in which '[l]e maître a[urait] pour premier devoir de discerner les vocations, d'en encourager l'éclosion, d'en guider l'épanouissement' (Compagnons 1998a: 64). This idea of what would become known as a *cycle d'observation*, in which the aptitudes of a pupil would be assessed in view of assigning them to the course of education that most suited them, would gain some success in future projects of reform and the idea of using the *certificat d'études primaires* as a sort of entry exam for the long course of secondary education beginning in the *sixième* was included in the final proposals of Buisson's commission for the *école unique* published in 1927 (Prost 1968: 411; Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 73).

That article 11 of the 1927 report of this commission on *l'école unique* also proposed that the process of selection should also refer to an examination of the pupil's *livret scolaire* (school record) and the results of psychological tests attests to the growing interest in emergent practices of *orientation*, which

had initially developed in the professional sphere and would begin to be institutionalised in the inter-war period before becoming a part of the discursive mainstream of educational reform in the post-war period, as a guide to how processes of selection can guarantee a democratised education that ensures a correct correspondence between the aptitudes of pupils and the education they receive (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 73; Prost 1968: 411). These measures had been proposed to the committee by Henri Laugier, described by Prost (1968: 411) as one of the founders of *l'orientation professionnelle*, who alongside his associate Henri Piéron would play a significant role in the inter-war years in the promotion of an objective, scientific study of the aptitudes of individual pupils, defined by Piéron in 1929 as the 'qualité plus grand de réussite' of a given individual in a given activity (quoted in Martin 2002: 179), in view of placing them in the profession where 'avec un minimum de fatigue et un maximum de joie au travail, il arrivera à un optimum de rendement' (Fontègne 1921 quoted in Solaux 2008: 510).[88] The development of *orientation professionnelle* in France drew its inspiration from an international movement in the industrialised world at the beginning of the twentieth century and began to be institutionalised in the context of the need to rebuild the economy after the First World War (Danvers 2005: 687-688; Lembré 2016: 68). Local *offices d'orientation professionnelle* attached to the administration of *l'enseignement technique* were codified by a *décret* of 26 September 1922 in order to orient pupils towards the right technical courses that would prepare them for the careers that most suited them and in 1928 Henri Piéron, Henri Laugier and a number of other figures in this

[88] For more information on the role of Laugier and Piéron, see Martin (2002).

psychotechnique movement[89] founded the *Institut national d'études du travail et de l'orientation professionnelle* that would train *conseillers d'orientation* through whose intervention the ideas of an *orientation* based on individual aptitudes would begin to find interest amongst certain teachers (Danvers 2005: 688 ; Prost 1968 : 411; Dorison 2010: 40; Lembré 2016: 68-69).

Reflecting a more thorough actualisation of the disciplinary techniques of examining, ranking and distributing individual subjects to produce a greater force (SP: 166-175, 190-197, 200-227) that were outlined in our examination of Foucault's concept of discipline in our first chapter, the actual development of such practices of rational *orientation professionnelle* in the inter-war period first indicates efforts towards a further intensification of the exercise of power in service of the economy-centred logic of *l'enseignement technique et professionnel* alongside the further development of the network of institutions that made up this order of education following the *loi Astier* of 1919, an intensification that the extension of these practices of *orientation* to all pupils at the end of a common course of education, as proposed in the plans for an *école unique*, would make all the greater. Following the passage of control of *l'enseignement technique* to a relatively independent *sous-secrétariat d'État de l'enseignement technique* under the *ministère de l'Instruction publique* in 1920, the network of institutions of this order of education extended greatly, with the total number of ENP and EPCI increasing between 1920 and 1938 from four to twenty-three and from seventy-six to 166, respectively (Lembré 2016: 62). The intervention of scientific processes of *orientation professionnelle* was intended to make this extension of institutions and the,

[89] Amongst these figures was Henri Wallon who would go on to take over the presidency of the post-war commission that published the influential *Rapport Langevin-Wallon* in 1947 after the death of Paul Langevin in 1946 (Dorison 2010: 40).

comparatively slow, development of *cours professionnels* more effective by examining the aptitudes of each pupil in relation to the normative profile of required aptitudes that had been established for each profession and then recommending to the individual the relevant course or job that represented the best fit for their aptitude profile (Dorison 2010: 40). The local nature of the *offices d'orientation professionnelle*, whose operation would be subject to the hierarchically organised *Inspection de l'enseignement technique*, also meant that the career profiles against which pupils were examined and oriented sought to respond to the needs of the local economy and thereby ensure maximum efficiency of technical education in the locality and a minimisation of waste (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 83; Lembré 2016: 69-70). As Decaunes and Cavalier (1962: 82-83) note, a *décret* of 24 May 1938 completed this *disciplinary dispositif* of *orientation professionnelle* by making this process of orientation obligatory at the end of *l'enseignement primaire* and instituting *offices municipaux d'orientation professionnelle* to ensure the necessary close collaboration of families, *instituteurs* and the service of *orientation* that would make the recommendation of the *orienteur* more likely to be followed.

The appeal to such techniques of *orientation* and the concern for a more thorough attention to the individual capacities of each pupil that appears to be proposed in the various plans for an *école unique* in relation to the selection, in particular, of those considered to merit access to a long course of secondary education also suggests efforts to intensify the disciplinary action of the individual-centred logic of education in this period and overcome the limitations of the limited and class-based recruitment of pupils for *l'enseignment secondaire*, efforts which indicate a shift in the discourse of

meritocracy deployed in the school. Indeed, this attention on adapting the treatment of a subject to maximise the intended effect as a function of the features of its individual case suggests an attempt to more finely apply the disciplinary '[*p*]*rincipe de la modulation des peines*' (SP: 314). The distribution of a limited number of *bourses* to pupils who had shown themselves to be particularly gifted so that they could attend *l'enseignement secondaire* prefigures this broader understanding of individual merit that finds expression in these plans, but, as Buisson noted in 1910, those who received these *bourses* could only be considered 'exceptions consolantes' (quoted in Robert 2010: 23-24) to a system that limited access to this secondary education, intended to provide those considered capable of receiving it with an education oriented towards their full realisation as individuals, to those who could afford the financial commitment to a long course of study with little practical application. This restriction was justified on the basis of an assumed natural homology between one's socio-economic position and one's talent, in which one's social position was taken as the most likely indicator of one's aptitudes (Prost 1997: 48-49; Mole 2007: 25-26). Partisans of an *école unique* in the inter-war period did not contest the perceived need to restrict access to this course of education and thereby upheld the disciplinary enclosure of this order of education against what was often presented as contamination from less talented pupils that would risk both the efficacy of *l'enseignement secondaire* and the production of *déclassés*, but shifted the criteria upon which this restriction would be operated. Indeed, as one *inspecteur général* noted in 1938 '[l]es théoriciens de l'école unique ont toujours entendu limiter l'accès de l'enseignement secondaire aux enfants capables d'en profiter; d'où la nécessité

d'une sélection' (quoted in Prost 1997: 53). The selection for access to a secondary education proposed through the examination of individual aptitudes rather than by reference to one's socio-economic position and ability to pay, which would become, it was thought, an irrelevance through the abolition of fees for this order of education (Prost 1968: 410-411), demonstrates an endeavour to intensify the action of the disciplinary *dispositif* of *l'enseignement secondaire* by insisting on a more thorough actualisation of the disciplinary technique of examining individual subjects in relation to a set norm and applying a normalising sanction to them, in this case their acceptance into the course of secondary education or their rejection and placement in another, more suitable, disciplinary enclosure. This selection based on the examination of individual capacities implied an intensification of the individual-centred disciplinary logic of education actualised by *l'enseignment secondaire* through the extension of its potential field of action to all pupils in society, who could be selected or rejected for this elite education based on their individual performance in relation to the given norm of aptitude. The potential rejection of any pupil based on the examination of their individual performance was just as important in the intensification of the exercise of power in service of the *mot d'ordre* of the individual as it would also reinforce the proper disciplinary enclosure of the courses of secondary education against the mediocrity thought to interfere with its proper and efficient function by ensuring that, in the words of the *Compagnons* (1998a: 67), '[l]e lycée ne traîne plus jusqu'au baccalauréat le boulet des "cancres".'

The reference to more scientific practices of *orientation* or selection and this shift in the discourse of justice deployed in relation to the *dispositifs* of

education, which emphasised each pupil's individual merit rather than their socio-economic origins as an indicator of this merit and their likely future position in society, indicates the emergent influence in this period of the theories of *l'Éducation nouvelle* amongst those interested in reforming the education system, in particular its emphasis on the unique interests and aptitudes of each child. Sharing foundations in research conducted in the relatively new field of psychology at the turn of the century with those concepts underpinning *l'orientation professionnelle*, but also drawing upon the pedagogical experimentation of figures such as Maria Montessori, the theories indicated by the term *l'Éducation nouvelle* promoted a child-centred form of education that sought to apply a scientific knowledge of child psychology, notably how children learn and their normal psychological development, and emphasised respect for the individuality of every child, recognition of each child's interests and aptitudes, and the encouragement of the free activity of the child guided by his or her own personality in education, as opposed to the constraints traditionally imposed by schools (Savoye 2010: 111-113). The general argument of these theories can be summarised by the following 1932 quotation taken from Célestin Freinet, an emblematic figure of the *Éducation nouvelle* movement: 'l'école doit prendre les enfants tels qu'ils sont, à partir de leurs besoins, de leurs intérêts véritables [...] afin de laisser librement s'amplifier, s'élargir, s'approfondir et se préciser la vie dans toute son intégrité et son originalité' (quoted in Savoye 2010: 114). Following the creation in 1921 of a *Ligue internationale pour l'Éducation nouvelle* (LIEN), a number of disparate associations were established in France in the 1920s to promote these theories, of which perhaps the most important was the *Groupe français*

d'Éducation nouvelle (GFEN), the French section of the LIEN formed officially in 1928 from an association originally established in 1922, which published the francophone journal of the LIEN, *Pour l'ère nouvelle*, and amongst whose scientifically and politically distinguished members were Henri Piéron, Henri Wallon and Paul Langevin (Savoye 2010: 112-114; Raillon 2005: 342-343). Savoye (2010: 115-116) notes that the ideas of *l'Éducation nouvelle* gained support amongst teachers of both primary and secondary education in the 1930s and resulted in the formation of an independent movement for pedagogical reform, which eventually found its proposals expressed in the policies pursued by Jean Zay, the *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* from 4 June 1936 to 10 September 1939, notably the proposal of 'activités dirigées' intended to appeal to the interests and spontaneity of pupils.

This emergent discourse of *l'Éducation nouvelle* presents the emergence of a new more extensive norm of the ideal individual, which, although largely marginal at this point, will become increasingly articulated in public discourse in the post-war period as an intensified expression of the individual-centred logic of education. As noted in the previous chapter, the individual-centred logic of education is oriented towards the achievement of the full realisation of pupils' capacities as individual human beings, but the operation of this logic in practice is based on the actual norms of the fully realised individual in the society in which it operates. *L'enseignement secondaire* as it developed under the Third Republic was the site of the actualisation of this disciplinary logic in that it prepared pupils considered apt for such development to conform to the normative model of the ideal

autonomous and rational self-governing individual. The extended norm of the individual that we find promoted in *l'Éducation nouvelle* refers back to the ideas in Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Émile, ou De l'éducation*, first published in 1762, to insist on the autonomous activity of the ideal individual capable of reason and to identify this capacity for reason as a natural quality of every human child that, as the child psychologists referenced by the *Éducation nouvelle* movement would also suggest in their research, is best developed through the child's own free activity guided by their own interests (Jacquet-Francillon and Ottavi 2010: 47-49; Jacquet-Francillon 2010b: 41-42). The norm of the individual that is developed from the theories of *l'Éducation nouvelle* is therefore still that of the autonomous self-governing individual, but one that develops itself through its own activity according to its own interests and aptitudes, and that is impeded by the external imposition of constraints and activities that were emphasised as formative of the rational autonomous individual posited by the traditional, long courses of *l'enseignement secondaire*. The operation of power in service of the *mot d'ordre* of the individual in relation to this new norm would therefore emphasise the recognition and fostering of the individual's unique interests and aptitudes and their autonomous activity to maximise the full disinterested realisation of these individual capacities. As Marcel Gauchet (1985: 57-59) notes, the emergence of the new pedagogies of *l'Éducation nouvelle* at the beginning of the twentieth century heralds, what he refers to as, the triumph of individualism later in the century, what we examined in the first chapter as the postmodern period of apparent liberation of the individual described by authors such as Lipovetsky (1993) and Lyotard (1979), through the norm of the individual who

realises themselves without reference to externally imposed obligations. Again, as seen in our first chapter, this norm of a liberated individual points to a challenge for the normative prescription and hierarchically organised exercise of power operated by disciplinary *dispositifs*, but, remembering that 'at any historical juncture, certain modes and practices of power are emergent, others dominant, still others residual' (Nealon 2008: 29), we should be aware that, although it may be considered to become more dominant in the late twentieth century, this new norm of the self-realising individual is only emergent in the inter-war period and the norm of the autonomous and rational individual formed through a long course of abstract, secondary education remains dominant at this time and would remain so well into the post-war period with the continued support of those attached to the traditional *culture scolaire* of secondary education.

In light of the deployment of these new discourses of individual aptitudes and practices of orientation and the emergent consensus regarding the structure of an *école unique*, we can see in the inter-war debates regarding the reform of the enclosures of the order-based status quo and the definition of an *école unique* efforts to intensify the exercise of power in service of all three logics of education through the definition of new structures and deployment of emergent discourses and practices. The extension of a single course of education to all pupils, including those traditionally beyond the reach of *l'enseignement primaire* who would usually attend the elementary classes of *l'enseignement secondaire*, would constitute an evident intensification of the operation of power in service of the community-centred logic of education by extending a common education to all pupils who would then be subjected to

the same common culture, a normative subjection that would be intensified by the extension in some plans of this common course of study beyond the limits of compulsory education at the time (up to 13 years old), such as in the Zoretti plan's extension of this course of study to 15 or 16 years old. That this common education would overcome immediate barriers of class to achieve a democratisation of selection also represents an intensification of the community-centred logic of education in that it more thoroughly actualises the norms of the republican community this logic seeks to foster by ensuring the equal consideration of all pupils for all courses of study according to their individual capacities. The democratisation of selection that would be achieved through this *école unique*, in conjunction with the introduction of free secondary education that formed a part of these proposals for reform, would also intensify the exercise of power in service of the divergent *mot d'ordre* of the individual by enabling the selection of pupils apt to fruitfully receive a long, abstract secondary education that would subject them to the norms of the ideal autonomous rational individual, thereby extending the reach of the individual-centred logic of *l'enseignement secondaire* beyond the limitations of a restricted pool of recruitment amongst those of a certain socio-economic standing and ensuring a selection based more on individual merit. The new emphasis in proposals for reform on individual aptitudes and their realisation, as shown in the interest shown towards new practices of *orientation*, also demonstrates an intensification of the individual-centred logic of education along the lines of the emergent norm of the unique individual who realises his or her self in accordance with their own unique interests and aptitudes. This same extension of the *orientation* of all pupils according to one's individual

aptitudes at the end of a course of common education that indicated an intensification of the individual-centred logic of education would also constitute an intensification of the economy-centred logic of education. This intensification would be due to the operation of this *orientation* to direct those pupils considered apt to receive a technical or professional education towards more vocationally oriented courses of this type proposed as alternative courses of further study alongside the modern or classical courses of secondary study. Indeed, some proposals for reform, such as that of the *Compagnons*, also saw the *école unique* and the democratisation of selection as a means to better serve the needs and growth of the French economy in a way evocative of Astier's vision of an education system fully oriented towards economic production, considered above, and which anticipates the development of theories of human capital in the post-war period.

The proposals for an *école unique*, as an institution that would act on all pupils in a single educative space, therefore indicate an occasion for each disciplinary logic to seek to intensify the exercise of power in service of their primary *mot d'ordre* of either community, the individual or the economy by extending their field of action to all pupils and thereby partly overcoming the limitations of the enclosures first identified in the pre-war period, but they also indicate a tendency towards a departure from the disciplinary model of an institution that operates as an individual mould for subjects in response to a single *mot d'ordre* as this intensification of logics leads them to overlap, prefiguring the eventual emergence of the contemporary *collège* as dividual institution of control as the result of this confluence of logics. As these logics of education all seek to intensify by expanding the disciplinary enclosures that

actualise them to saturate the whole field of education through the construction of an *école unique* and by operating a new, intensified, disciplinary normalising examination through the processes *orientation* based on individual aptitudes, they come to overlap with other logics with divergent objectives that also seek to fill the space of this unified institution. This overlapping of these divergent logics of education in the propositions for an *école unique* that seek to intensify the operation of power in service of their different *mots d'ordre* can be illustrated by a brief examination of the emblematic proposals of the *Compagnons de l'Université nouvelle* of 1918.

The *Compagnons* clearly articulate the demand for an intensification of the community-centred logic in their reflections on the comradeship of those who fought together in the First World War: 'Les pères ont veillé dans les mêmes tranchées; partout où cela est réalisable, les fils peuvent bien s'asseoir sur les mêmes bancs' (2010: 799). Indeed, the separation of one group of pupils from another in the established order-based system of education is critiqued by the *Compagnons,* who condemn the way that *l'enseignement secondaire* 'nouriss[ait] les jeunes esprits de la pensée allemande' (2010: 799) instead of immersing them in specifically French culture and state that '[s]éparer, dès l'origine, les Français en deux classes et les y fixer pour toujours par une éducation différente, c'est aller à l'encontre du bon sens, de la justice et de l'intérêt national' (2010: 801). The *Compagnons* also, however, indicate a criticism of the community-centred logic of education as an obstacle to the intensification of the individual- or economy-centred logics of education, denouncing 'ce terrible instinct nivelateur qui nous a fait tant de mal' and rejecting the pretension of *l'enseignement primaire* to be complete in

itself, ‘un “tout”’, depicting the common education rather as a preparation for secondary or professional education (1998a: 65; 1998b: 70).

An interest in ensuring an intensification of the exercise of power in service of the individual-centred logic of education is indicated by the *Compagnons*’ insistence that ‘l’enseignement démocratique sera en même temps un procédé de sélection’ (1998a: 64) and that *l’école unique* they propose would open access to *l’enseignement secondaire* to ‘tous ceux qui en sont dignes’ (1998b: 68) thereby ensuring the formation of an elite, conforming to the model of the rational autonomous individual, through the study of the humanities (1998a: 64). They also note that ‘L’enseignement nouveau s’adressera [...] à *toute la nation* et à *l’homme entier*’ (2010: 800), suggesting an early interest in the ideas of *l’Éducation nouvelle* regarding the development of the various individual aptitudes and interests of each pupil that, as we saw above, it would be the first duty of the teacher to identify, encourage and guide to their realisation (1998a:64). The disinterested development of the individual, however, is equally criticised by the *Compagnons*, however, who deride the ‘dilletantisme’ (1998a: 63) of the culture scolaire that marked secondary education as ‘une culture exclusivement théorique’ fit only for ‘un peuple de grands seigneurs artistes’ (2010: 799).

Indeed, there are also indications that the *école unique* the *Compagnons* proposed was intended to achieve an intensification of the exercise of power in service of the *mot d’ordre* of the economy, with both the ‘lutte pacifique’ of production that would follow the First World War and the role of *l’Université nouvelle* in providing France with producers to face this challenge being underlined by the *Compagnons* at the beginning of their manifesto (2010: 799).

This intensification of the economy-centred logic is also apparent in the *Compagnons*' proposal of professional education as the alternative to secondary education in their plan and can be seen in statements such as '[u]n enseignement démocratique est […] celui qui permet de tirer de tout homme le meilleur rendement' (800) and '[l]'intérêt national veut que toutes les capacités soient exploitées à fond et atteignent leur plein rendement' (801), which anticipate the language of human capital theory in the post-war period. Having stated that 'L'Université n'a qu'un but: accroître l'activité française', however, the *Compagnons* specify that they do not only mean economic activity, but more generally 'la production sous toutes ses formes' whether it be intellectual, artistic, economic, or otherwise and so, as previously quoted, this new education is addressed to 'l'homme *tout entier*' (2010: 800), it is not focused on the formation of economically productive subjects, nor on the disinterested development of the individual, nor on the fostering of a citizen bound to his or her community through a common culture.

The divergent orientations that traverse the proposals for an *école unique* indicate the tensions that persist between the strategic objectives posited by each of the disciplinary logics whose expansion to saturate the space of a school addressing all pupils that was sought in such proposals for reform results in their conflicting superposition over the same school space, prefiguring the modulation that will mark the contemporary *collège* as an institution of control. The economy-centred logic of education conflicts with both the community-centred logic's concern for non-economic components of a common culture and the individual-centred logic's concern for the disinterested realisation of the individual through their subjection to an abstract

culture scolaire or through the pursuit of their own interests. The community-centred logic in seeking to impose a common culture is at odds with the specialisation of pupils according to economic utility and the realisation of individuality that exceeds or even expresses disinterest in this common culture. The individual-centred logic rejects the imposition of both an economic instrumentalisation of an individual's development as an individual and the subjection of this development to the limited norms of a common culture.

These divergent logics that traversed the vigourous public debate regarding the idea of an *école unique* and which will prove to be significant for our analysis of the *collège* also contributed to the failure to achieve a major reform of the tripartite education system before the Second World War heralded the end of the Third Republic. Indeed, the lack of such a major reform in this period can be considered the result of both the failure of partisans of an *école unique* to agree on any given plan, largely due to the ongoing rivalry between the secondary and primary orders of education, and the lack of a political consensus for reform that saw the continuation of political divisions of the pre-war period (Lelièvre 1990: 137).

Paul Lapie's statement in his 1922 article that '[n]os ordres d'enseignement sont tellement séparés que, même lorsqu'on veut les unir, c'est le divorce qui demeure leur loi' (1998: 78) indicated the difficulty of overcoming the hostility between the personnel and partisans of *l'enseignement primaire* and *l'enseignement secondaire* during this period. This division was revealed in opposition between these two camps with regards to the plans for an *école unique*. On the one hand, partisans of the primary order of education tended to argue that the entirety of the compulsory

period of education should be unified and designated to be taught by personnel of *l'enseignement primaire*. Those who supported this position included Zoretti, the *Compagnons* and the *Syndicat national des instituteurs* (SNI). Advocates for secondary education, including Hippolyte Ducos, Francisque Vial, the majority of *professeurs* of secondary education and their unions, on the other hand, refused to accept such an amputation of what they saw as their territory and supported the retention of separate orders of education even before the completion of compulsory education (Lelièvre 1990: 136-137; Prost 1968: 409-411; Barreau and Garcia 1998: 10-12). Due to these divisions there was a lack of support for any given project for wholesale educational reform.

In addition to these tensions amongst partisans of the *école unique*, there remained significant political opposition that echoed some aspects of tensions of the pre-war period and made the pursuit of educational reform difficult. Although the SFIO joined the *Parti radical* in supporting the idea of an *école unique*, the Communist party that had split from the SFIO at the 1920 Tours conference remained reticent towards the idea of an *école unique*, viewing it as a bourgeois scheme intended to sap the strength of the proletariat. Many conservatives still feared the contamination of the elite secondary education with the mediocrity of the masses and, supporting the traditional view of a natural hierarchy that posited a homology between one's merit and one's social position, were suspicious of the state's ability to conduct an adequate selection of the "right" pupils by merit to attend the *lycées* and *collèges*. Other conservatives also feared that an *école unique* would reduce the supply of manual labour, provoke an 'exode rural' and encourage the development of 'déclassés' who would become a receptive audience for

Bolshevik demagoguery. Furthermore clerical conservatives saw the *école unique* as a threat to private Catholic schools. (Lelièvre 1990: 134-136; Barreau and Garcia 1998: 9-10, 13-14, 16-18; Chapoulie 2010: 299-326, 347-349)

Faced with this opposition and division, however, some more modest concrete reforms were achieved before the Vichy regime came to power that partially implemented some aspects of the limited consensus that had emerged from the debates of this inter-war period. With the abolition of fees for *l'enseignement secondaire*, the development of a unified elementary degree of education, and the a number of measures taken by Jean Zay in the final years of the Third Republic, some movement in the direction of an *école unique* was achieved.

The abolition of fees for all classes of *l'enseignement secondaire* was introduced progressively in the government's budgets issued between 1930 and 1933, with article 157 of the *loi* of 16 April 1930 making the classes of the *sixième* in *lycées* and *collèges* free, the equivalent law of 1931 extending this measure to the classes of the *cinquième* in these institutions, the law of 1932 applying this act to the classes of the *quatrième*, and, finally, the finance law of 31 May 1933 abolished fees for all other classes after the *sixième* in the secondary order of education.[90] This elimination of fees lifted an obstacle to

[90] The decision to abolish fees for these classes of *l'enseignement secondaire* was made in light of the experimental, money-saving practice of 'l'amalgame' between 1925 and 1926 in which pupils from different courses of study would be brought together in the same class for common courses, such as French and arithmetic. First introduced in 1925 for pupils following the courses of modern and classical secondary education, it was extended to include those pupils studying at EPS and EPCI annexed to a *collège* or *lycée* in 1926. This experiment was short-lived, but the apparent injustice of some pupils, those of the EPS, receiving a free education being taught in the same classes as those of *l'enseignement secondaire*, who paid fees, led to the precedent for free secondary education to be set in the budget for 1928 (*loi* of 27 December 1927), which made these common classes free (Prost 1968: 415-417; Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 424-425).

the attendance of these classes, which combined with a larger generational cohort saw the number of boys attending the *sixième* of *lycées* increase from 10,848 in 1929 to 14,955 in 1930, reaching 19,967 in 1939. To manage this increasing number of pupils and assure a selection amongst candidates that was based on merit, an entry exam was introduced by an *arrêté* signed by the *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* Anatole de Monzie on 1 September 1933 (Prost 1968: 416-417; Lelièvre 1990: 137-138).[91]

The first step towards the unification of an elementary degree of education, which would, nonetheless, not be fully achieved until the eventual disappearance of the elementary classes of *lycées* in the 1960s, despite the official abolition of these *classes élémentaires* of secondary education by *ordonnance* 45-318 on 3 March 1945, was taken with the *décret* of 12 September 1925 that abolished the need for the special *certificat d'aptitude professionnelle* (CAP) to teach in the elementary classes of *l'enseignment secondaire*, which had been introduced by Ferry (*Décret* of 8 January 1881) thereby making it possible for the elementary classes of both primary and secondary education to be taught by *instituteurs*. Although the last *concours* for these *certificats* was held in 1927, however, the change towards a single body of teachers for classes of this level was slow as holders of this CAP who were already in post were only gradually replaced, often by *instituteurs* who were carefully selected for these more prestigious positions (Prost 1968: 412). The unification of these *classes élémentaires* and those of *l'école primaire*

[91] Alternatives for ensuring this selection that were closer to the methods being pioneered in *l'orientation professionnelle*, such as an examination of each pupil's record and psychological tests, were rejected. The idea of using the exam for the *certificat d'études primaires* as an entry exam was rejected by partisans of primary education as, in order to coincide with the class of *sixième*, it would require this exam to be taken before the end of the period of compulsory education that it was intended to sanction (Prost 1968: 417).

élémentaire was also furthered by the *arrêté* of 11 February 1926, which made the *programme* of the elementary classes of secondary education the curriculum for both these classes and the elementary classes of *l'enseignement primaire*, and the somewhat belated extension of the jurisdiction of the *Inspection primaire* to cover the elementary classes of *l'enseignement secondaire* by a *circulaire* of 5 December 1932 (Prost 1968: 412). The distinction between these two orders of education at this level remained though, as, even after the abolition of fees for the classes of *sixième* and above of *l'enseignement secondaire*, the classes of the *petit lycée* remained fee-paying and served as a privileged route to further secondary study (Prost 1968: 413; Lelièvre 1990: 137).

The final achievements of the Third Republic in education were the much feted reforms, inspired by the debates regarding the *école unique*, pursued by Jean Zay, a member of the *Parti radical-socialiste* who became the *ministre d'Éducation nationale* on 4 June 1936 following the victory of the *Front populaire*, remaining in this post until 10 September 1939 when he resigned to join the army. This series of measures extended compulsory education to the age of 14 years old, imposed an organisation of the education system by progressive degrees, brought the EPS and *enseignement secondaire* closer together and organised an experimental *dispositif* of orientation. The first of these measures, the extension of obligatory education to the age of 14 years old, was achieved soon after taking up his post as minister through the law of 9 August 1936, but his other actions, which were part of an even more

ambitious *projet de loi* proposed on 5 March 1937,[92] had to be passed by means of regulatory rather than legislative texts as a mixture of personal animosity and hostility from partisans of secondary education on the parliamentary *commission de l'enseignement* left this *projet* unexamined by parliament at the outbreak of the Second World War (Prost 2013: 30-32).

Mentioned in the previous chapter, the *décret* of 1 June 1937, reorganised the administrative structures of the education system to reflect a progression of degrees rather than the inefficient separation of orders, partially in line with the consensus amongst partisans of an *école unique*, but, due to the ambiguous status left to the CC, maintained an institutional separation between the individual-centred logic of the extensive and scholarly culture of secondary education and the community-centred logic of the limited and practical general culture of the primary education. With this *décret*, which left the *direction de l'enseignement technique* unaltered, the Ministry of National Education's *direction de l'enseignement primaire* and *direction de l'enseignement secondaire* became the *direction de l'enseignement du premier degré et de l'éducation post-scolaire* and the *direction de l'enseignement de second degré et de l'enseignement supérieur* respectively, and the EPS and the *Écoles normales de l'enseignement primaires* passed from the jurisdiction of the former to that of the latter whilst the elementary classes of *l'enseignement secondaire* passed to that of the latter to the former. Formally, this partially reflected the reformers' proposed organisation of horizontally coordinated,

[92] This *projet de loi* proposed a complete plan for an *école unique*, in which the elementary classes of *l'enseignement secondaire* would be abolished entirely and this unified primary degree of education would end at the age of 11 with a *classe d'orientation* which would direct pupils to one of three courses of further study, split over two *cycles*: classical, modern and technical. The personnel of the secondary and primary degrees of education would be brought closer together too with pedagogical training expected of the former and the *baccalauréat* required of the latter. See Prost (2013: 30-31).

graduated degrees in place of vertically juxtaposed, competing orders, but the CC that were appended to the *écoles primaires élémentaires* remained under the jurisdiction of the *direction de l'enseignement du premier degré*, as the reference to *éducation post-scolaire* indicated, and so a division of the second degree remained, with CC constituting 'le germe d'un nouveau secondaire du primaire' (Prost 1968: 419). The introduction of the same curriculum for both the first cycle (classes of *sixième* to *troisième*) of *l'enseignement secondaire* and the EPS by the *arrêté* of 11 April 1938 suggested a unified extension of compulsory education like those suggested in some plans for an *école unique*, such as those of Zoretti and of the *Compagnons*, but also confirmed the separation of the EPS from the CC and their community-centred logic of primary education (Lelièvre 1990: 139), expressed in revised primary programmes of study, fixed by the *arrêtés* of the 23 March 1938. This distinction between these two courses of study were reaffirmed in Zay's 1938 *instructions officielles*, where Zay states that while primary education should provide a closer link and preparation for further studies, it should remain, 'pour le plus grand nombre, un enseignement complet, c'est-à-dire une préparation directe aux tâches, aux devoirs, aux combats et aux joies aussi de la vie toute entière' (in Heurdier and Prost 2014: 121). The studies undertaken in the second degree by contrast would be described by Zay as 'un enseignement humaniste' of which the goal is not so much to provide pupils with a useful minimum knowledge but rather to foster in pupils 'le libre et complet développement de leurs facultés et d'en faire des hommes, en cultivant chez eux, tout ce qui fait l'excellence de l'homme, l'intelligence, le cœur, le caractère, le sens moral, le goût du beau' (in Barreau and Garcia 1998: 21).

Indeed, as will be evident in post-war debates, this formal reorganisation of the education system did not overcome the divisive rivalry, or even hostility, between the personnel of these two degrees of education and their supporters who still subscribed to the differing logics of education oriented towards either community or the individual (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 432-433; Prost 1968: 419).

Zay made a significant step towards the ideal of meritocratic selection and *orientation* according to individual aptitudes sketched in plans for an *école unique*, however, through the experimental introduction of *classes d'orientation* at the level of the *sixième* in the EPS, EPCI and modern and classical courses of the *lycées* and *collèges*, which would seek to orient pupils towards either further classical, modern or technical studies (*Arrêté* of 22 May 1937). In order to achieve this *orientation* Zay established a partial common programme of study, or *tronc commun*, in these classes across these various institutions (*Décret* of 21 May 1937, *Arrêté* of 30 August 1937) and proposed new active pedagogical methods inspired by *l'Éducation nouvelle*, such as 'activités dirigées' that would, according to Zay's instructions of September 1938, 'faire un appel direct à l'activité spontanée de l'enfant' (in Prost 2013: 39) and thereby enable the interests and aptitudes of each pupil to be revealed to the teacher, tasked with carefully observing his or her pupils in these classes to ensure the direction of these pupils towards the course of education that best suited them (Briand and Chapoulie 2011: 433-435; Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 100-103; Prost 2013: 33-34, 39-41). This experiment was prolonged and extended in 1938, but in practice the limited common education that had been established, particularly in the EPCI, only allowed a period of roughly a third

of the year for the observation of pupils' various aptitudes beyond the course they were already undertaking and this *dispositif* had little effect on the *orientation* of pupils (Barreau and Garcia 1998: 19; Prost 1968: 418- 419; 2013: 33-34). This *orientation* experiment and the new active pedagogy that had been promoted with it, and which met with approval by the *Conseil supérieur de l'Instruction publique* (Prost 2013: 34), would be swept away by the Vichy regime, but would serve as an inspiration to post-war debates and plans for educational reform, notably the Langevin-Wallon plan.

As noted in the previous chapter, the disciplinary enclosures of the tripartite system of education remain largely intact at the end of the Third Republic and the limitations of these distinct enclosures identified at the turn of the century persisted. Following the *loi Astier* of 1919, which, as shown in the previous chapter, codified the hierarchical disciplinary organisation of this *dispositif*, *l'enseignement technique et professionnel*, for example, saw a significant increase in the number of institutions it administered and pupils it taught in the inter-war period (Lembré 2016: 62), but this economy-centred education remained somewhat marginal in 1939, with the CAP still a rare qualification at this time, only 12% of employees in business and industry aged under 18 years old registered for *cours professionnels*, despite the provisions of the *loi Astier* making them compulsory, and only slightly over 90,000 of the approximately four million boys and girls aged between 13 and 18 years old attending an institution of technical or professional education (Ibid. 72). The individual-centred secondary education was still only addressed to a small fraction of any age group before the Second World War, with the percentage of an age cohort achieving the *baccalauréat* marking the successful completion of

this education only increasing from 1.1% in 1911 to 2.7% in 1936 (Lelièvre 1990: 129) and only 6.5% of the age cohort entering the *sixième* of *lycées* or *collèges* on the eve of World War Two, even after the abolition of all fees for the classes of *sixième* upwards of *l'enseignement secondaire* and the unification of the programmes of the elementary classes of *l'enseignement primaire* and *l'enseignement secondaire* in 1926, a figure that only increases to 11.5% if we include the number of pupils entering the equivalent class of the EPS that had become part of the *enseignement de second degré* in 1937 (Lelièvre 1990: 139). Furthermore, the elementary classes of secondary education, which remained fee-paying, continued to teach approximately 70,000 students per year until the 1960s who were separated from free elementary schools of the community-centred *enseignement primaire* (Prost 2004: 171), maintaining the separation of a small elite from the rest of the community. Indeed, the common culture of the community-centred primary education was only given to those who stayed in the *écoles primaires* and CC up to the end of their compulsory education at the age of 14 years old, excluding those who went on to follow courses in the second degree or technical education. The intensification and extension of the limited action of these logics of education would remain a project to be pursued in the post-war years.

The period leading up to the Second World War saw the identification at the turn of the century of a number of limitations on the exercise of power in service of the *mots d'ordre* of community, the individual and the economy that existed in the tripartite system of enclosed disciplinary *dispositifs* established

under the Third Republic. Subsequently, advocates of the community-, individual- or economy-centred logics of education that had been actualised in the separate institutions of this tripartite system formulated proposals that sought to overcome these limitations and intensify the operation of power in service of these logics. This led to serious public debate in the inter-war period, which focused on the idea of an *école unique*, proposed as a means of extending the disciplinary logics discussed to address all French pupils, and saw the deployment of emergent practices of *orientation* and discourses of *l'Éducation nouvelle* that carried within them an evolution of the norm of the individual that would operate through the individual-centred logic of education, moving from an enlightened rational and autonomous individual to a self-constructed individual who realises his or her self in response to their own interests and aptitudes. Although the extent of realised reforms was limited before the end of the Third Republic and much of the limitations to the exercise of power oriented by the order-words of community, the individual or the economy that had been identified before the First World War persisted, the debates of this period indicated the development of an *école unique*, drawing upon the emergent practices and discourses of *orientation* and *l'Éducation nouvelle*, as the means of intensifying the exercise of power in service of each of the disciplinary logics mentioned beyond their current limits. This idea of an *école unique* as a space where the divergent logics of education all find themselves actualised simultaneously as they overcome their initial enclosures prefigures the development of a dividual institution of control at the confluence of these logics, which we will see emerges in the form of the *collège* in the 1970s. However, with the limitations of the separation of distinct

dispositifs of education oriented by different *mots d'ordre* still apparent, the project of intensification of the different logics of education responding to these order-words would be continued in the post-war period during the Fourth Republic when a new consensus regarding the necessity and contours of educational reform emerged.

1944-1958: The emergence of a consensus for reform

Despite the limited, if important, concrete achievements of this pre-Second World War period, the matter of substantial educational reform to achieve the democratisation of education, understood as the broadening of access to education to all children, that was envisaged in the inter-war debates regarding an *école unique* was unresolved and would again become a matter of debate in the immediate post-war period, covering the provisional government and the Fourth Republic, following the disruption of World War Two and the Vichy government. Although, significant reform would remain obstructed and elusive during this frequently overlooked 'moment creux' (d'Enfert and Kahn 2010: 7) often said to be marked by 'non-décision' (Sadoun and Donegani 1976), there were some significant changes to the existing institutions and a consensus began to emerge regarding the definite need for a reform that would intensify the exercise of power in service of the community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education in the face of new economic and demographic challenges, as well as regarding a number of principles upon which that reform would be built, notably an extension of compulsory

education and the idea of a period of *orientation* at the level of a middle school built around a complete or partial common curriculum (a *tronc commun*).

We will first outline the impact of the Second World War and the Vichy regime on the education system and the challenges of post-war reconstruction before considering the unrealised Langevin-Wallon plan of 1947 as a blueprint for the future development of an *école unique* that placed a great emphasis on a more intensive democratisation of education that sought the cultivation of every pupil's individuality and revived debate regarding educational reform in the post-war period. We will then proceed to give an overview of the many proposals for reform put forward during this period and the consensus that emerged from across these conflicting projects by the end of the Fourth Republic. The reasons for the failure to enact any of these reforms under the Fourth Republic will then be analysed in the context of both the political fragility of the period and the ongoing rivalry between different sectors of the education system. Next, we will consider the development of the institutions of the primary degree, secondary degree and technical education over this period in relation to what Louis Cros would identify as 'l'explosion scolaire' (Robert 2015: 40-41), the mass development of longer periods of schooling that resulted from new economic needs, the demands of families and the demographic growth of the post-war period. Finally, the ongoing inequalities evident in these adaptations and the new economic demands, developed through reference to the emergent paradigm of human capital, will be examined to highlight the convergence of community-, individual- and economy-centred demands on the idea of an educational reform that would enable longer studies and a more thorough and just *orientation* of pupils. This

convergence prepares the ground for the enactment of reform at the start of the Fifth Republic.

France's education system at the end of the Second World War was marked by the material damage of the conflict, with almost 5,000 schools destroyed and over 6,000 schools seriously damaged across primary, secondary and technical education (Robert 2015: 24), but also bore the scars of the reactionary and inegalitarian education policies of the far-right Vichy government, which, in the words of Abel Bonnard, the *Secrétaire d'État de l'Éducation nationale et de la Jeunesse* from April 1942 until the fall of the regime in August 1944, sought to promote an 'inégalité fraternelle' in service of France instead of an 'égalité fallacieuse' (quoted in Barreau and Garcia 1998: 23). Amongst various interventions that encouraged the development of private education, suppressed teaching unions, disrupted administrative structures of inspection and consultation, and harassed personnel on various prejudicial grounds, the Vichy regime took numerous measures to reaffirm a strict social hierarchy, including the reintroduction of the CAP for *professeurs* of the elementary classes of *collèges* and *lycées* and fees for secondary education that had been abolished in the 1930s, and the closure of the *écoles normales primaires*. All these measures would be reversed at the end of the war and the elementary classes of the *lycées* and *collèges*, while still persisting until the end of the 1960s, were officially abolished by the *ordonnance* 45-318 of 3 March 1945 (Barreau and Garcia 1998: 23-25; Robert 2015: 23; Prost 2004: 255-256).

Although incredibly disruptive, the Vichy government did, however, contribute, intentionally, to the development of *l'enseignement technique* and, unwittingly, to the democratisation of secondary education through the reclassification of EPS. Responding to the first of the values in the motto of Pétain's *État Français* (*Travail. Famille. Patrie.*), the development of technical education fitted with the Vichy regime's ideological programme of "national revolution" and so the network of *centres de formation professionnelle accélérée*, created in haste by the Third Republic at the beginning of the war (*Décret* of 21 September 1939) to provide munitions factories with a qualified workforce, was extended. These institutions, renamed *centres de formation professionnelle* (CFP) in 1942, were intended to prepare pupils for a CAP over three years from the end of their compulsory education and formed a network as dense as that of the institutions of secondary education by the end of the war, providing the basis for a mass technical education of a less advanced level than that given by the EPCI and ENP (Lelièvre 1990: 168-170; Lembré 2016: 73-75; Prost 1968: 316).

The unwitting democratisation of secondary education achieved by the Vichy regime resulted from the law passed on 15 August 1941 by Jérôme Carcopino, Bonnard's predecessor as Minister of Education from February 1941 to April 1942, in which the EPS were redesignated *collèges modernes* which offered the modern course of secondary studies, excluding Latin. Intended to end the competition posed by EPS to the *lycée* and *collèges* of secondary education, which after 1940 only offered courses of classical secondary education, and affirm the superiority of these secondary studies, this law actually articulated a course of secondary education leading to a

baccalauréat with the *écoles primaires* from which the EPS would usually recruit, resulting, as Lelièvre (1990: 140) notes, in a significant increase in the proportion of children from working class backgrounds in the classes of secondary education that, although still only a modest 13% of the pupils in these classes, would persist at similar levels beyond the end of the Second World War (Lelièvre 1990: 140-141; Barreau and Garcia 1998: 24-25). Retained after the Liberation, this redesignation completed the assimilation of EPS to secondary education initially indicated by Zay's 1937 administrative reform.

In the wake of these changes and reversals, it was again in the context of responding to the challenges of post-war reconstruction that educational reform returned as a subject of public debate. This new debate drew upon that of the inter-war period and carried with it the desire to finally effect a reform guided by the ideal of an *école unique* and a democratisation of education that had been frustrated under the Third Republic, whose largely unreformed education system was considered a factor in the defeat of 1940 (Ahearne 2010: 130; Prost 2004: 263-264; Robert 2015: 28). The interest in achieving these unaccomplished reforms indicates the recurrence of efforts to intensify power in service of the divergent logics of education that we saw in this inter-war period.

Confronted with the radically conservative right-wing agenda of Pétain's *État français* and its inegalitarian education policy, plans for educational reform had already begun to be debated and produced amongst the French Resistance, which as early as December 1941 had set up, in London, a commission to examine the issue of education and clearly supported the

democratisation of education as part of the programme published by the *Conseil national de la Résistance* (CNR) on 15 March 1944 (Robert 2015: 24, 28). As *Commissaire à l'Éducation nationale et à la Jeunesse* in the *Comité français de la Libération nationale*, René Capitant, set up a commission in January 1944 which would publish on 16 November 1944 the first post-Liberation plan for educational reform. Evoking the issues of equal opportunity, new pedagogical methods and the unification of the school system, the *Plan d'Alger*, named after its place of elaboration, responded to the principles espoused by the Resistance and indicated the continuity of points to be addressed between the inter- and post-war periods and areas of debate for the following decades (Robert 2015: 28-29).

Seeking a more definitive report on educational reform that would reunite the most competent authorities, however, Capitant, now the *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* in the provisional government, established a new *commission d'études pour la réforme de l'enseignement* on 8 November 1944 that would become known as the Langevin-Wallon commission after the two figures, both members of the Communist party as well as the GFEN, that presided over this group, Paul Langevin and Henri Wallon, who took over following the former's death in December 1946 (Prost 1968: 420; 2013: 45-46; Robert 2015: 30; Ahearne 2010: 128). Finally presented to the Minister of Education on 19 June 1947, the report of this commission set out an ambitious, and even utopian (Robert 2015: 35), plan for a unified education system purposely devised anew to avoid concessions to or accommodations of the

existing structures that the authors described as piecemeal and inefficient.[93] However, as the Cold War set in, resulting in the expulsion of the Communists from the government in May 1947, and limited economic resources demanded governmental austerity, the submission of this report after almost three years of deliberations meant that this plan had missed its 'political window' of opportunity offered by the enthusiasm for reform immediately following the Liberation and would remain unexamined by parliament (Ahearne 2010: 129). Despite this, the Langevin-Wallon plan would go on to become 'la référence quasi liturgique de tous ceux qui veulent une "démocratisation" de l'enseignement' (Prost 1968: 420), 'la bible de la réforme de l'enseignement' (Prost 2004 : 267) that would serve as a model for future reflection on school reform.

Placing itself in the tradition of debates regarding the reorganisation of the education system that had emerged in the inter-war period and developed, amongst the Resistance, through the Second World War (LW: 15), the Langevin-Wallon plan, in many respects, represents a continuation of the debates that began at the turn of the century and, like those plans for an *école unique* that preceded it, expresses an effort to produce an educational *dispositif* that would intensify the exercise of power in service of the order-words of community, the individual and the economy. Indeed, the plan identifies three objectives of the education system that can be seen to correspond, respectively, to these individual-, economy- and community-centred logics of education that had been actualised in the separate disciplinary *dispositifs* established under the Third Republic:

[93] Commission ministérielle d'étude (2004: 18). References to the text of the Langevin-Wallon plan will be given to the reproduction of this text in Allègre et al. (2004: 13-102) and hereafter given in brackets following the abbreviation LW.

> Le but de l'enseignement est:
>
> 1° D'assurer aux aptitudes de chacun tout le développement dont elles sont susceptibles.
>
> 2° De préparer l'enfant aux tâches professionnelles qui lui sont le plus accessibles et où il pourra le mieux servir la collectivité.
>
> 3° D'élever le plus possible le niveau culturel de la Nation.' (LW: 28)

Each of these objectives, the full-realisation of each individual's capacities, the subjection of pupils to the norms of professional activity to better serve the economy, and increasing the level of culture of the community, understood in this text as the preparation, through contact with a broad range of general studies, of every pupil to exercise their own critical judgement and free enquiry so that they can take on their civic and social responsibilities in solidarity with their fellow citizens (LW: 17-18, 20-21, 70-78; see also Ahearne 2010: 133-137), are recurrent themes throughout the text. The Langevin-Wallon report also goes on to identify the shortcomings of the educational status quo that its proposals will intend to overcome, which again reiterate the familiar limitations on the exercise of power in service of the community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education identified in the order-based system earlier in the century, including the socio-economic divisions between the separate orders of education that limited their reach (LW: 22), the inefficient duplication of effort in these orders (16), the failure of this system to satisfy

the needs of the economy (16-17), and the limited selection and development of individual capacities (19-20, 22).

As Prost (2004: 265) observes, the Langevin-Wallon plan's proposals responding to these limitations offered a synthesis of those of preceding debates, drawing upon the ideal of an *école unique* for its structures and on the theories of *l'Éducation nouvelle* for its pedagogy. Regarding the structures of the education system, the authors proposed raising the end of compulsory education to 18 years old, to facilitate a longer period to observe the aptitudes of each child and thereby avoid his or her premature, and so potentially erroneous, *orientation* (LW: 30-31), and a system split across a *premier degré*, open to all and made up of three cycles, and a *second degré* of higher education, which would include technical, as well as literary, scientific and artistic studies, open only to those who demonstrated themselves apt to receive it (LW: 22-23). This education would be free throughout, with extra financial support provided for pupils in the third cycle of primary education and students of the second degree (24-25).

The *premier degré* of this plan reflected the structures of the various plans for an *école unique* produced in the inter-war years, with a period of common education during which the individual aptitudes of each pupil would be observed and identified, the first cycle for pupils aged 7 to 11 years old and second *cycle d'orientation* for pupils aged 11 to 15 years old, and a final period of diverse and separate courses of study that would later split into different courses over the third *cycle de détermination* for those aged 15 to 18 years old that intended to provide them with the education that best fitted pupils' aptitudes and would lead them to take up a role in the economy where

they could be most productive (LW: 22-24, 29-35). As Chapoulie (2010: 365) and Lembré (2016: 76) recognise, the three courses of this final cycle of the primary degree can be seen to roughly relate to the existing institutions of education. The s*ection théorique* constituted the equivalent of the *collèges* and *lycées*, leading to the *baccalauréat* 'ou aux épreuves qui lui seront substituées' (LW: 34) that would encompass literary, scientific and also technical sections. The *section professionnelle* corresponds to the more advanced technical education given by the *collèges techniques* and ENP (LW: 34). Finally the *section pratique* is said to correspond to the *centres de formation professionnelle* (CFA), but, with a continued emphasis on general education and a demand that any technical education remain as broad as possible (LW: 33-34), also bears some similarities to the ambition of a limited and practical culture that had been pursued by the primary order of education, and was reaffirmed in Jean Zay's 1938 programmes for the *cours de fin d'études* intended to complete a primary education (in Heurdier and Prost 2014: 107-111).

As with some inter-war plans for the *école unique*, and although education has only remained compulsory up to the age of 16 since the 1959 Berthoin reform and not been raised to the age of 18 as this 1947 plan proposed, the structures of the *premier degré* of the Langevin-Wallon plan appear to sketch the eventual contemporary architecture of the French education system with the contemporary *collège* established by the 1975 *loi Haby* corresponding to the plan's central *cycle d'orientation* for all pupils aged 11 to 15 years old. Indeed, the four-year course of this *cycle d'orientation* again seems to prefigure the modulation of multiple logics of education across

a single pedagogical space that would mark the *collège* as a single space for the actualisation of the three logics of individual-, economy- and community-centred education indicated by the plan's goals of education cited above.

However, perhaps reflecting the Langevin-Wallon report's somewhat utopian orientation, identified by Ahearne (2010: 136-138), and the authors' intentionally *ex nihilo* formulation of the plan, which abstracts these proposals from the real pressure and forces that would be exerted by the *dispositifs* propagating the divergent logics of education, there is an assumption that the deployment of a flexible active pedagogy inspired by the theories of *l'Éducation nouvelle* (LW: 58-59) would be sufficient to both ensure a common course of education and adapt to the diversity of individual interests and aptitudes of all pupils in their institutions (LW: 31-32, 52-53, 56-57, 71) and thereby enable the divergent demands of community, individual and economy to converge and be actualised in this *cycle d'orientation* without contradiction, overlooking the varying investment of different *dispositifs* in distinct pedagogical strategies and the real tensions between the actualisation of these three logics of education that would undermine the individual disciplinary unity of the *collège* that we will see later. The Langevin-Wallon report's *second cycle du premier degré* was to actualise a community-centred logic of education, firstly, through a *tronc commun* of subjects that would contribute to 'la formation morale et civique par la culture de l'esprit critique et le libre examen' (LW: 72) and provide pupils with 'une documentation sur les grands faits historiques, économiques, sociaux, susceptibles de leur permettre ultérieurement une meilleure compréhension des événements contemporains et un choix personnel éclairé de leur position idéologique et de

leur action civique' (LW: 73). Secondly, in addition to this common culture, this logic would be actualised in the common provision of all available options that could come to supplement this common core, where '[t]out enfant doit pouvoir être mis à l'épreuve d'une option quelconque' (LW: 32). The economy-centred logic of education would also be actualised at this stage through the 'place importante […] faite à la connaissance des professions, de leur rôle, de leur évolution, des conditions où elles s'exercent' (LW: 73) in this common education and the possibility of pursuing further specialised options oriented towards technical skills ahead of the *cycle de détermination* (LW: 56-57). It is in relation to these options and the cultivation of the individual's capacity for critical, independent enquiry that the individual-centred logic would be actualised in this *cycle d'orientation* in order to realise the 'devéloppement maximum que leur personnalité comporte' (LW: 18).

Indeed, in order to distribute pupils between the different courses of the third cycle of this *premier degré*, the pupil's interests and aptitudes would be encouraged and observed over the course of the *cycle d'orientation* that covered a broad curriculum encompassing the *tronc commun* and a wide range of optional subjects for pupils to explore, which were intended to offer pupils a broad experience of as many different subjects as possible so that they might find and develop their interests and reveal their aptitudes in relation to this broad culture (LW: 19, 23, 31-33). This *cycle d'orientation* can be seen as an extension over four years of study of the one-year *classes d'orientation* proposed by Jean Zay's 1937 unexamined project for reform, which also emphasised an active pedagogy inspired by the theories of *l'Éducation*

nouvelle calling upon the spontaneous activity and interests of each child (LW: 58-59; Dorison 2010: 41-44).

It is with this firm pedagogical reference to the theories of *l'Éducation nouvelle*, however, which was, no doubt, derived in part from Langevin, Wallon and, vice-president of the commission, Henri Piéron's membership of the GFEN, that the Langevin-Wallon report also indicated a more intensive conception of a democratisation that affirms the possibility for all pupils to realise their full potential, which would contribute to the future development of debates regarding educational reform. While previous proposals for an *école unique* had been based upon a democratisation of selection where an *orientation* by aptitudes would ensure the meritocratic selection of cultural and technical elites from across the entire student population, the Langevin-Wallon plan instead demanded the free and full cultivation of each pupil according to their unique individual aptitudes and interests, a democratisation achieved 'moins par une sélection qui éloigne du peuple les plus doués' than by the equal right of every pupil to the 'développement maximum que leur personnalité comporte' with no limitation other than their own aptitudes (LW: 18). We see here a distinction in practices, highlighted by Dorison (2010: 41, 44-45), between a diagnostic and an educative understanding of *orientation* by aptitudes. The diagnostic understanding of *orientation* was that to be deployed in the majority of reforms proposed in the inter-war years and a number of post-war reform proposals, such as that proposed in January 1953 by the *directeur de l'enseignement du second degré*, Charles Brunold (see Robert 2015: 37-38; Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 156-158), that emphasised a process of the selection of elites and saw the aptitudes of a child as fixed,

natural qualities to be detected and used as the basis of a directed *orientation* of these pupils. The educative conception of *orientation*, on the other hand, which saw the aptitudes of each child as capacities that could and should be developed and realised through the child's own experience of education before they orient themselves, by pursuing their interests, amongst the options available to them, was expressed in both Jean Zay's initial plan for reform and the Langevin-Wallon report as well as a number of other post-war reports. This emphasis on fully realising all pupils' potentials and corresponding practice and discourse of *orientation* implicitly carried within it the ideal of a self-realising individual that emerges with theories of *l'Éducation nouvelle* and indicates the emergent shift in the post-war period, identified by Prost (1997: 53-60), from demands for the 'démocratisation de la sélection' towards those for a 'démocratisation de la réussite'. These demands would become over the following decades a source of critiques of the educational *dispositif*, and thus calls for the intensification of its exercise of power, that respond to the *mots d'ordre* of both community and the individual, on the grounds either that not all pupils receive common treatment from the school or that individual pupils are prevented from realising their individual potential.

Although unexamined by parliament, according to Louis Legrand (1998: 27), the publication of the Langevin-Wallon report 'déchaîna véritablement les passions' and in the years before the eventual implementation of the Berthoin reform of January 1959 there would be numerous projects for educational reform presented: the *projet Depreux* in 1948; the *projet Delbos* in 1949; the proposals of the *Fédération de l'Éducation nationale* (FEN) in 1952; the *projet* of the *direction de*

l'enseignement du second degré, the *projet* of the *direction de l'enseignement du premier degré*, and two *projets Marie* in 1953; the first *projet Berthoin*, the SFIO's *proposition de loi* and the first PCF *proposition de loi* in 1955; and the second PCF *proposition de loi*, and the *projet Billères* in 1956 (Robert 2015: 36-37). We will not examine the detail of all of these projects, but instead present an overview of the major tensions and points of consensus that emerged over the course of these debates that will present what Robert (2010: 21-22) might refer to as a matrix for the reform to come.

Although varying on the specific details of measures across these plans, most of these reform projects showed some continuity with the proposals of the Langevin-Wallon report insofar as they all proposed a *cycle d'orientation*, which would enact an *orientation* of pupils according to their individual aptitudes, and most projects also envisaged a curricular *tronc commun*, if not the more ambitious ideal of a single *école unique*, and an extension of the age of compulsory education (Robert 2015: 37; Dorison 2010: 37-38, Sadoun and Donegani 1976: 1130-1132). The variations between these forms would tend to present a limited number of possibilities. For example, whilst the 1953 *projets Marie* did not propose any extension of the period of compulsory education (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 163-167), the 1948 *projet Depreux* and 1949 *projet Delbos* proposed extending it to 18 years old (Ibid. 136, 139) and the 1955 *projet Berthoin* (Ibid. 176) and 1956 *projet Billères* (Ibid. 187) proposed that compulsory education only be extended to 16 years old. Most projects proposed a shorter *cycle d'orientation* than that proposed in the Langevin-Wallon plan, with all suggesting a two-year *cycle d'orientation* except the 1948 *projet Depreux*, which proposed a four-year period of

orientation (Ibid. 136), and the 1955 SFIO project, also devised under Edouard Depreux, which suggested a period of three years (Ibid. 171). The degree to which a *tronc commun* would be put in place during this period of *orientation* also varied between projects, with, for example, the 1956 *projet Billères* proposing a two-year *tronc commun* that was complete, offering no optional study, over the first year and partial, offering optional, specialising studies, for the second year (Robert 2010: 29), while the 1955 SFIO project suggested a partial *tronc commun* over all of its three-year period of *orientation* (in Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 320) and the 1953 *projet Marie*, somewhat exceptionally, proposed no *tronc commun* during the *cycle d'orientation*, which would instead encompass two years of distinct courses taught in separate institutions (Robert 2010: 28).

As Robert (2010) and Dorison (2010) show, some of these projects were more radical and progressive while others were less ambitious and even conservative in their vision for the French school, revealing the reluctance of some to abandon the traditional hierarchies and disciplinary enclosures that had been established under the Third Republic. Dorison (2010: 37-39, 44-47) notes that although the reference to an *orientation* according to pupils' individual aptitudes is generalised across all of these post-war plans for reform, the way that this is understood varies, with some more ambitious reforms proposing an *orientation* based on what we have identified as an educative conception of aptitudes and other more conservative proposals understanding aptitudes in a diagnostic sense. In those projects expressing an educative understanding of aptitudes, such as the Langevin-Wallon report, the Depreux project of 1948 and the SFIO project of 1955, an appeal is made to the active

pedagogy of *l'Éducation nouvelle* and a longer *cycle d'orientation* with multiple options to give pupils a chance to test and develop their aptitudes sufficiently for them to choose the right subsequent course for them and avoid a premature and incorrect *orientation*. For Robert (2010: 22-23), such projects present a 'matrice progressiste' of educational reform that demands the equal opportunity for every pupil to achieve their full potential according to their individual aptitudes regardless of their background or status. These reforms, as we have seen in the comprehensive plans of the Langevin-Wallon report, maintain little of the existing separate enclosures of the education system and, indeed, seek to go beyond these divisions by, for example, establishing a single, common body of teachers who would receive their training in the same institutions (Ibid. 23; LW: 44-46). On the other hand, those plans that, according to Dorison (2010: 45-47), refer to a more diagnostic conception of aptitudes, such as the 1949 Delbos project and the 1953 *projet Marie*, the aptitudes of the child are considered similar to pre-existing, natural talents to be detected over a short *cycle d'orientation* and then referred to in order to direct pupils to the relevant course for their talents in a process more akin to selection. As Robert (2010: 26-27) notes, such projects as those produced by Yvon Delbos in 1949 and André Marie in 1953 demand only that there is a selection of elites, who would be developed to realise their full potential in more prestigious courses of study, from amongst the whole population of pupils rather than from amongst the already privileged. These projects maintained an interest in preserving disciplinary divisions and hierarchies between the different orders of education. Delbos' project, for example, defends the restriction of longer courses of study beyond the end of the current

age of compulsory education, 14 years old, to an elite and supports the principle of a strict selection of pupils on the basis that '[v]ouloir obliger tous les enfants à entreprendre et à poursuivre des études qui exigent des dons que la nature […] est loin d'impartir également à chacun, c'est courir le risque […] d'abaisser le niveau de l'enseignement' (in Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 293).

The tensions between these two orientations indicate the strong division and the intense rivalry between the administration, personnel, trade unions[94] and other partisans of *l'enseignement du second degré* and those of *l'enseignement du premier degré* that would contribute to the failure of significant educational reform during the Fourth Republic and focused particularly on the disputed ground of the *premier cycle du second degré*, which corresponds to that of the contemporary *collège* (Lelièvre 1990: 141; Robert 2015: 39-40). The issue of the middle school or *cycle d'orientation* that was beginning to emerge at this level as part of any future reform (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 202) was the nodal point of this conflict and was caught between each camp's area of competence with each side disputing the questions of what institutions this *cycle* should take place in, e.g. CC or *collèges modernes/classiques*, and which body of teachers should teach in these classes, e.g. *instituteurs* or *professeurs certifiés* (Sadoun and Donegani 1976: 1145; Prost 2007: 146). The obstructive nature of the division between the camps of primary and secondary education was perhaps most starkly displayed in 1953, when the publication of a project by Charles Brunold, the

[94] The *Syndicat national des instituteurs* (SNI) represented the vast majority of *instituteurs* who taught in the *premier degré* while the *Syndicat national des enseignements du second degré* (SNES) represented the vast majority of *professeurs* of the *second degré*. In *l'enseignement technique* the largest teaching union was the *Syndicat national de l'enseignement technique* (SNET). See Robert (2005) for more information on teachers' trade unionism.

directeur de l'enseignement du second degré from 1951 to 1960, proposing two courses of short or long secondary education, at the expense of the CC of the *premier degré*, that emphasised the selection of a small elite for further studies through these secondary courses, was met by a counter-project produced by the *direction de l'enseignement du premier degré*, which rejected Brunold's two secondary courses and insisted on the continuation of CC and, indeed, their extension to five years in length (Robert 2010: 27-28; Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 155-162). This episode highlights the ongoing division between these two orders of education that were supposed, since 1937, to act as successive degrees, with their opposing *directions* constituting 'de[s] véritables ministères dans le ministère' (Prost 2007: 77). The tension recognised in the previous paragraph can be seen to largely reflect the differing inclinations of partisans of the *premier degré*, who were in favour of an ambitious democratisation of education through a *tronc commun* and the fusion of previously separate orders, and advocates of the *second degré*, who tended to favour only a democratisation of selection and seek to preserve the preeminent prestige of secondary education and its distinction (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 160; Robert 2015: 39-40).

As Lelièvre (1990: 141) notes, it is this division between these rival orders of education, rather than the governmental instability that marked the Fourth Republic, that is responsible for the failure of any significant reform in this period. As Robert (2010: 30) notes, whatever the various aspects of the reform proposed, each proposal would confront 'une variété presque infinie des critiques, fonction d'intérêts particuliers des catégories d'acteurs'.

Substantial reform would have to await the opportunity presented by the new Fifth Republic.

A number of lesser initiatives were taken in relation to education during this period, however, through the use of regulatory texts. These measures served to reinforce the disciplinary enclosure of each of the separate orders or degrees of education but also enabled the primary degree of education and technical education, in particular, to respond to the growing demand for longer studies from families, which precipitated a huge increase in the number of pupils in post-elementary education, even before the baby boom generation began to enter these classes from 1956 onwards, and from the French economy, which was just entering the *trente glorieuses*. The inequalities that emerged from the competition between these different orders or degrees of education over this period highlighted a continued failure of the education system to overcome the unequal opportunities of pupils derived from their socio-economic background, and therefore to provide either a democratisation of selection or educational success. These inequalities will also go on to be recognised as a limit on the capacity of the education system to satisfy economic demands and eventually lead to demands for a more thorough process of *orientation*.

Following the Liberation, each order of education would renew their separate means of recruiting and training their teaching personnel in line with their own norms thereby reinforcing their disciplinary enclosure and the saturation of their institutional space with these norms oriented towards the logic of education they actualise. Closed by the Vichy regime, the *écoles normales d'instituteurs* (ENI) were reopened immediately after the war to train

the generalist *instituteurs* who, after a course of four years that would now include passing a *baccalauréat* and a final year of pedagogical training, would go on teach in the *écoles primaires* and their associated CC under the jurisdiction of the *direction de l'enseignement du premier degré* (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 149-150; Grandière 2010: 146). In the *second degré* a new *concours* was established alongside that of the *agrégation* to recruit subject-specific *professeurs* to teach in the *collèges*, *lycées* and *collèges modernes* (former EPS) under the jurisdiction of the *direction de l'enseignement du second degré*. Following the transformation of EPS into *collèges modernes* in 1941, a new *concours* for a *certificat d'aptitude à enseigner dans les collèges* (CAEC) was established to recruit *professeurs* to teach in these institutions in place of those trained at the ENI, but in 1950 (*Décret* of 1 April 1950) this was reorganised as a *concours* for university graduates conferring the *certificat d'aptitude au professorat de l'enseignement secondaire* (CAPES), which, after 1952, would be followed by a year of pedagogical initiation at one of the *Centre pédagogique régional* (CPR) established by a *décret* of 17 January 1952 (Obin 2013: 99; Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 150-151). Finally, the personnel under the *direction de l'enseignement technique* were also given specialised training, with those seeking to teach in the ENP and *collèges techniques* (former EPCI reclassified by Carcopino in 1941) continung to study at the *école normale supérieure de l'enseignement technique* (ENSET) where, now after three rather than two years of study, they would receive the *certificat d'aptitude au professorat de l'enseignement technique* (CAPET) enabling them to teach in these institutions, while an *ordonnance* of 2 November 1945 establishing five *écoles normales nationales d'apprentissage* (ENNA) to train

the teachers for the CFP, which would be renamed *centres d'apprentissage* (CA) by a *loi* of 21 February 1949 (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 151-152; Lembré 2016: 75).

This re-organisation of recruitment practices took place in the post-war context of what Louis Cros, who would become *directeur de l'administration générale du Ministère de l'Éducation nationale* from 1960 to 1964, would refer to in 1961 as an 'explosion scolaire' in which the economic need for education, the demand for longer education from families and eventually the demographic tidal wave of the baby boom generation would lead to a huge increase in the number of children in the education system pursuing post-elementary studies beyond the age of 14, the official end of compulsory education (Robert 2015: 40-41). As Prost (1968: 440; 2004: 276-278) notes, in the post-war period, the French economy needed to be rebuilt and modernise to compete with other countries and so it would need to overcome its lack of skilled labour. The post-war development of the economy, which was marked by a rural exodus, industrialisation and the growth of the third sector, indicated a demand for 'plus de cerveaux et moins de bras' (Prost 1968: 440) as even jobs in the secondary sector increasingly demanded a higher level of education as technicians and managers were sought. As Cros explained in 1961, many families perceived this economic shift that would increase demand for more educated workers and sought to keep their children in education for longer (Robert 2015: 41). Even before the baby boom generations born after the war hit the age of 11 years old from 1956 onwards and added to this trend then, we see a major increase in the numbers of pupils pursuing studies in various institutions at the level of the *premier cycle* of secondary study, that began at

the level of the *sixième* at 11 years old, and beyond the age of compulsory education. We can see this tendency in the percentage of the population aged 12 to 15 years old in education, which increased from 20.5% in 1945-1946 to 38.5% in 1955-1956 before the baby boom generations reached this age, after which the percentage continued to show this trend and reached 45.7% in 1959-1960 (Robert 2015: 42). As 'chaque ordre part[ait] à la conquête de cette population nouvelle' (Prost 2013: 80), it became clear that, although the number of pupils in the first cycle of the *second degré* increased from 206,600 in the academic year 1945-1946 to 421,200 in 1958-1959 (Robert 2015: 42), the major beneficiaries of this increase in pupil population were the CC of the primary degree and the institutions of technical education, which through extending their influence amongst this population intensified their disciplinary exercise of power by achieving a greater saturation of society with their logics of education oriented towards the *mots d'ordre* of community and the economy.

As both Prost (2013: 81) and Chapoulie (2010: 402-403) show, the CC of the *premier degré* were best placed to respond to these new demands due to their administrative status and a post-war reorganisation of this institution's course of studies and its sanctions. The CC, as supplementary classes connected to existing *écoles primaires*, could be more readily and cheaply created and extended to respond to demand than the institutions of the *second degré*. Whilst the Ministry of Education had to approve the creation of a new *lycée*, the development of CC, as part of primary education, was under the devolved authority of the *inspecteurs d'académie* who only required an additional free classroom and *instituteur* to create each year of CC and could

therefore easily extend the offer of CC by this same method up to a complete CC of four years. This flexibility enabled a network of CC more dense than that of the institutions of the *second degré* to extend across the country with the number of CC increasing from 1,944 CC with 6,458 classes in 1945 to 2,667 CC with 14,946 classes in 1958 (Prost 2013: 81-82). Overall, between the academic years of 1945-1946 and 1958-1959 the number of pupils enrolled in public sector CC increased from 152,800 to 410,300 (Robert 2015: 42).

This expansion was also aided by the post-war revision and reorganisation of study in CC that enabled these classes to provide a full four-year course of education that eventually offered pupils the chance to pursue further study upon its completion. Long left undefined and intended to loosely mirror the programmes of the EPS, the programmes of the CC, which, under the Vichy regime, had been reduced to cover only the two year *classes de fin d'études primaires* also taught in *écoles primaires* without official CC attached, were codified by the *arrêté* of 24 July 1947 to follow as far as possible the programmes of the first cycle of the second degree of education, as taught in the *collèges modernes*. This would offer a course of studies over four years, available in CC with sufficient staff and pupils to cover a four-year period, that took on the nomenclature of the classes of the second degree (*sixième* to *troisième*) (Chapoulie 2010: 402; Prost 2013: 79, 81). The successful completion of these four years of study would also be sanctioned by a new *brevet d'études du premier cycle du second degré* (BEPC), instituted by a *decrét* of 20 October 1947, that replaced both the BEPS and the BE. The exams for the BEPC could also be taken by pupils having completed this *premier cycle* in the institutions of the *second degré* who readily availed

themselves of this opportunity (Chapoulie 2010: 402). This reorganisation and replacement of the BEPS with the BEPC suggested an orientation of these CC towards a possible preparation for further studies, which were further enabled by the opening of a new section (*moderne prime* or M') in 1952 in the institutions of the *second cycle du second degré*, which, by adapting the *section moderne* (M) to substitute scientific studies in place of modern languages for the first part of these secondary studies, enabled pupils of CC to pursue their studies to the level of a *baccalauréat*, which they did in increasing numbers (Chapoulie 2010: 402; Prost 1997: 89-90). The result of this reorganisation of the CC that indicated a reorientation towards a preparation for further studies was somewhat at odds with the objective still implicitly ascribed to them by the Ministry of Education of providing a practical general culture that prepared pupils for everyday life, which would be reaffirmed in the Berthoin reform of 1959, but these institutions still taught the four years that led to a BEPC as a complete whole, with pupils having to attend an institution of the *second degré* to pursue a *baccalauréat*, and the ready availability of this education that remained taught by polyvalent *instituteurs* remained close to the culture and concrete concerns of the families who sent their pupils to these schools (Chapoulie 2010: 402; Prost 1997: 96).

L'enseignement technique also responded to the new demand from families and the economy with new offers of education that saw the extension of its economy-centred discipline to a greater number of pupils. In the context of economic reconstruction this order of education came to be held in some esteem by the government, industry, trade unions and the PCF (Lembré 2016: 78-79; Troger and Ruano-Borbalan 2010: 85-86) and its accelerated

development was set as an objective of the first Plan for the years 1946 to 1953 produced by the *Commissariat général du Plan* in 1946 (Robert 2015: 46). The CA recruited pupils to study for a CAP at the end of their compulsory education, 14 years old, by *concours* but still saw an increase from 860 CA with 60,000 pupils in 1944 to 946 CA with 170,000 pupils in 1958 (Lembré 2016: 77-78). Another remarkable expansion was seen in the more advanced courses of the *collèges techniques* and ENP in which the number of pupils increased from 86,500 in 1944 to 137,000 in 1958. These ENP and *collèges techniques*, which also recruited pupils by *concours* at the end of compulsory education, began to offer more advanced qualifications over four years, such as a *baccalauréat technique*, created by the *décret* of 6 May 1946, usually offered by ENP, and *brevets de technicien*, created by a *décret* of 19 February 1952, usually offered in *collèges techniques*. With this the ENP and *collèges techniques* tended to become considered parallel, though of less cultural value, to the second cycle of the second degree of education (Lembré 2016: 75-76; Prost 1968: 316; Chapoulie 2010: 400-401). Although, as Lembré (2016: 77-78) notes, both of these levels of technical education recruited their pupils by *concours* at the age of fourteen at the end of compulsory education, i.e. the level of the class of *quatrième*, Lelièvre (1990: 174) and Prost (2004: 633) state that these institutions also began to open technical classes of *sixième* and *cinquième* to attempt to prepare pupils for this order of education before they were recruited to other orders of education, thereby constituting a third type of *sixième* into which pupils could enter from their elementary studies alongside that of the CC and that of the *collèges classiques ou modernes* or *lycées*.

Although offering a number of opportunities for study beyond the age of compulsory education, responding to general social and economic demands for more education, the largely uncoordinated competition between these different orders of education demonstrated the persistent limitation constituted by the continued dominance of socio-economic origin upon pupils' educational opportunities and outcomes. As Lelièvre (1990: 174) notes, in 1958, children of workers made up half of all those attending CA, a third of those in CC and only 15% of those attending either *lycées* or *collèges modernes* or *classiques* of the *second degré*, while, conversely, children of parents working in liberal professions or management made up a third of pupils in institutions of the *second degré*, 14% of those in CC and only 7% of those in CA. Additionally, this analysis, as Lelièvre (1990: 174) highlights, ignores the large number of pupils that would not enter into one of these classes at the level of *sixième* at all, with over half of pupils aged 11 years old at the end of the class CM2 of the *écoles primaires* remaining in the classes of the *école primaire* to continue their studies in the primary *classes de fin d'études*, while 16% enter into CC, 14.5% go on to pursue their studies in the courses of the *second degré* and 2% take up studies in technical education. Indeed, studies conducted by the demographer and sociologist Alain Girard in 1953, 1954 and 1955 confirmed the importance of social and gegraphical inequalities and the significant influence of these disparities on pupils' chances at school, leaving many excellent pupils ending their studies prematurely (Prost 2013: 86; Chapoulie 2010: 461-462). This problem of inequality was recognised officially by René Billères, the Minister of Education from 1 February 1956 to 14 May 1958, for example, who drew upon these statistical studies to note in his 1956 *projet* for

educational reform that one of the reasons the school required reform was that 'l'origine sociale de l'élève oriente fatalement l'option à onze ans' and called for a reinforced process of *orientation* as a solution (in Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 360-361).

This uneven and haphazard development of educational outcomes would also come to be identified as an obstacle to the French school responding sufficiently to economic demands (Lelièvre 1990: 176-177). Indeed, despite the extended schooling that had developed in each of the orders and degrees of education, it soon became apparent that the existing education system was not adapted to respond to the demands of the rapidly growing economy as the contribution of education to economic growth became a growing concern and topic of enquiry in the 1950s, reflecting an international trend of reflection upon the various factors of a country's economic growth that saw the emergence of theories of human capital (Robert 2015: 46, 49-52; Prost 2013: 82-83; Chapoulie 2010: 395-397).

As Rosen (2008) explains, human capital theory can be traced back to the work of Adam Smith in the eighteenth century but only became the subject of extensive study in the twentieth century, the term itself being developed during the 1950s and established in the 1960s by economists such as T. W. Schultz and Gary Becker, as part of efforts to first identify the source of rapid economic growth and later to explain income disparities within societies. This theory asserts that human beings, or rather the stock of skills and knowledge that they embody, constitute a sort of capital, i.e. 'a stock which has value as a source of current and future flows of output and income', which is most obviously invested in and so developed and made more productive through the

investment of one's initial stock of time and effort in education that develops one's general or particular skills (Rosen 2008). As comparative studies of long-term economic growth increasingly came to the conclusion in the post-war period that a country's investment in the physical capital, or constant capital, of the means of production, such as machinery, could not sufficiently account for growth in national GDP, education came to fill the explanatory role of the residual factor in this growth identified by economists (Robert 2015: 51). Bowman (1966: 111) noted, this paradigm of human capital investment marked a 'revolution in economic thought' that began in the 1950s, with 117 articles published on this topic in the 1950s, followed by another 283 in the first four years of the 1960s, and only 20 published on this issue earlier in the twentieth century. In human capital theory, then, education is considered an economic investment for future return and, as Robert (2015: 52) highlights, this understanding of education leads to questions regarding what types of educational investment were likely to be the most productive and how the state can best ensure the most productive pattern of investment.

It is this sort of human capital investment that the *Commissariat général du Plan* would set out, but the lack of an effective system of *orientation* to direct pupils towards the course thought to constitute the best human capital investment of their capacities meant that the distribution of pupils across the eduction system was, as noted above, left to chance, under the influence of socio-economic inequalities, resulting in a number of shortfalls in higher skilled technical and tertiary sector labour. Although successful, the development of technical education that had been specified in the first Plan, for example, had resulted in an oversupply of lower level technicians compared to

a relative lack of better qualified higher level technicians (Robert 2015: 46). Indeed, studies found that France trained half as many engineers as the USA, the USSR or the UK and that similar shortfalls existed for other medium and higher level technicians (Prost 2013: 83). In order to respond to this demand for more engineers, trained at either a *Grande école*, such as *l'École Polytechnique*, or in the *Écoles nationales supérieures d'ingénieurs* attached to the universities that were established by a *décret* of 16 January 1947, a greater number of pupils would need to receive the *baccalauréat* that enabled access to higher education, but, as a 1955 report noted, contrary to claims from partisans of the *second degré*, like the director of *l'enseignement du second degré* Charles Brunold, who claimed that the *lycées* were submerged by a wave of extra students, the secondary education system proved to be somewhat 'anémié' with less than 6% of an age cohort holding a *baccalauréat* (Prost 2013: 82-83). The development of longer non-technical education was also required in response to the needs of the tertiary sector of the economy, as Jean Berthoin, during his first period as *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* from 19 June 1954 to 1 February 1956, recognised in his first *projet* for educational reform published on 1 August 1955:

> [T]out fait voir que les activités non techniques, ou semi-techniques, du secteur "tertiaire", celles qui sont de l'ordre théorique, de type commercial ou, pourrait-on dire, de style relationnel, offriront à nos élèves des carrières de plus en plus nombreuses. (in Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 341)

Indeed, in his reform project published the following year, René Billères, Minister of Education from 1 February 1956 to 14 May 1958, described this development of tertiary sector employment as an irreversible movement that 'conduit un nombre de plus en plus élevé de travailleurs qui n'avaient besoin autrefois que d'une instruction élémentaire vers des emplois ou des fonctions qui exigent des connaissances, au moins générales, plus étendues' (in Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 362). Both projects noted that the capacity of the current school system to develop sufficient numbers of the teachers, researchers, lawyers, scientists, salespeople, receptionists, managers and so forth to respond to these new demands was limited by the malthusian supply of secondary education and uncoordinated practices of *orientation* (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 175, 186-187).

In response to the new demands of the economy and the apparent failure of the French school to respond to these demands, then, the last proposals for reform under the Fourth Republic, the 1955 Berthoin project and 1956 Billères project, each proposed a systematic process of *orientation* and an extension of compulsory education from 14 to 16 years old. Berthoin insisted on the necessity of a more thorough process of *orientation* to ensure the best distribution of 'nos richesses humaines entre les niveaux et les formes des emplois non-techniques ou semi-techniques' (in Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 342) and the extension of compulsory education to 16 years old partly to avoid a premature *orientation* (in Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 343-345). Billères' project also emphasised the importance of an *orientation* that would seek to overcome the prejudices of socio-economic origins (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 360-361) and called for an extension of compulsory education to 16

years old to raise the general level of education in society, recognising that 'la productivité est directement conditionnée par le niveau d'éducation de l'ensemble des travailleurs' (in Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 363). In November 1956, Billères took concrete action to enable the extension of education and the availability of secondary education by abolishing the entry exam at the level of *sixième* for *lycées* and *collèges modernes ou classiques* and replacing it with an examination of each pupil's academic record, namely their achievement of *la moyenne* in their previous studies, as the criterion for accepting a pupil (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 196).

With this economic interest in the extension of education for all and an *orientation* of pupils according to their aptitudes, we can see a convergence of demands for the intensification of community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education on the idea of a reform that would enable such longer studies and practices of *orientation* in relation to an, at least partial, *tronc commun*, which had become a common refrain in the numerous reform projects of this post-war period. As Louis Cros stated in 1961, at this point '[l]es exigences de la prosperité et de l'équilibre économique s'ajoutent […] aux raisons de justice et d'égalité sociales pour rendre nécessaire en même temps que désirable, l'instruction la plus développée possible pour le plus grand nombre possible d'enfants' (in Prost 2013: 84). The democratisation of education envisaged by the Langevin-Wallon report, where the full-realisation of individual capacities responds to the individual-centred logic of education and the extension of equal opportunity to achieve this full-realisation in relation to a common curriculum responds to the community-centred logic of education, comes therefore to offer the development of pupils' capacities in

response to the economy-centred logic of education. Indeed, this convergence of distinct educational logics is indicated in Billères' 1956 proposal for the extension of compulsory education to 16 years old, where it is recognised that this extension would not just serve the needs of the economy, but also contribute to the development of the individual and the fostering of community: 'la prolongation de la scolarité ne saurait reposer essentiellement sur la nécessité d'une formation professionnelle plus poussée; […] elle tend aussi à assurer un développement plus complet de l'homme moderne et tient compte de la nécessité absolue pour le bon fonctionnement de la démocratie, d'une promotion culturelle générale du corps social' (in Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 363).

By the end of the Fourth Republic, then, we see the emergence of a consensus in favour of educational reform that incorporates a number of common aspects from the numerous educational plans produced throughout this period in the wake of the ambitious Langevin-Wallon report, which, in establishing the blueprint for the future architecture of the French education system, had again prefigured an *école unique* in which power would be exercised simultaneously in service of the *mots d'ordre* of community, the individual and the economy. These aspects of consensus included the establishment of a separate *cycle d'orientation*, which would include an either partial or complete *tronc commun* in relation to which all pupils might be observed and oriented, and the extension of the compulsory age of education. Despite the emergence of this consensus over the course of the Fourth Republic, however, the fierce rivalry between the partisans of primary and secondary education, particularly with regard to which of the two should take

charge of this *cycle d'orientation*, meant that any legislative efforts were stymied, leaving the inequalities still evident in the haphazard *orientation* of pupils as a limitation on the community-, individual- and economy-centred logic of education, which sought the equal opportunity of all pupils against the background of a *tronc commun* as part of a common republican culture, the full-realisation of each pupil's individual aptitudes, and the most economically profitable education respectively. The new conditions of the Fifth Republic would enable this deadlock on reform to be overcome and a number of long-awaited reforms to be passed.

Disciplinary educational reform in the early Fifth Republic: the 1959 Berthoin reform, the 1963 Fouchet-Capelle reform, and the consolidation of an integrated disciplinary *dispositif*

The educational reforms that were eventually undertaken at the beginning of the Fifth Republic, the Berthoin reform of 1959 and the Fouchet-Capelle reform of 1963 that modified and sought to correct this earlier reform, which had proved too limited in its provisions to ensure the *orientation* of pupils in function of their individual aptitudes or to reduce inequalities in the education system, can be seen as the product of the consensus, noted above, that saw in the extension of the age of compulsory education and the definition of a distinct *cycle d'orientation* with a *tronc commun* a means of intensifying the exercise of power in service of the community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education. These educational reforms and the accompanying

restructuring and reinforcement of the administrative apparatus of the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale* in the 1960s, which consolidated the codified and regular exercise of disciplinary power in a single *dispositif* converging towards a single central authority, constituted a step towards the unification of the separate orders of education that had persisted with their own distinct institutions, personnel and administration, despite the changes in nomenclature that had followed the 1937 Zay reforms, and therefore towards the realisation of the long-discussed *école unique*, which had been at the horizon of projects for educational reform since the First World War.

However, despite this apparent movement beyond these 'cloisonnements abusifs' (Capelle 1966: 29) and towards an *école unique*, the Berthoin and Fouchet-Capelle reforms reasserted the distinctions between community-, individual- and economy-centred disciplinary enclosures, which operated as 'des moulages distincts' (PP: 242) within a unified and centralised, disciplinary *dispositif*. This *dispositif* was consolidated through the reorganisation of the previously separate *directions* of the primary degree, secondary degree and technical and professional education into a single, unified *direction générale de l'organisation et des programmes scolaires* (DGOPS) under the authority of the Minister of Education; the rationalisation and reorganisation of the various inspectorates to integrate those that had been developed to oversee the separate orders of education and to account for the rapid expansion of the education system; and the development of the *carte scolaire* that established a disciplinary *quadrillage* of French territory in order to standardise the offer of education across France and to organise the distribution of pupils between the various disciplinary enclosures of the

education system. This *carte scolaire* was essential for the operation of the strict *orientation* of pupils that underpinned the intended operation of the *premier cycle du second degré* in both the Berthoin and Fouchet-Capelle reforms.

Guided by the forecasts and previsions of the Plan, this *orientation* was to respond in particular to the order-word of the economy by seeking to maximise the economic effectiveness of these human capital investments, but also responded to demands to limit access to the individual-centred long course of general education to ensure its disciplinary enclosure. Intending to operate according to individual aptitudes and be applied to all pupils equally, this *orientation* also intended to actualise the community-centred logic of education, as well as the individual-centred logic, and as such served to extend the operation of all three logics into the different enclosures oriented by these logics, which could be considered to blur the disciplinary boundaries of these *dispositifs*. Nonetheless, the operation of this *orientation* would soon be subject to further critiques later in the decade alongside the apparent limitations of these preserved disciplinary enclosures.

A - The Berthoin reform (1959)

The long-awaited reform of the education system finally began with the signature on 6 January 1959 of *ordonnance* 59-45, extending the compulsory period of education from 14 years old to 16 years old, and *décret* 59-57, enacting a reorganisation of the post-elementary education system, that together constituted the Berthoin reform. This initial reform was made possible, firstly, by the strengthened position of Charles de Gaulle and his

government, which, following the establishment of the Fifth Republic and the losses of the Left in the legislative elections of November 1958, could prove its dynamism by standing up to the rival corporate interests of the education system (Prost 1997: 96-97; 2004: 289-290), but also, secondly, by the inoffensive content of the decree, which placated these interests by preserving the distinctions between the different orders of education at this level of education while establishing a limited *cycle d'orientation* (Chapoulie 2010: 422-423). Further to this preservation of these disciplinary enclosures oriented towards different order-words, one can indeed see this reform as an uneven effort to intensify the exercise of power in service of each of the order-words that had animated these distinct *dispositifs* of education. The extension of compulsory education to the age of 16 and the institution of a *cycle d'orientation* beginning with a brief *tronc commun* for all pupils suggested an intensification of the community-centred logic of education. The *orientation* of pupils according to their individual aptitudes and the broader-based and more scientific recruitment of pupils to long courses of secondary education indicated an intensification of the individual-centred logic of education. Indeed, the similarly expanded recruitment of pupils to courses of technical education that would be integrated with the rest of the public education system pointed to an intensification of the economy-centred logic of education. However, although we can see some indication of these broader intentions, this reform, carrying the name of Jean Berthoin, who was *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* again from 1 June 1958 until 8 January 1959 under de Gaulle, largely followed the template set out in Berthoin's earlier 1955 reform project, and as such, placed an emphasis on responding to the demands of the economy

by ensuring the best investment of the nation's human capital through longer studies and a more efficient *orientation* of pupils (Robert 2010: 30-34). The community-, individual- and economy-centred ambitions carried by this reform would only receive a limited realisation, however, and the 1963 Fouchet-Capelle reform, which similarly prioritised economic concerns, would seek to address its shortcomings.

Ordonnance 59-45 extended compulsory education by two years to the age of 16 rather than 14 years old and would be applicable to all pupils whose sixth birthday fell in 1959 and subsequent generations, coming into effect from 1967 onwards when these pupils turned 14 years old (Art. 1). It ensured a quantitative democratisation of studies up to the age of 16 that also expanded the recruitment pool for longer courses of study. Although, as Prost (2013: 84-85) notes this measure responded to the trend towards longer studies that was already underway and that Louis Cros would identify as part of the *explosion scolaire*, Chapoulie (2010: 421) highlights that in 1958 the proportion of pupils who would enrol in a class of *sixième* of any institution offering an education beyond the age of 14 years was less than 50%. Significant investment in the development of the necessary infrastructure would be needed to accommodate this greater number of pupils, especially the generations of the post-war baby boom, but this massification of attendance in the *premier cycle* of secondary education was successful with, for example, the proportion of 12 to 15 year olds in education increasing from 45.7% in 1959 to 47% in 1961, even with an increase in this population by 500,000 in this same period (Prost 2013: 82, 85).

The second text of the Berthoin reform was *décret* 59-57 that set out a reorganisation of post-elementary, second degree education that offered a

number of distinct courses of study, taught within renamed iterations of the pre-existing separate institutions, and established a two-year period of *orientation* with a limited common curriculum intended to enable the distribution of pupils between these courses that would be followed by a *cycle terminal* in which pupils would complete their given course of study. The long-debated period of *orientation* was introduced as a *cycle d'observation* (Art. 4, 6 to 21) that took place in the classes of *sixième* and *cinquième* of every type of school that made up the *second degré*, each remaining in separate institutions. These classes would remain 'partie intégrante de l'établissement où elles sont installées' (Art. 7) but the different programmes of these institutions would be as close to each other as possible over this cycle (Art. 8). During this *cycle d'observation* teachers were to methodically observe 'les goûts et les aptitudes de l'élève' (Art. 11) so as to provide a recommendation regarding the future schooling of each pupil in each school's *conseil d'orientation*, composed of all the teachers of the *cycle d'observation* of that school (Art. 17). This would occur at the end of the first trimester of this cycle (Art. 10), followed by continued observation and evaluation over the course of the cycle with further recommendations given to parents on an *ad hoc* basis (Art. 12), and then finally at the end of the *cycle d'observation* upon the conclusion of the *cinquième* (Art. 14). To correct any erroneous *orientations*, which this new process intended to reduce, the reform also called for the establishment of *classes passerelles* that would enable pupils to pass from one course to another (Art. 16; JORF 7/1/1959: 424-425). If pupils wished to follow an alternative course of study to that recommended at the end of the *cinquième*, however, they would have to pass an entry exam to prove their

aptitude (Art. 14). As the decree's accompanying *exposé des motifs* notes, the intention of this period of *orientation* was to 'substituer à l'orientation de hasard ou de préjugé [...] une orientation fondée sur la pleine observation de[s…] aptitudes [des enfants]' (JORF 7/1/1959: 423).

The different courses or forms of education towards which pupils could be oriented and in which they could complete their compulsory education in the *cycle terminal* that followed the *cycle d'observation* were defined in the decree as *l'enseignement terminal* (Art. 5, 31); *l'enseignement technique*, *court* or *long* (Art. 29 to 39); and *l'enseignement général*, *court* or *long* (*classique ou moderne*) (Art. 22 to 28). Each of these courses largely corresponded to existing courses of education and, with the exception of *l'enseignement terminal*, would be taught in renamed versions of the pre-existing institutions by their different bodies of teachers. *L'enseignement général long*, leading to a *baccalauréat* (Art. 26) after six years of study, including the *cycle d'observation* (Art. 22), would be taught in *lycées*, a title that would also be applied to the *collèges* of the second degree (Art. 25), by the same body of *professeurs* that had previously taught in these institutions (Art. 55). *L'enseignement général court* was intended to lead to a *brevet d'enseignment général* over the course of five years of study, including the two years of the *cycle d'observation*, although the Fouchet-Capelle reform would return the length of this course of studies to four years in 1963 and *décret* 59-1314 of 16 November 1959 stipulated the retention of the title of BEPC for the qualification sanctioning the completion of these studies. This education would be given in the CC that would now be called *collèges d'enseignement général* (CEG) (Art. 28), and be taught by *instituteurs* 'pourvus d'une licence adaptée à

leur mission' (Art. 54). This licence would be codified by *décret* 60-1127 of 21 October 1960 as the *certificat d'aptitude pédagogique pour les collèges d'enseignement général* (CAP-CEG) that could be awarded, by examination, to *instituteurs* who had either completed extra studies over one or two years in the *centres de formation des futurs professeurs des CEG* established by another decree of 21 October 1960, or who could demonstrate experience and qualifications equivalent to five years of teaching and a *brevet supérieur* or *baccalauréat* (Lelièvre 1990: 179-180). *L'enseignement technique court* would be taught in CA, renamed *collèges d'enseignement technique* (CET), and lead to a CAP over three years of study after the *cycle d'observation* (Art. 32), while *l'enseignement technique long* would train 'agents techniques' over four years (Art. 33) and 'techniciens' over five years (Art. 34) after the *cycle d'observation* in ENP and *collèges techniques*, both renamed *lycées techniques*, and would train 'techniciens supérieurs' over a longer period of time in 'des écoles ou sections spéciales' (Art. 35). Each of these long courses of technical education would be sanctioned by a relevant *brevet* (Art. 33 to 35), adapting through subsequent decrees, as Courtebras (2008: 79-80) explains, the *brevets de technicien* created in 1952 for the first two of these courses, while creating new *brevets de technicien supérieur* (BTS) for the longest course by the *décret* of 26 February 1962. Both the short and long courses of technical education would be taught by a single body of *professeurs de l'enseignement technique* (*décret* 59-57, Art. 56) who would all have received the CAPET, which was reorganised by a *décret* of 10 September 1959 to include those who had previously followed a separate course to teach in what were now CET. Finally, the vaguely defined *enseignement terminal* would

provide a general education alongside a practical preparation for agricultural, artisanal, commercial or industrial work, which could be concluded in the workplace (Art. 31), to complete the compulsory period of education for those pupils unwilling or unable to follow the other courses of education and lead to a *diplôme de fin d'études obligatoires* (Art. 5). As the *exposé de motifs* that introduced *décret* 59-57 states (JORF 7/1/1959: 425), this education would not have its own specific institutions or personnel, but would be taught in *sections terminales* attached to CEG where these institutions were available. This general and practical education intended to complete one's compulsory education suggests an extension of the *classes de fin d'études* of the *écoles primaires*. As we will see, this organisation of the education system would soon be modified and *l'enseignement terminal* sketched out in *Décret* 59-57 would soon be abolished, but, as Prost (1968: 422) noted, with this initial reclassification of the education system 'chacun reste chez soi.'

By largely maintaining the distinct enclosures that had existed at this post-elementary level under the Fourth Republic under different names, this reform managed to satisfy partisans of both the primary and secondary degrees (Prost 2004: 291; Lelièvre 1990: 181), but also reasserted the boundaries between distinct disciplinary *dispositifs* oriented by divergent logics of education. Referred to as 'l'enseignement théorique' in the decree's *exposé de motifs* and representing the most advanced expression, at this level, of 'l'héritage de savoir désintéressé et la tradition humaniste qui constitue l'essence du génie française' evoked six paragraphs earlier in the same text (JORF 7/1/1969: 423), the long courses of general education preserved the tradition of the Third Republic's *enseignement secondaire* and continued to

actualise an individual-centred logic in the *lycées* through an education oriented towards the full realisation of individual pupils as extensively cultured and rational self-governing individuals, which remained the dominant norm in the second degree (see Château 2010). Remaining close to the primary degree and taught by specially qualified *instituteurs*, the short general education of the CEG was to be a continuation of the four-year CC, which, although offering the potential to join a longer course of technical or general education in the class of *seconde* through the qualification of the BEPC (*Décret* 59-1314, Art. 3), would focus on providing a limited general culture considered complete in itself (JORF 7/1/1959: 425-426). This reflects the objective of the Third Republic's *enseignement primaire* to provide a limited and general culture to all its pupils. The fact that these institutions were considered to be the default home, where possible, to sections of *l'enseignement terminal* (Ibid. 425), which, in their mission to provide pupils with a minimum level of general education alongside a preparation to take up employment, reflected the goals of the *cours de fin d'études* of the *école primaire* outlined by Jean Zay in 1938 (in Heurdier and Prost 2014: 107-108), also underlines a certain proximity to the normative goals of that community-centred education. The long and short courses of *l'enseignment technique* remained oriented towards the demands of the economy, seeking to subject pupils to the norms of technical knowledge and activity demanded by various technical professions of different levels (JORF 7/1/1959: 425). The Berthoin reform's new distinctions between different courses reproduced the old separation of divergent disciplinary logics in distinct *dispositifs* oriented by different *mots d'ordre*.

In the reform's *exposé des motifs*, each of these separate courses of education is explicitly said to lead to a particular class of employment (JORF 7/1/1959: 425-426), indicating a disciplinary codification of progression to other disciplinary sites and programmes of work, but also the dominant discursive reference to an economy-centred logic of education that has been identified in this reform. It is stated then that: *l'enseignement terminal* prepares pupils to subsequently take up agricultural, artisanal or unskilled technical work; *l'enseignement technique court* leads to skilled industrial work; *l'enseignement technique long* enables access to specialised industrial work and engineering; *l'enseignement général court* opens access to mid-level white collar employment; and *l'enseignement général long* opens the way to managerial positions and liberal professions, potentially after further study in higher education (JORF 7/1/1959: 425-426). If these different forms of education do not necessarily function in themselves according to the norms of economic activity and may retain their own normative programmes centred on practical or disinterested general culture, this designation implies an extension of the economy-centred logic of education, suggesting a functional integration of these non-vocational courses of study with the economy. This indicates an intensification of the disciplinary exercise of power in that it constituted an attempt to codify the transition from one disciplinary institution to another by determining a fixed value of the sanction that marked the successful completion of each course of education, akin to the fixed value of 'des monnaies moulées qui renfermaient de l'or comme nombre étalon', said by Deleuze to be indicative of the disciplinary economy as opposed to the 'échanges flottantes' of the economy of control (PP: 244). This attempted

codification of the relationship between courses of education and types of employment was reflected in the system of *orientation* between these different courses set out in this reform, which was devised less in response to demands for greater equality of opportunity than the demands of the growing economy (Robert 2015: 55-57).

As Robert (2006: 188-190; 2015: 52-56) notes, the predominantly economic orientation of this reform accorded with de Gaulle's demand for the school to respond to the 'conditions de l'époque qui sont utilitaires et techniques' (quoted in Lelièvre 2008: 103), which indicated a need for the education system to better serve the modernising economy, and can be seen in the *exposé de motifs* that introduced *décret* 59-57 (JORF 7/1/1959: 422-427). Robert (2006: 189-190) highlights the influence of the new discourse of human capital investment in this text with reference to the recurrent use of terms such as 'investissement éducatif', 'ressources humaines', and 'réserves d'aptitude' and the title of the section outlining the reasons for a reorganisation of the education system: 'Investir à plein profit'. Indeed, intending to secure 'une pleine rentabilité' to the nation's financial investment in the school, the stated primary aim of the reform and its organisation of a period of *orientation* was to ensure 'une prospection aussi complète que possible de nos ressources juvéniles' (JORF 7/1/1959: 423). If the stinginess of the pre-existing system is condemned in this text it seems to be less due to an interest in more equal access to education or the promotion of each pupil's full and disinterested self-realisation and more due to the failure of this system to provide profitable human capital: 'Nous ne pouvons plus maintenir une organisation scolaire qui ne nous permet de former qu'un chercheur, un ingénieur, un professeur quand

il en faudrait deux, un technicien quand trois seraient nécessaires' (JORF 7/1/1959: 423).

As Robert (2015: 54) highlights, the intentions of this reform responded to the economic demands set out in the third Plan for 1958-1961 that expressed businesses' demands for more highly skilled engineers, technicians and managers, and an increase in skilled and qualified workers. Indeed, by ensuring a greater integration of short and long courses of technical education with the other courses of general study (Prost 2004: 646), emphasising the value of these courses as being equal to those of disinterested general studies (JORF 7/1/1959: 426-427), and encouraging the *orientation* of pupils towards these technical and professional courses through the organisation of a common *cycle d'orientation*, this reform sought to promote the movement of pupils towards these explicitly economy-centred courses of education in response to the needs of the job market and finally give long courses of technical study their 'lettres de noblesse' (Ibid. 425). The extension of compulsory education by two years from 14 to 16 years can also be considered as part of this intensification of the economy-centred logic of education in that it encouraged the pursuit of longer studies, which would enable access to the courses sanctioned by the qualifications required to satisfy the demands of the economy, and reflected the fact, underlined by Chapoulie (2010: 431), that, since the mid-1950s, employers had increasingly expressed an unwillingness to hire workers younger than 16 years old and a wish for a higher level of general education than that received by those who had entered *l'enseignement technique* at the age of 14 years old, for example.

Although an emphasis is placed on the economic orientation of this reform and allusions to democratisation, social justice or equality are much less common in the *exposé des motifs*, we should not overlook the ways in which this reform also constitutes an effort to intensify the exercise of power in service of the order-words of community and the individual. These efforts can be seen in: the promotion of a *tronc commun* that could be considered the basis of a common culture for all pupils; the measures taken seeking to provide all pupils with equal access to education; the insistence on according pupils' individual aptitudes with the education they would be given; and the preservation of the traditionally individual-centred courses of long secondary study.

The extension of compulsory education for all pupils until the age of 16 years old and the institution of a period of *orientation* that began with an, admittedly limited, *tronc commun* for all pupils can be considered an intensification of the exercise of power oriented by the order-word of community as it gave a greater degree of common education to all pupils. The reform's *exposé des motifs* emphasises that 'le rapprochement des programmes […] pour les premières années de formation', codified in article 8 of *décret* 59-57, is 'une nécessité première' and underlines the importance of ensuring a 'harmonisation' or 'analogie' of the programmes of fundamental or common disciplines across the various courses of education in order to provide a common 'plate-forme à partir de laquelle les choix et les repentirs pourront s'exercer avec commodité' (JORF 7/1/1959: 426). The *exposé des motifs* even suggests a 'rapprochement' of pedagogical methods would follow such a convergence of programmes (JORF 7/1/1959: 424).

Beyond this envisaged harmonisation of programmes and methods across the courses of education, the Berthoin reform constituted an intensification of the exercise of power in service of the community-centred logic of education by seeking to assure the equal access of all pupils to this education and extend a more equal opportunity for pupils to undertake longer or more prestigious courses of education according to their observed aptitudes rather than their socio-economic background. Such a democratisation of education constituted a more thorough realisation of the republican value of equality that formed part of the common culture disseminated in public schools. This intention to overcome 'un cloisonnement paralysant et une prospection très fragmentaire' (JORF 7/1/1959: 423) that marked the institutions of the preceding organisation of the education system was inscribed in the first article of *décret* 59-57, which stated that 'l'enseignement obligatoire public assure à tous les enfants des conditions égales devant l'instruction.' The *cycle d'observation* that instituted a process of *orientation* intended to direct pupils towards the relevant course of study according to their observed aptitudes rather than their socio-economic background was one part of the response to this injunction, but in the *exposé des motifs* the statement that 'l'enseignement, sous toutes ses formes, doit être mis à la portée de ses usagers' accompanies a demand for the extension of the network of schools, and especially classes of the *cycle d'observation*, so that all types of education are geographically available to all pupils (JORF 7/1/1959: 424). The text highlights the case of rural areas where CC (future CEG) might be the only nearby institutions of education beyond the age of 14 years old, limiting the possibility for an *orientation* of pupils towards courses other than

l'enseignment terminal or *l'enseignement général court* during the *cycle d'observation* and beyond. In response to such cases, the text calls for the extension of an experimental practice, instigated in October 1958 by Charles Brunold *directeur de l'enseignement du second degré* (Prost 2013: 88, 335), of seconding *professeurs* from nearby *lycées* to teach *lycée*-style classes, including Latin, that would enable the identification of those pupils apt to follow the classical or modern long course of secondary education, what *décret* 59-57 would classify as *l'enseignement général long*, and give these pupils the opportunity to follow the initial stages of such courses of study. Following the stimulus of the Berthoin reform, this practice was generalised to form *groupes d'observation dispersés* (GOD), covering the classes of *sixième* and *cinquième* that made up the *cycle d'observation*, and given an official status in a ministerial *circulaire* of 9 August 1960. These GOD were quickly established in isolated CEG and, more frequently, in *écoles primaires* where an *instituteur* qualified to teach in CEG would also be seconded to the school. Indeed, the central and local administration encouraged and supported the development of GOD, demanding the creation of either a GOD or a CEG in every town (Chapoulie 2010: 426-427; Prost 1997: 98-99; 2013: 88).

This democratising commitment to more equal access to education for all pupils, stated in the reform and demonstrated by the development of GOD, indicated efforts to intensify the exercise of power in service of the order-words of both community and the economy. The former was achieved by seeking equal access to education for all members of the community, and the latter by seeking to organise a more thorough and efficient exploitation of France's human capital. However, it also expressed an intensification of power

oriented by the individual-centred logic of education. This can be seen in how the process of *orientation* was intended to enable the realisation of individuals according to their aptitudes, and also in how this reform sought both the continued enclosure of the *lycées* providing the individual-centred education of the long courses of disinterested secondary studies, and the extension of their potential pool of pupil recruitment.

The intensification of the individual-centred logic of education in the Berthoin reform can be seen in the emphasis placed upon pupils' individual aptitudes and their *orientation* to achieve the full realisation of each pupil in accordance with these aptitudes. As Robert (2015: 54-55) notes, the idea of pupils' individual aptitudes is a key reference point for the reform, appearing 31 times across the four and a half pages of the reform's *exposé des motifs* in the JORF and reappearing in numerous articles of *décret* 59-57, as well as becoming a common reference in the ministerial texts regarding primary, secondary, technical and higher education published in the weekly *Bulletin officiel de l'Éducation nationale* following this reform. Indeed, the *exposé des motifs* indicates that the reform seeks for all pupils 'une orientation fondée sur la pleine observation de leurs aptitudes' that, by 'une exacte recherche de ces diverses aptitudes', would ensure that each different course of education would receive those pupils considered most apt to follow them (JORF 7/1/1959: 423).

This reform also intensified the action of the disinterested individual-centred education, inherited from *l'enseignement secondaire*, that intended to form extensively cultured and rational self-governing individuals. It did this by ensuring the disciplinary enclosure of the *lycées* that actualised this discipline, and by expanding the potential pool of recruitment for these courses of study.

As Louis Legrand (1998: 31-32) remarks, this reform sought to preserve the integrity of the traditional secondary education given in the *lycées*, which were presented in the *exposé des motifs* as in danger of being 'submergés par un million d'élèves' who should rather consider a technical education that may be more suited to their aptitudes (JORF 7/1/1959: 423). The process of *orientation* introduced by the reform was intended to both stem this flow of pupils who 'trouveraient mieux leur voie dans l'enseignement technique à l'un ou l'autre de ses niveaux' and broaden the recruitment of pupils to this course of education, bringing into the long course of general education those pupils with the aptitude to follow these studies who might otherwise be left to 'l'enseignement utile mais sommaire des classes de fin d'études, ou dans les enseignements courts' (Ibid.). The provision of classes of Latin as part of the policy of GOD demonstrates, as Chapoulie (2010: 427) notes, the continued support of the central administration for classical secondary education, but also indicates the intensification of the exercise of power in service of this logic of education through the extension of its field of operation to encompass those areas and pupils that might previously have been beyond this field. Furthermore, the ambition of the reform to adapt the education system to the needs of the economy was to be accomplished 'sans que pourtant se trouve le moins du monde menacé l'héritage de savoir désintéressé et la tradition humaniste qui constituent l'essence du génie français et fondent son originalité' (JORF 7/1/1959: 423). This was partially achieved by the continued separation of the various courses of education with their own personnel and institutions, and the stipulation that the classes of the *cycle d'orientation* would be a 'partie intégrante de l'établissement où elles sont

installées' (*décret* 59-57, Art. 7), but the integrity of the classical course of secondary education was further protected by the fact that the study of Latin was only delayed until the second trimester of the *sixième*, requiring at this stage an early division of pupils between those who will follow this classical course of study and those who will follow the modern course of study (Art. 9).

B - Critiques of the Berthoin reform

The Berthoin reform exhibited great ambitions to guarantee equal access to education for all pupils through the creation of a *cycle d'observation* beginning from a *tronc commun*. Not only would this expand the recruitment of technical education and long courses of secondary education, but it would also ensure an *orientation* of pupils that would seek both to realise the potential of each pupil in response to their individual aptitudes and to respond to the needs of the economy. However, the modesty of the measures it enacted, which, notably, undermined the creation and operation of a common period of *orientation* for all pupils, meant that it had little success in realising these measures that would have intensified the action of the education system in service of the order-words of community, the individual and, particularly, the economy.

These shortcomings were soon highlighted in new studies conducted by Alain Girard and other sociologists and demographers under the authority of the *Institut national des études démographiques* (INED). These studies drew upon the statistics produced since 1957 by the statistical services of the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale* and pursued a cohort study of pupils completing their primary education in 1962. The preliminary results of these

studies were presented at a symposium in May 1962, ahead of numerous publications, beginning the following year, that would continue into the 1970s, and underlined the continuing weight of pupils' socio-economic background and geographic situation on their *orientation* and subsequent schooling, which penalised those in more rural settings and of more modest backgrounds (Robert 2015: 67-68; Prost 2013: 86-87; Chapoulie 2010: 462-463; Lelièvre 1990: 174-176).

The failures of the Berthoin reform were soon recognised and publicly critiqued by Jean Capelle, one of the speakers at the aforementioned 1962 symposium, who had been appointed in February 1960 to the position of *directeur général de l'Organisation et des Programmes scolaires* (DGOPS) with authority over *l'enseignement du premier degré*, *l'enseignement du second degré* and *l'enseignement technique*[95] (Chapoulie 2010: 434-436; Simon et al. 2010: 30-33). Alongside his critiques, set out below, Capelle would develop a response to these failures that would inform the 1963 Fouchet-Capelle reform passed under Christian Fouchet, the *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* from December 1962 to April 1967.

Capelle highlighted the failure of the Berthoin reform's measures to effectively achieve an *orientation* of pupils between the various courses of study based upon their aptitudes in a cabinet meeting of 21 December 1962, where he asserted that the *orientation* of pupils to a different course of education, and so a different type of institution, under this new system of education only effectively concerned 1% of pupils (Prost 2013: 87). In a monograph published after his resignation from the DGOPS, Capelle (1966:

[95] A position created with the administrative reorganisation of the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale* that took place between 1960 and 1962, which will be discussed below.

33) emphasised the significance of article 7 of *décret* 59-57, which stipulated that the classes of the *cycle d'observation* were to operate as 'partie intégrante' of the institutions in which they took place and so meant that pupils tended to stay at the institutions in which they started their studies in the *sixième*. Indeed, as Prost (1997: 99) underlines, it seemed natural for pupils who had started their secondary studies in a CEG to continue and complete their studies in a CEG, just as it seemed natural for pupils who attended the *sixième* of a *lycée* to continue their studies in these same institutions.

In an interview published in February 1962 by the journal *L'Éducation nationale*, Capelle underlined the interest of the personnel of CEG in retaining their best pupils rather than directing them to continue their studies at the nearest *lycée*, but also identified the obstacle posed by the still incomplete network of educational institutions, highlighting the limited number of places available in *l'enseignement général long* and the unlikelihood of parents to support the transfer of their pupil from the nearby CEG to a further away *lycée* with uncertain capacity for boarding (Chapoulie 2010: 435-436). As Prost (2013: 87-89) notes, the fact that the increase in the number of CEG and GOD by 60% between 1958 and 1963 was not mirrored by a similar extension of the network of *lycées* and institutions of technical education threatened to impede the effective operation of an *orientation* of all pupils according to their aptitudes. This was because the GOD and CEG could only provide one full course of education set out by the Berthoin reform, *l'enseignement général court*, or potentially house the ill-defined *enseignement terminal*. Prost (Ibid.) quotes an *inspecteur général* recognising this barrier in his June 1962 report on a visit to rural areas of the Indre. He stated that 'nous risquons de créer trop

d'unités dispersées sans latin, [...] trop de CEG' and that in doing so 'nous nuisons à l'orientation des enfants vers les enseignements longs et même vers l'enseignement technique'. An effective orientation would require the extension across France of institutions offering all the different courses of education.

The timing and conception of *orientation* set out in the reform was also considered a factor in the failure of this process. In the aforementioned February 1962 interview, Capelle stated that it was 'abérrant' to want to determine the schooling of a large mass of pupils as early as the *cinquième* and that the *orientation* of pupils as early as the first trimester of the *sixième* was therefore premature (in Chapoulie 2010: 435). This same premature *orientation* of pupils was also critiqued by Henri Wallon in 1960 as too fatalistic (Robert 2015: 57). Indeed, as Robert shows, the concept of aptitude deployed in the Berthoin reform is akin to an idea of a natural talent to be detected as early as possible, in contrast to Wallon's own understanding of aptitudes as interests and capacities to be fostered and developed over the course of education, which was evident in the Langevin-Wallon report (Ibid.).

Capelle also critiqued the early separation of pupils between different courses of education caused by this premature *orientation* which led to pupils receiving unequal, and, even insufficient, levels of the common general education. In his post-resignation work, *L'École de demain reste à faire*, Capelle (1966: 34-35) argued that the Berthoin reform failed to recognise 'la nécessité, même pour la préparation aux activités professionnelles les plus modestes, d'augmenter le bagage de culture générale de chaque futur citoyen' and reiterated demands from employers for a longer period of general

education where pupils would only begin to specialise, and perhaps follow a more narrowly focused technical education, after nine or ten years of general education, which is to say at the age of 15 or 16 years old. Capelle also underlined this necessity in his February 1962 interview where he affirmed the need to 'repousser aussi loin que possible la spécialisation tant intellectuelle que manuelle' of each pupil who should receive an 'instruction élargie' in order to face the changing world and evolving economic environment (in Chapoulie 2010: 435).

Consistent with his critique of premature *orientation* and specialisation, Capelle also condemned the potential precipitous curtailment of studies for those pupils considered less capable and proposed measures to ensure their integration into the *cycle d'orientation* and their engagement in full-time study until they reached the end of their compulsory education at 16 years old. Capelle was concerned for the lack of provisions made in the Berthoin reform for those pupils who, on the basis of a single *instituteur*'s judgement, might be prevented from entering into the *sixième* of a *lycée*, CEG or CET and so maintained in the *écoles primaire* until the completion of their compulsory education, but was also concerned by the Berthoin reform's *enseignement terminal* where, according to article 31 of *décret* 59-57, pupils could leave school at the age of 13 years old and complete their compulsory education up to the age of 16 years old through taking up work or an apprenticeship (Chapoulie 2010: 435; Capelle 1966: 33-34). In response to these limitations Capelle oversaw the introduction in 1961 and 1962 of experimental trials of pre-terminal or transitional classes of *sixième* and *cinquième* for those pupils he referred to as 'moins doués', which were officially codified in *décret* 62-

671 signed by Pierre Sudreau, the Minister of Education from 15 April to 15 October 1962, on 14 June 1962 and would enable pupils to pursue their studies in a practically oriented two-year *cycle terminal* that would be sanctioned by a *diplôme de fin d'études obligatoire* and open access to courses of technical or professional education (Chapoulie 2010: 436; Capelle 1966: 33-34; Robert 2015: 61).

The institutions established by the Berthoin reform failed to deliver an initial common education offering all pupils equal educational opportunities and an *orientation* that would both respond to economic demands and enable the realisation of each pupil's individual aptitudes and so, in order to achieve a better 'brassage social des élèves' and the *orientation* of these pupils according to their aptitudes that Capelle (1966: 32) considered to be the unachieved aims of the Berthoin reform, Capelle proposed, in a note to the minister, Christian Fouchet, on 12 March 1963, a new type of polyvalent school for pupils aged 11 to 15 years old, with its own specific body of teachers, that would bring together the various, different courses of study corresponding to this age range, which would share a significant *tronc commun*, within the same institution (Chapoulie 2010: 436). The features of this proposal followed the recommendations given by a commission that had been set up by Pierre Sudreau, which were set out in a December 1962 report written by René Haby, who was serving as Capelle's deputy at this time. Building on accounts, published in the journal *L'Éducation nationale*, of the administrative and pedagogical advantages of experiments in cooperation between CEG, CET and *lycées* that further developed the model provided by the GOD (Chapoulie 2010: 426-427) and the 1962 proposals of the *Syndicat général de l'Éducation*

nationale (SGEN) (Prost 1968: 423), this report argued that '[l]'établissement polyvalent règle avec élégance le problème de l'orientation en la rendant possible de façon continue' and proposed that the different sections of study should 'comporte[r] le fonds commun le plus développé possible' (in Prost 2013: 89).

As Prost (2013: 89-96) and Chapoulie (2010: 438-441) have shown, however, this proposal was subject to debate within the executive branch of government and would be modified before it was put into legislation. The Prime Minister Georges Pompidou, a partisan of traditional secondary education, was 'violemment hostile' to any *tronc commun* beyond the age of 11 years old and insisted on the continuity of *l'enseignement général long*, refusing any delay to the beginning of this course that would result from the imposition of a *tronc commun* with a later *orientation* of pupils and insisting that this course be taught by the *professeurs certifiés* that had traditionally taught in *l'enseignement secondaire*. Fouchet, who demonstrated limited interest in the reform, largely shared the Prime Minister's views on traditional secondary education, but President de Gaulle and his adviser Jacques Narbonne, who were interested above all in an efficient system of *orientation* that could respond to the labour demands of the economy as set out by the *Commissariat du Plan*, supported Capelle's proposed polyvalent middle school in a meeting between the aforementioned parties at the Élysée on 4 April 1963 and a version of this institution that took into account Pompidou's objections was approved to be piloted experimentally before being put into law later that summer (Prost 2013: 90-94; Chapoulie 2010: 438-441).

C - The Fouchet-Capelle reform (1963)

The Fouchet-Capelle reform was enacted by *décrets* 63-793 and 63-794 of 3 August 1963, which, respectively, modified the provisions of the Berthoin reform's *décret* 59-57 and codified the organisation of the new polyvalent institutions, the *collèges d'enseignement secondaire* (CES), that were intended to become the principal institution for the *premier cycle du second degré* and would realise, to a limited extent, the ideal of the *école unique* by bringing all pupils together in one institution (Sadoun and Donegani 1976: 1135-1137; Prost 1968: 424). The system of education resulting from these *décrets* introduced a new arrangement of three courses of education for this first cycle of secondary education and modified the established provisions for *orientation* in response to the critiques directed towards the operation of this process as established under the Berthoin reform. The courses of study at this post-elementary level specified by this reform would all be united within the CES, but would remain distinct from each other, with their own programmes of study, personnel and pedagogy continuing to express the divergent normative orientations that had been articulated in the separate orders of education consolidated under the Third Republic and reiterated in the distinct courses and institutions of the Berthoin reform. Given this maintenance of distinct and separate courses of study oriented by different disciplinary logics of education within the same institutional premises, the Fouchet-Capelle reform constitutes a further intensification of the disciplinary exercise of power in service of the order-words of community, the individual and the economy and demonstrates the persistence of enclosures coded for the disciplinary exercise of power in

service of a prescribed normative programme within the newly integrated school system.

This reform, which, according to Lelièvre (1990: 184), achieved the passage 'd'une structure de réseaux d'établissements juxtaposés (voire concurrentiels) à une structure fondée sur des filières (rassemblées dans [les] mêmes établissements)', was also accompanied by the completion of a unified and centralised disciplinary *dispositif* that regulated the function of the whole public education system. This administrative *dispositif*, which had been under construction since the beginning of the Fifth Republic, integrated the previously separated *directions* of the different orders of education into a single organisation. It also saw the development of the *carte scolaire*, which would be used both to standardise the offer of education across the French territory and, in response to centrally defined targets derived from the recommendations provided by the Plan, to manage the flows of pupils through the education system and their distribution amongst the various institutions of this system. This accompanying administrative reform will be examined in the following sub-section.

Article 2 of the Fouchet-Capelle reform's *décret* 63-793 set out the new architecture of studies in the *premier cycle du second degré*, which would now take place over four years of study, made up of a two-year *cycle d'observation* followed by a two-year *cycle d'orientation*, and includes three potential courses of study that would come to be referred to as *voies* or *filières*. These three courses included the first four years of *l'enseignement général long* (*classique* or *moderne*) (*voie* I), the four years of a modern *enseignement*

général court (*voie* II), and a third course of study (*voie* III) made up of 'les deux années qui complètent le cycle élémentaire pour les élèves n'entrant pas au cycle d'observation (cycle de transition) et les deux années du cycle terminal'. This third course of study was set out in *décret* 62-671 of June 1962 following Capelle's experimental introduction of *classes de transition* in 1961 and so ended the potential for an early exit from the education system outlined in article 31 of *décret* 59-57 that had been critiqued by Capelle (1966: 33-35). In accordance with Capelle's disdain for any premature specialisation of studies, articles 2 and 3 of *décret* 63-793 indicated that technical or professional education would only begin through entry into a CET or *lycée technique* after the completion of the *premier cycle*.

As the absence of the long and short courses of technical education described by the Berthoin reform at this level implies, this reorganisation of the *premier cycle* of the secondary degree of education also modified the practices of *orientation* that had been established by the previous reform. Indeed, the changes to *décret* 59-57 introduced by article 2 of *décret* 63-793 indicated the deferral of the principal stage of *orientation* from the end of the *cinquième* to the end of the *troisième* at the end of the *premier cycle*. The same article states that, at this point, pupils can complete a final 'classe complémentaire de l'enseignement général court', be directed towards the completion of a modern or classical long general education, or towards a short or long course of technical education, or, if they have reached the age of 16 years old, leave education. With this definitive *orientation* officially postponed until the end of the completed first cycle, this second article of *décret* 63-793 also provided for the practices of observation and *orientation* outlined in *Titre*

II of *décret* 59-57 for the *cycle d'observation* of the *sixième* and *cinquième*, such as regular meetings of each institution's *conseil d'orientation*, to be extended to all four years of the *premier cycle* in order to enable the correct *orientation*, or *réorientation*, of pupils over the course of their compulsory education (Legrand 1998: 33).

These measures extending the period of observation and *orientation* and the incorporation of the pupils of *voie* III into this process can be seen both as a response to Capelle's concerns, highlighted above, regarding the premature and determinant *orientation* of pupils, and as efforts seeking to intensify the operation of disciplinary power in service of the community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education. This longer period for a more thorough examination of all pupils to assess their individual aptitudes would be common to all pupils, would enable the *orientation* of pupils according to their individual aptitudes, and would both enlarge the pool of recruitment and improve the selection of candidates to pursue different courses of study, including those of the economy-centred professional and technical education and the traditionally individual-centred courses of a long secondary education.

As article 2 of *décret* 63-793 states, this *premier cycle* would be taught in either the new CES, which would offer all three *voies* including the classical section of *voie* I, or in CEG offering only *voies* II and III. It was expected, however, that the new CES model would be generalised, with CEG being converted into CES just as the *premiers cycles* of *lycées* were detached to form autonomous CES (Prost 1997: 101-102; 2004: 293-295; 2013: 94; Chapoulie 2010: 440-441; Robert 2015: 64). The number of CES in France steadily

increased from 20 in 1963 to 209 in 1964 and 393 in 1965 but, following the government's decision in a meeting of 3 May 1965 to generalise these new institutions, a huge effort was made to extend these institutions across France, with the fifth plan approved in November 1965 asserting that by the end of the 1970-1971 school year, 80% of pupils should be taught in CES and only 20% in CEG (Robert 2015: 64; Lelièvre 1990: 184; Prost 1997: 124). The reality fell short of these plans, however, with only 53% of pupils of the *premier cycle* attending CES, 26% attending CEG and 21% still attending *lycées* (Lelièvre 1990: 184), but 2,354 CES were built between 1966 and 1975, which, conforming to the Gaullist slogan 'Un CES par jour', was approximately one CES built for every working day over this period, helping to resolve the geographic problem of unequal access to all courses of education (Robert 2015: 64).

The measures taken in the Fouchet-Capelle reform to integrate all pupils into the *premier cycle* of secondary education and those taken subsequently in order to extend the geographic reach of this network of institutions that would welcome pupils of all three *filières* point towards the intended development of the CES as a single institution for all pupils, suggesting an intensification of the community-centred logic of education by bringing all pupils together in one institution that could therefore be considered a realisation of an *école unique*. Indeed, following the introduction of this reform, Prost (1968: 424) wrote that 'il semble bien qu'avec les CES, l'école unique ait trouvé sa structure' and Fouchet, in his 19 June 1963 speech to the *Assemblée nationale* announcing the reform and the CES, highlighted this outcome: 'Pour la première fois, au-delà de l'école élémentaire, des enfants

d'origines diverses et promis à des destinées diverses fréquenteront les mêmes établissements et apprendront à mieux se connaître' (in Chapoulie 2010: 421).

As Prost (1968: 424) recognised, however, this unification of pupils in one institution would not extend to the different courses that these pupils followed. They would still remain divided according to course. The CES can rather be seen as an extension of the *dispositif* of GOD that, intervening in local CEG or *écoles primaires*, sought to enable access to the different courses outlined in the Berthoin reform. As Sadoun and Donegani (1976: 1137) state, rather than constituting a unified and distinct middle school for all pupils, 'la réforme Fouchet[-Capelle] annexe l'école moyenne sous l'appellation de CES, mais en la vidant de son contenu, le tronc commun'. Indeed, with their distinct programmes of study and pedagogies, '[c]es filières restaient totalement étrangères les unes aux autres' (Prost 2004: 292).

Décret 63-794 of 3 August 1963 completed this major innovation of the Fouchet-Capelle reform by codifying the pedagogical organisation of the CES, which, as we have seen, were to encompass three 'groupes de sections': 'Sections classiques et modernes de l'enseignement général long', 'sections modernes de l'enseignement général court' and 'classes du cycle de transition et du cycle terminal' (Art. 1). These groups would be 'caractérisés par leur pédagogie propre' (Art. 1) and would each remain taught by separate bodies of teachers: *professeurs agrégés ou certifiés* specialised in and teaching one subject each taught in *voie* I; largely *instituteurs* who had obtained the CAP-CEG, and later, from 1969, a distinct body of *professeurs d'enseignement général des collèges* (PEGC), considered below, who taught two subjects each would teach in *voie* II; and specialised *instituteurs* taught in *voie* III (Art. 2).

As Prost (2004: 292) notes, these distinct groups of teachers remained 'peu disposés à collaborer les uns avec les autres.'

The choice to maintain three distinct *filières* of the *premier cycle* despite their reunion within the CES reflected Pompidou's intervention in favour of traditional secondary education, Capelle's support for those previously excluded from the *second degré*, and the continuing tensions between *instituteurs* and *professeurs* seeking to protect their own educational domain and assert their claim to the years of this *premier cycle* (Robert 2015: 119-120), and was justified, in a ministerial document produced by Capelle's deputy René Haby in 1961, as the offer of different types of education to respond to the different aptitudes of pupils (Chapoulie 2010: 437-438). However, it ultimately served to maintain the three distinct disciplinary enclosures with distinct ends. These separate *filières* reflected the divisions between the community-, individual- and economy-centred *dispositifs* that had been established under the Third Republic and perpetuated in the distinctions between different courses of education and their respective institutions in the Berthoin reform, with *voie* III taking on, at this level, the role of an education with a primarily economy-centred normative orientation that sought above all to prepare pupils to become economically useful workers, following the deferral of entry into CET or *lycées techniques* to the *second cycle du second degré*.

The modern and, especially, classical sections of *voie* I continued the tradition of the long individual-centred education of *l'enseignement secondaire* that sought to form extensively cultured and rational self-governing, fully realised individuals. Conserving secondary education 'dans sa pureté et sa

noblesse "humaniste"' (Legrand 1998: 33), it is this distinct course of study that Pompidou had intervened to maintain at the level of the *premier cycle* when opposing Capelle's initial proposals and the idea of a *tronc commun* and a single body of teachers specific to the *premier cycle* (Prost 2013: 91-94). The first four years of this course of study, in either the modern or classical sections of this *filière*, were intended to prepare pupils to go on to complete this course of study in the *lycées* of the *second cycle du second degré* and eventually receive a *baccalauréat*, which continued to open access to higher education (Lelièvre 2008: 136).[96] The affinity of this course of study with the individual-centred, disinterested tradition of the *lycées* was underlined by Capelle who, writing in *L'Éducation nationale* in 1966, noted that pupils of this *voie* would benefit from the 'méthode des lycées', in which 'les élèves acceuillis dans ces sections y ont individuellement plus d'indépendance, plus de responsabilités aussi, et plus de facilités d'approfondissement' (in Lelièvre 1990: 184).

The strict disciplinary enclosure of this *filière*, which preserved its link to study for a *baccalauréat* and possible entry into higher education for those considered capable, continued to receive support from the Élysée and Matignon who advocated a strict selection of pupils seeking to pursue it (Prost

[96] The *baccalauréat* was reformed by *décret* 65-438 of 10 June 1965, which established three initial sections (*littéraire*, *scientifique*, and *technique industriel*) that would then lead to one of five types of general *baccalauréat* (Art. 1). The literary and scientific sections would each offer what Prost (2007: 245) describes as one more theoretical and one more applied series of *baccalauréat*: A (*Lettres-Philo*) and B (*Lettres-Sciences économiques et sociales*) in the literary *filière*, and C (*Maths-Physique*) and D (*Maths-Sciences expérimentales*) in the scientific *filière*. The technical and industrial section would lead to a *baccalauréat T* (*Maths-technologie*), which remained a general *baccalauréat* and would be classified as the E series from 1967 (Robert 2015: 64). This *décret* also introduced the *baccalauréats de technicien* that could be studied in technical sections of *lycées* or in *lycées techniques* (Art. 3). These vocational *baccalauréats* would be organised into series that indicated the sector of economic activity towards which they were oriented: F (Secondary sector), G (Tertiary sector), and H (Information Technology). See Prost (2007: 245). For further details of the reforms of the *second cycle du second degré* (1965) and of the higher education system (1966), see Prost (2013: 106-117).

2013: 99-106). A system of selective *orientation*, whether based on the usual assessment of pupils by examinations, as favoured by Pompidou, or on psychological assessments of pupils' aptitudes administered by an extended body of *orienteurs*, endorsed by de Gaulle, was considered necessary to avoid spending 'une masse de crédits pour absorber une masse de crétins qui normalement, n'auraient pas eu accès à l'enseignement supérieur', as de Gaulle put it in a cabinet meeting of 4 May 1965 (in Prost 2013: 100). This intention to organise a process of selection and 'mettre un terme à l'afflux inconsidéré des élèves peu doués vers le baccalauréat et l'enseignement supérieur' was made clear as the motivation for the decision of the cabinet committee of education (*conseil restreint*) on 4 April 1963 to issue new instructions for selection and *orientation* (in Prost 1997: 119) and would sit alongside a commitment to an *orientation* responding to the order-word of economy that required relatively few pupils to pursue a long general education.

Voie II of the *premier cycle* constituted a continuation of the short general education, outlined in the Berthoin reform's *décret* 59-57, that had been offered in the CC then CEG, and which had developed as an extension of the community-centred education of the Third Republic's *enseignement primaire*. Taught by *instituteurs* who had completed the CAP-CEG, this education often led to additional studies in CET, where pupils could study for a CAP over three years or, from 1966 onwards, for a less specialised *brevet d'études professionnelles* (BEP) over two years, or *lycées techniques*, where they could study for a *baccalauréat de technicien* (Lelièvre 2008: 106; Robert 2015: 62, 64-65). Widely accessible to pupils due to the extension of the network of CEG, noted above, and considered the normal course of study at

this level for the majority of pupils who were considered capable of proceeding from *l'école élémentaire* to a *sixième* of the *premier cycle*, but not sufficiently talented to be destined for the long general education of *voie* I (Robert 2015: 62-63; Chapoulie 2010: 436-437), this course of education responded to the requirement, imposed by the Berthoin reform's prolongation of compulsory education to 16 years old, of 'une formation plus achevée' (JORF 7/1/1959: 423) that would satisfy demands for a higher level of general education, which had been articulated since the mid-1950s as both a new imperative of the modernising economy (see Chapoulie 2010: 419) and as a necessity for 'le bon fonctionnement de la démocratie' (1956 *projet* Billères in Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 363).

The third *filière* of the CES, which could lead to further vocational study in a CET, but more often led to a direct entry into the workforce, contrasted with the other *voies* by its predominant practical orientation that emphasised the development of technical skills in advance of an entry into the job market (Figeat and Lebaume 2015: 27). Encompassing the *classes de transition* and subsequent *cycle terminal* outlined in the *décret* 62-671, this course of study was intended to accommodate those pupils considered unable to pursue studies in the *sixième* of a CEG or CES who would previously have completed their education prematurely in the *classes de fin d'études* of *l'école primaire*, without the possibility of pursuing a short course of technical education in a CET or of an *orientation* towards a longer or more general course of study in response to the later development and manifestation of their individual aptitudes. Indeed, as the numbers of pupils in this *filière* of the *premier cycle* increased, the number of pupils in the *classes de fin d'études*

primaire decreased dramatically as they were progressively closed (Lelièvre 1990: 185; Prost 2013: 99). Described in the *instructions* of 10 September 1963 as not being suited to an abstract, conceptual education, these pupils were said to show 'l'intérêt pour le concret, [...] le goût des activités pratiques, un sentiment précoce des responsabilités et le désir de s'engager rapidement dans la vie active' (in Lelièvre 2008: 106). These pupils were therefore intended to be taught in this *filière* by *instituteurs* who had received specific training in an active pedagogy, inspired by the theories of *l'éducation nouvelle*, whose completion would eventually be attested to by a specific *certificat d'aptitude* following its introduction by *décret* 66-581 of 27 July 1966 (Vial 1967: 20-21). With entry into either the workforce or a CET as the endpoint of this practical course of study, Capelle emphasised in another *circulaire* 'l'importance dans ces classes du travail manuel' (in Chapoulie 2010: 436). As the *instructions* of 15 July 1963 underline, those pupils of the *classes de transition* who belatedly showed themselves to be 'doués' and capable of following a "normal" course of study that did not focus on preparation for working life were to be re-oriented towards one of the other *filières* of general education (in Heurdier and Prost 2014: 219).

Although entry into a course of technical or professional education in the CET and *lycées techniques* was deferred to the *second cycle du second degré*, and only *voie* III prepared its pupils directly for employment, each of the distinct *filières* of the *premier cycle* that were oriented by different order-words, as outlined above, was again assigned economic values in the context of an *orientation* that still intended to achieve the optimal investment of the nation's human capital, indicating continuing efforts to intensify the operation

of the *dispositif* of education in service of the *mot d'ordre* of the economy through this *orientation*.

Following the preparatory work for the fourth Plan (1962-1965), a classification establishing various categories of employment in correspondence with different levels of education was produced in June 1961. Developed too late to be used in that Plan, this classification would come to serve as a common reference for employers and the administration of the education system, allowing the quantity of workers of each level of qualification that would likely be required by the developing economy to be projected and enabling 'des normes qualitatives et quantitatives de développement de l'institution scolaire' (Prost 1968: 466) to be deduced from these figures and fixed as objectives. This classification would establish six levels that ranged from levels one and two for engineers and senior managers, corresponding, respectively, to doctorates or other postgraduate qualifications and to *licences*, to level six which indicated unskilled labour with no qualifications. Level three corresponded to technicians and mid-level management who would have completed the equivalent of the *premier cycle de l'enseignement supérieur*.[97] Level four indicated clerical workers and supervisors with the equivalent of a *baccalauréat*, or eventually a *baccalauréat de technicien*. Finally, level five corresponded to skilled workers with a CAP or, eventually, a BEP (Prost 2013: 103; Lembré 2016: 91). Figures produced by the *Commissariat du Plan*, fixing an ideal distribution of cohorts of pupils within the education system over the course of their studies, began to be circulated ahead of the 1963 Fouchet-

[97] This level of higher education would include the technical courses leading to a *diplôme universitaire de technologie* over two years that would be offered in the *instituts universitaires de technologie*, which were established in January 1966 as an alternative technically oriented higher education to the general studies of the universities. See Prost (2013: 110-111); Lembré (2016: 83).

Capelle reform (Prost 2013: 103-104) and were included in the following fifth Plan, for years 1966-1970, published in November 1965. These figures recommended that: 20% of the current cohort of pupils leave education at the end of their compulsory education (level six); 40% should complete a short technical course of education (level five); 15% should finish their education after the *second cycle du second degré* (level four); and 20% should proceed to technical and general higher education; with 5% of 'enfants inadaptés' removed from these calculations (Prost 1968: 466-467). These figures (40% of pupils to complete a short education in the *second degré*, and 35% to complete a long education of the *second degré*) were themselves transmitted as guides for the local operation of *orientation* in a *circulaire* of 5 January 1965 (in Heurdier and Prost 2014: 195-196). Solaux (2008: 510) notes that the sixth Plan, published in July 1971 for years 1971-1975, marked the high point of these projections by providing an exact number of the various qualified personnel that would be needed for each sector of the economy.[98]

Although, as Robert (2015: 66-67) notes, the economy-oriented discourse that had been apparent in the Berthoin reform seemed largely absent from subsequent texts produced by the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale*, the projections produced by the *Commissariat du Plan* continued to demonstrate the ongoing influence of this economy-centred logic with regard to the education system throughout the 1960s. Indeed, contemporaneously, Prost (1968: 466-469) remarks upon this economy-centred approach to *orientation* that sought to take precedence over the wishes of families and, as Robert (2015: 66-67), Prost (2013: 100-104) and Chapoulie (2010: 446-449) note, the

[98] As we shall see below, the precise projections of the sixth Plan would, perversely, coincide with a crisis in confidence regarding the ability of the state to accurately plan the investment of human capital.

idea of an *orientation* operated in conformity with the projections of the Plan was consistently supported by Charles de Gaulle, his advisor Jacques Narbonne and also by Capelle. The discourse of human capital investment that proposed both an 'élargissement du recrutement social du secondaire et sélection draconienne aux différents paliers du cursus' (Robert 2015: 66) was persistently expressed by Charles de Gaulle, in particular, throughout his presidency and thereafter (Chapoulie 2010: 446-447) in repeated demands and stipulations that *orientation* be conducted in accordance with teachers' appraisal of pupils and the state's assessment of the 'besoins des différentes branches d'activité de la nation, en nombre et en qualité suffisants, même si les parents sont d'un autre avis' (de Gaulle at a cabinet meeting of 26 May 1966 quoted in Prost 2013: 104).

D - The *carte scolaire* and the completion of a centralised disciplinary *dispositif* of education

In order to achieve such a strict *orientation* of all pupils that conformed to national prescriptions, as demanded by those seeking to limit access to the long courses of general education in *lycées* and higher education and to manage the optimal investment of the nation's human capital, an administrative *carte scolaire* was developed and strengthened over the course of the 1960s. The *carte* expressed an intensification of the centralised disciplinary *dispositif* of the education system through a standardisation of the offer of education across the country, the imposition of a single disciplinary mould, and the hierarchically organised distribution of pupils between institutions and courses. Indeed, the disciplinary *quadrillage* of French

territory, enacted through the *sectorisation* of the *carte scolaire*, indicated the completion of the centralised disciplinary *dispositif* of the education system, which, as Lelièvre (2008: 173) notes, reached its height under the *dirigiste* presidency of Charles de Gaulle, with its influence even extending to the definition of the programmes to be followed by private schools that received public funds through contracts established by the 1959 *loi Debré* (Ibid. 172-173). This reorganised administrative apparatus unified the separate *directions* that had been established to manage the different orders of education, identified in the previous chapter, under a single central authority. This central authority would organise the distinct disciplinary enclosures of this education system, which persisted in the separate *filières* of the *premier cycle* and institutions of the *second cycle* of secondary education, and the flow of pupils between these enclosures. With this consolidation of its centralised *dispositif* the education system came to more closely emulate the disciplinary project of the subdivision of a mass into smaller individual units and the rational and centrally-directed articulation of these units to produce a greater force that responds to the objective established by the central authority. This disciplinary project had been recognised by Deleuze (PP: 240) and identified by Foucault in the development of the tactically constructed modern army and its distribution in the military camp into functional spaces under a single normalising surveillance (SP: 190-199, 201-203).

The *dispositif* of the *carte scolaire*, initially instituted alongside the Berthoin reform and further developed following the Fouchet-Capelle reform, can be seen first of all as a *dispositif* to ensure the standardisation of the education system across France by expanding the field of action of its

institutions to apply to all pupils across France. It therefore can be seen as an intensification of power in service of the community-centred logic of education by providing a common offer of education, with the associated democratisation of access and supposed equality of opportunity that this entails. In response to the uneven rate of entry of pupils completing the second year of the *cours moyen* (CM2) in the *école primaire* into the *sixième* of the *second degré* across France,[99] the *décret* 58-1473 of 29 December 1958 established *commissions académiques de la carte scolaire* to centralise the planning and approval of the construction of educational institutions within each *académie* under the authority of the centrally appointed *recteur*. A further *circulaire* of 29 July 1959 indicated the objective of reducing these inequalities, in particular in rural areas, by extending the network of schools (Robert 2015: 58-59). This purpose of the *carte scolaire* was reiterated in the c*irculaire* of 3 May 1963 that set out its mission to ensure the concrete realisation of the democratisation of access to education:

> La carte scolaire doit traduire dans les faits le principe de l'extension de la scolarité obligatoire jusqu'à seize ans et permettre l'exercice de l'orientation pour que chacun puisse bénéficier de la formation convenant le mieux à ses goûts et à ses aptitudes. (in Heurdier and Prost 2014: 187)

[99] As Lelièvre (1990: 175-176) notes, this rate could vary significantly both between *départements* and within them. For example, this rate of entry was of 26% and 27% in the Somme and the Vendée, which were amongst the *départements* with the lowest rates, to 74% in the Var, one of the highest rates. From one canton to another within a *département* one's chances of entering the *second degré* after completing CM2 could double or even triple.

As the *circulaire* states, this mission meant realising 'la dispersion géographique la plus large possible des enseignements correspondants' for the *premier cycle* of secondary education to ensure 'dans chaque établissement, et pour chaque niveau d'âge, la diversité minimum des sections, sans laquelle l'orientation resterait lettre morte' (Ibid.). This *circulaire* called for each *département* to be divided into *secteurs* of roughly 10 to 15 square kilometres serving populations of at least 4,000 inhabitants[100] that, following the necessary constructions, were each to eventually provide the complete required offer of education to this population (Van Zanten and Obin 2008: 14-16; Lelièvre 1990: 182). As stipulated in another *circulaire* issued on 5 January 1965 (in Heurdier and Prost 2014: 193-205), this *sectorisation* of the *carte scolaire* was to be completed by creating *secteurs* in urban areas and by assuring the offer in all *secteurs* of full access to the courses of the *second cycle du second degré*. As Louis Legrand (1998: 34) recounts, the construction of new institutions to provide the required full offer of education was subject to central approval with the proposals for new constructions having to be examined and approved by 'un quasi-jury national'. The definition of these *secteurs* and of the institutional needs of these areas therefore helped organise the aforementioned spread of new CES and contributed to a standardisation of the offer of education across French territory (Van Zanten and Obin 2008: 14-15; Legrand 1998: 34; Lelièvre 2008: 191). This should be understood as an

[100] The size of the population covered in each *secteur* depended upon the geography of its area. Focusing on the provision of education in rural areas, this *circulaire* proposed the creation of *secteurs ruraux*, serving rural areas with a population between five and six thousand, and *secteurs mixtes*, encompassing a conurbation of more than 4,000 inhabitants and any dependent smaller towns within 15 kilometres and therefore possibly serving over 10,000 inhabitants. The 1965 *circulaire* discussed next organised the *sectorisation* of urban areas as the *carte scolaire* extended to apply to the *second cycle* of secondary education (in Heurdier and Prost 2014: 189-190; 193-203).

intensification of the disciplinary *dispositif* of the education system through its extension, with its various disciplinary moulds, to cover, and thereby achieve saturation of, the space of France.

This establishment and *sectorisation* of a *carte scolaire*, intended to ensure the standardised provision of the offer of education across France, also served to intensify the disciplinary *dispositif* of the centralised education system, by simultaneously forming a number of hierarchically organised structures that Robert (2015: 65) has referred to as 'une véritable machine de distribution des flux d'élèves dans différentes filières en fonction des besoins recensés par les planificateurs.' The *orientation* of pupils in the public education system of each *secteur* would be operated through these structures of the state in accordance with norms derived from the forecasts of the Plan that were set by the central authority of the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale*.

This disciplinary operation of the *carte scolaire* was first enabled by the disciplinary tactics of *quadrillage* and enclosure (SP: 166-168) enacted in the delimitation of a *secteur* as a site which specified both a population and the institutions which the individuals of that population could attend. As Louis Legrand (1998: 34) explains, these *secteurs* constituted 'des zones de recrutement impératif, telles écoles élémentaires devant obligatoirement conduire ses élèves à un collège de secteur, et plusieurs collèges devant déboucher dans des établissements généraux et techniques d'un district'. The only exception to this obligation were private schools, which remained outside the regulatory framework of the *carte scolaire*, even in institutions which had signed one of the contracts between the state and private schools set out in the 1959 *loi Debré* that would provide the contracted school with public funding if

the institution, which could nonetheless retain 'son caractère propre' (Art. 1), provided an education that conformed to that given in the public education system. Unless they chose to send their child to a private school, families within a given *secteur* would be obliged to send their children to the local CES, whether it was a former CEG, a former *premier cycle* of a *lycée*, or newly constructed, and therefore the distribution of pupils between institutions was no longer left to the wishes of families, who might prefer certain institutions that due to their background as the *premier cycle* of a *lycée*, for example, could initially be more suited for the more prestigious courses of *voie* I, but was rather determined by the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale* (Van Zanten and Obin 2008: 16; Lelièvre 2008: 191-192).

The distribution of pupils amongst the enclosures of secondary education would be achieved through an *orientation* of pupils in each area. This would be guided by the centrally determined normal distribution fixed in response to the projections of the Plan and be conducted in relation to the number of places available in each type of institution in a given area, which would itself derive from the influence of the Plan's recommendations on investment and construction. This distributive intention is made clear in the *circulaire* of 5 January 1965 where it is asserted that the *carte scolaire*

> n'a pas seulement pour but d'assurer la satisfaction légitime de préférences individuelles justifiées; elle doit aussi préparer l'avenir par la mise en place progressive d'une répartition des adolescents entre les différents types d'enseignement de second

> cycle conforme à un équilibre souhaitable. (in Heurdier and Prost 2014: 195-196)

This desirable balance set out in this *circulaire* was based upon the preparatory work for the fifth Plan for years 1966 to 1970 that would be published later that year and reflected the Plan's aforementioned recommendations that the education system should accommodate 'pour chacune des tranches d'âge, 35 % des adolescents dans le second cycle long et 40 % dans le second cycle court' (Ibid. 196). The *circulaire* states that these figures refer to a national level and accepts that there may be variations from these norms at a local level, but affirms that these centrally determined numbers constitute 'l'hypothèse de travail indispensable à la mise en place d'une carte cohérente du second cycle' (Ibid.). This statement indicates that these figures also guided the provision of each type of education in each *secteur* and the orientation of pupils between these courses at a local level.

As Robert (2015: 65) notes, the *projets de décrets* adopted in the meeting of the cabinet committee on education (*conseil restreint*) on 26 May 1966, built upon the groundwork established by the Berthoin reform, which, with articles 20 and 21 of *décret* 59-57, provided for the creation of departmental *conseils d'orientation* and a central ministerial *conseil d'orientation*, to complete the administrative apparatus to assure the operation of this *orientation* across the *carte scolaire*. The first of these decisions determined the establishment of *conseils d'orientation* in each CES, which would distribute pupils amongst the different *voies* of this institution and organise the *orientation* of pupils after the class of *troisième* at the end of the

premier cycle (Robert 2015: 65; Prost 1997: 125). Other resolutions of this meeting provided for the creation of an *Office national de l'orientation scolaire et professionnelle*, which would contribute to the training of *orienteurs* and provide information for the various organs of *orientation*, and set out new procedures, which would establish an *orientation* service led by an *inspecteur d'académie* under each *recteur* to organise the distribution of pupils between the enclosures of the education system in each *académie*.

These measures were finally officially approved in a cabinet meeting in January 1968, following the replacement of Fouchet with Alain Peyrefitte, who was more amenable to a selective *orientation*, as *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* in April 1967, but the implementation of the new procedures of *orientation* and establishment of the *Office national de l'orientation scolaire et professionnelle* were disrupted by the events of 1968. Nonetheless, a process of selective *orientation*, albeit somewhat uncoordinated at the national level, was already in operation, and keenly perceived by parents and critics, before the disruption of that year (Prost 1968: 468-469; Chapoulie 2010: 445; Danvers 2010: 99-105). As Prost (2013: 116-117) notes, the main aspects of this reform were codified in the years following 1968 under Pompidou's presidency, which we can see as the consolidation of a fixed, centralised disciplinary *dispositif* of *orientation* that operated through the enclosures of the *carte scolaire*.

Décrets 70-238 and 70-239 signed on 19 March 1970 by Olivier Guichard, *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* from 22 June 1969 to 5 July 1972, established and codified the *Office national d'information sur les enseignements et les professions* (ONISEP). This organisation fulfilled the role

set out for the *Office national de l'orientation scolaire et professionnelle* in 1966 by contributing to the organisation of training for *orienteurs* and both developing, with the aid of a *Centre d'études et de recherches sur les qualifications* (CEREQ), and providing information to those involved in the process of *orientation*. It carried this out at a more broadly national level, but also at a regional level through delegations in each *académie* that, under the authority of the *recteur*, were led by a *chef de service d'observation, d'information et d'orientation* (*décret* 70-239, Art. 1, 9). D*écret* 71-541 of 7 July 1971 also established *centres d'information et d'orientation* under the authority of the departmental *inspecteur d'académie*, who reported to the *recteur* of the relevant *académie*, in each sector of the *carte scolaire* (Art. 5 to 7) and specified that, in accordance with the directives of the central administration of *l'Éducation nationale* and under its surveillance (Art. 2), these institutions of information and *orientation* were to operate at the national, regional and local level to organise

> l'information et l'orientation des élèves dans un processus éducatif d'observation continue, […] de les guider vers l'enseignement le plus conforme à leurs aptitudes, de contribuer à l'épanouissement de leur personnalité et de les aider à choisir leur voie dans la vie active, *en harmonie avec les besoins du pays et les perspectives du progrès économique et social*. (Art. 1, emphasis added)

Beyond consideration of individual wishes or aptitudes, the *orientation* of pupils promoted through these institutions was still to be guided by national economic and social criteria.

Following the creation of these institutions, the new procedures of *orientation* were established by a *décret* 73-129 and an *arrêté* issued on 12 February 1973 by Joseph Fontanet, the Minister of Education from 6 July 1972 to 27 May 1974. These provided for greater dialogue with each pupil's family during the process of *orientation*, which Solaux (2008: 510) identifies as an indication of a partial liberalisation of the *orientation* resulting from the social movements of the 1960s, and, as Prost (2013: 117) underlines, gave the authority to issue decisions on the *orientation* of pupils to the *conseils de classe* in each institution rather than an external and authoritative state body as set out in the 1966 plans. However, as Prost (Ibid.) also notes, the procedures still put in place a centrally directed *orientation* process similar to that proposed in 1966. Indeed, as Solaux (2008: 510) and Danvers (2005: 689) recognise, this dialogue and the decisions of the *conseils de classe* were limited and framed by the hierarchically organised power of the state and its regional representatives. As *décret* 73-129 states, the family of a pupil in the *cinquième* or *troisième*, which constituted the significant levels of orientation within the *premier cycle* and ahead of the *second cycle* of secondary education respectively, could appeal against the *orientation* proposed by the *conseil de classe* in response to their initial wishes if an agreement was not reached following discussions with the *chef d'établissement*. Depending on the choice of the parents, this appeal would be resolved either through the passage of an examination set by the *inspecteur d'académie* or the arbitration of a

commission d'appel that would be established by the *inspecteur d'académie* (Art. 2, 3, 5 and 6 of *décret* 73-129; Art. 9 and 10 of the *arrêté* of 12 February 1973). As Danvers (2005: 689) and Solaux (2008: 510) note, however, whatever the proposed *orientations* that resulted from an appeal or that were formulated by *conseils de classe*, these proposals would be subject, at the stage of the effective distribution of pupils, to the decisions of the departmental *inspection de l'académie* within the limitations of places and sections offered in each sector by the *carte scolaire*, as article 8 of *décret* 73-129 highlights. Indeed, article 9 of this same *décret*, clarified by Art. 13 of *arrêté* of 12 February 1973, requires a *conseil départemental d'orientation*, headed by the *inspecteur d'académie*, to meet at least twice a year. These meetings were used to consider the operation of *orientation* and the *affectation* of pupils within the *département* and their relationship to the *carte scolaire*, and to develop a plan for the *orientation* of pupils and the development of the *carte scolaire* in the *département* in line with the policies defined by the central ministry. The hierarchically and centrally organised process of a rigid *orientation* indicated in the provisions of the Berthoin reform and set out in 1966 became codified with these acts of February 1973.

The *sectorisation* of the *carte scolaire* therefore effected a disciplinary *quadrillage* (SP: 166-168) of the education system across France. By subdividing both the geographical area and the population on which this system operated, this *quadrillage* facilitated the distribution of the pupils of these *secteurs* between and within the various disciplinary enclosures of the education system in response to the norms determined by the central authority of the *ministère* and the observed and recorded performances of these pupils in

their prior schooling. This centralised system of *orientation* of pupils, organised through the *carte scolaire* and the different enclosures it encompassed, expressed the distribution and composition of the elements of a given mass under the normalising surveillance of a central authority to generate a greater force that Deleuze (PP: 240) recognises as the project that discipline accomplishes through its enclosures. This process is evocative of the tactical composition and deployment of soldiers and their various groupings, in the modern, disciplined army that emerged in the eighteenth century, and the organised distribution and controlled movements of this mass of soldiers under the hierarchically organised surveillance of a central authority demonstrated in the military camp, which Foucault presented as prototypical of the exercise of disciplinary power (SP: 190-199, 201-203). As Louis Legrand (1998: 34) remarked of the *carte scolaire*, '[j]amais le système français de centralisation n'a eu pareille illustration.'

This centralisation of the *dispositif* of *orientation* was indicative of the reorganisation of the central administration of the French education system that was conducted under de Gaulle's presidency, which served to intensify the disciplinary operation of power. This development of new administrative structures unified and coordinated the administrations that had separately managed and promoted the distinct orders of education identified in the previous chapter, thereby improving the coherency of the *dispositif*'s action. It also reorganised the services of inspection in the face of an expanding bureaucracy and network of institutions, and an increasing pupil population, to ensure the efficient operation of this education system.

The reorganisation of the administration of the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale* enacted by *décret* 60-556 of 1 June 1960 created a DGOPS in charge of the *direction de l'enseignement du premier degré*, the *direction de l'enseignement du second degré* and the *direction de l'enseignement technique* (Art. 2). Articles 1, 2 and 4 of an *arrêté* issued the same day gave this new *direction* broad powers over the operation of schooling, including responsibility for proposing reforms to the minister, for executing reforms outlined in legislative and regulatory texts, for the formation and management of teaching personnel, and for the development of the *carte scolaire* and the operation of *orientation*. As Prost (2013: 89) notes, this ended the autonomous, and often fractious, operation of the three previously separate *directions* of primary, secondary and technical education and brought the administration of their 'moulages distincts' (PP: 242) under a single central authority under the *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* as the separate orders of education inherited from the Third Republic were integrated within a single system. As Caplat (1984: 50) highlights, the *directions* of primary, secondary and technical education placed under the authority of the DGOPS lost their autonomy and were reduced to the management of their pedagogical domains due to the removal of their powers over personnel, budget, and equipment and constructions, which were granted to the separate *direction de l'administration générale et des services communs* (*Décret* 60-556, Art. 1) and *direction de l'équipement scolaire, universitaire et sportif* (Art. 3). The integration of these previously distinct administrations of separate orders of education under a central authority was maintained, and reached its peak (Caplat 1984: 45-46), with the administrative reform undertaken through *décrets* 63-1033 and 63-

1034 of 15 October 1963 and *décret* 64-241 of 14 March 1964. These *décrets* instituted a single *secrétaire général* as a powerful central authority responsible only to the minister himself, whose jurisdiction extended to all the other *directions* of the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale* (*Décret* 64-241, Art 1). Although this particular organisation of the ministry's central administration did not persist beyond the resignation in July 1968 of Pierre Laurent who had held the position of *secrétaire général* since its creation, the principle of a centralised and coordinated management of the various functions and elements of *l'Éducation nationale* under the eventual central authority of the minister persisted, through a variety of institutional arrangements, into the 1980s (Simon et al. 2010: 30-40; Caplat 1984: 51).

The inspectorates ensured the efficient and coherent operation of this *dispositif* in accordance with centrally determined norms derived from its policy and were also strengthened through the rearrangement of existing bodies and development of new bodies of inspectors to confront the challenges of the expansion of the education system to welcome ever greater number of pupils. The reorganisation of the inspection of teaching practices and the operation of the administrative structures of *l'Éducation nationale* served to intensify the disciplinary *operation* of this *dispositif* by ensuring a greater saturation of its institutions and subjects with the normalising gaze of a single central authority.

Alongside the integration of the previously separate orders of education into a single system that had been initiated by the Berthoin reform, the disparate bodies of *inspecteurs généraux*, which had been established under the Third Republic to ensure the normalising surveillance of the primary,

secondary and technical orders of education, were integrated between 1960 and 1965 into a single body of *inspecteurs généraux de l'Instruction publique*, later to be renamed and reorganised as *inspecteurs généraux de l'Éducation nationale* (IGEN) by the *arrêté* of 2 January 1980. This inspectorate's organisation according to subject specialism or expertise in primary or specialist education was codified by an *arrêté* of 5 November 1964 (A. Legrand 2005: 506).[101] Separated from the distinct *directions* of the separate orders of education that had persisted until the administrative reforms identified above, the authority over these *inspecteurs* was centralised after 1960 under the control of the Minister of Education (*décret* 60-556, Art. 5; *décret* 64-241, Art. 1 and 4; A. Legrand 2005: 506; Gerbod 1979: 263; Simon et al. 2010: 33-35, 40, 42, 44, 46, 51, 58).

As Prost (2007: 130-131) notes, however, in the context of the 'explosion scolaire' identified by Cros and the subsequent quantitative democratisation, or massification, of secondary education in the 1960s with the corollary increase in the number of teachers to be inspected, these *inspecteurs généraux*, of which there were 125 in 1965, could not fulfil their traditional role since the beginning of the Third Republic of travelling the country examining the teaching of every teacher under their supervision. This was especially true following the 1959 *loi Debré*'s extension of this inspection to also cover teachers in those private schools that had agreed a contract with the

[101] Article 1 of the *arrêté* of 5 November 1964 defined the following groups of specialism: 'Mathématiques; Sciences physiques; Sciences naturelles; Philosophie; Lettres; Histoire et géographie; Langues vivantes; Disciplines techniques industrielles; Disciplines techniques économiques; Enseignement préscolaire, enseignement élémentaire, formation professionnelle dans les écoles normales; Enseignements spécialisés: disciplines artistiques, enfance inadaptée, enseignement agricole, enseignement ménager.' This list of specialisms was revised in article 2 of the *arrêté* of 2 January 1980 and notably included the broader category of 'Éducation et vie scolaire', which had been established in the interim.

state and thereby received public funds. In response to this situation a body of *inspecteurs pédagogiques régionaux* (IPR) were established following the *instruction générale* issued on 5 November 1964 to operate under the joint authority of the *inspecteurs généraux* and *recteurs* to increase the capacity of this *dispositif* of inspection by establishing a body of inspectors for the teachers of the *second degré* that was attached to the area of an *académie* (Prost 2007: 131; A. Legrand 2005: 506). This geographically bound body of inspectors would function alongside the *inspecteurs de l'enseignement technique*, which already existed at the *académie* level under the authority of the *recteur* to inspect technical education, and the *inspecteurs de l'enseignement primaire* and *inspecteurs des écoles maternelles*, which were jointly renamed as *inspecteurs départementaux de l'Éducation nationale* (IDEN) by *décret* 69-1016 of 13 November 1969, that operated at the departmental level under the authority of the *inspecteur d'académie* for teachers of primary education (A. Legrand 2005: 506). The recruitment, grades, missions and responsibilities of these pre-existing bodies of inspection were themselves revised and codified by *décrets* 72-585, for the *inspecteurs de l'enseignement technique*, and 72-587, for the IDEN, of 4 July 1972, affirming their hierarchical organisation under the ministry's central authority and their normalising disciplinary action (Gerbod 1979: 263).

In addition to this centralisation and development of the traditional *dispositif* of inspection that served to conduct normalising examinations of teaching personnel, a new centralised *inspection générale de l'administration de l'Éducation nationale* (IGAEN) was established by *décret* 65-299 of 14 April 1965 to inspect the financial and administrative operation of all aspects

of the increasingly large *dispositif* of the education system beyond teaching personnel (Mallet 1981: 133; A. Legrand 2005: 506). As Simon et al. (2010: 139) note, the IGAEN brought together and extended the disparate services that served to monitor the operation of the institutions under the *directions* of the previously separate orders of education and further demonstrates the integration of these orders within a the single *dispositif* of *l'Éducation nationale* that developed following the 1959 Berthoin reform.

Three processes served to complete the unified disciplinary *dispositif* of the French public education system and thereby intensified the operation of disciplinary power through this organisation and its series of institutional enclosures. The first was the elaboration of a *carte scolaire* for the centrally directed distribution of pupils within the different enclosures of the education system. The second was the reorganisation of the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale* that integrated the previously separate orders of education into a single, central authority. Finally, the third was the development and extension of the hierarchically organised inspectorates of the education system. The *carte scolaire* undertook a disciplinary *quadrillage* of the French school system that enabled both the application of the same disciplinary set of moulds to subjects in all areas of France and the distribution of pupils between the different enclosures of this *carte scolaire* according to their individual performances and guided by the targets set by the central *ministère*. The unification of the central administration of the education system and the development of its inspectorates to ensure the operation of the school system and its administration according to the prescriptions of the *ministère* affirmed the pyramidal organisation of this *dispositif* that converged towards this ministry

as a central authority. This authority sought to direct the functioning of the various enclosures of the education system that, as we have indicated above in relation to the separate *filières* of the CES, continue to actualise divergent disciplinary logics and organise the passage of pupils between them.

The Fouchet-Capelle reform of the education system and the reorganisations of the administration of this system that took place throughout the 1960s can then be seen as the peak of the unified disciplinary organisation of the French public education system following the integration of the three separate orders of education that were established by the Third Republic under a single central authority. As we have noted above, the different *filières* of study in the *premier cycle* of secondary education, which completed the compulsory education of pupils, operated as distinct enclosures within the CES instituted by this reform and continued to actualise distinct programmes. These *filières* and their programmes echoed the Third Republic's separate orders of primary, secondary and technical education that responded to the order-words of community, the individual and the economy. *Voie* I (modern or classical) continued the individual-centred programme of a long abstract general education of *l'enseignement secondaire*. *Voie* II, which was considered the normal *filière* to be attended by the majority of pupils, offered a short course of general education similar to that developed in the CC of the community-centred *enseignement primaire*. *Voie* III offered a short practical course of education that emphasised the acquisition of technical skills to prepare pupils for entry into the workforce and so demonstrated an affinity with the economy-centred education of the Third Republic's *enseignement technique*. Indeed, Delahaye (2006: 33) uses Jean Capelle's (1966: 29-30) description of the

'cloisonnements abusifs' of the tripartite education system inherited by the Fifth Republic, where '[l]es trois mondes de l'enseignement primaire, de l'enseignement secondaire et de l'enseignement technique [...] se répartissaient - ou se disputait - la clientèle des jeunes de 11 à 15 ans', to characterise the system inaugurated by the Fouchet-Capelle reform and express the ongoing separation of these three *filières* and what we have referred to as their distinct disciplinary logics.[102] The centralised integration of the administration of these and other enclosures of the education system and the development of the *carte scolaire* enabled the organisation of the passage of pupils between these enclosures through a system of *orientation*. Although the process of *orientation* organises the passage of pupils between these enclosures, it should perhaps be noted that this process of *orientation* that cuts across all these enclosures was itself developed and operated in response to the order-words of community, the individual and the economy that incited the development of these enclosures, and could be argued to still express the tendency of these disciplinary powers 'à sortir de leurs forteresses closes où ils fonctionnaient et à circuler à l'état "libre"' (SP: 246), the tendency of an exercise of power in service of one order-word to blur disciplinary boundaries as it seeks to intensify its power by extending itself to apply in another enclosed space coded and operating in response to a different order-word.

Responding to the demographic wave of the baby boom and the increase in demand for longer studies, this completed and integrated disciplinary *dispositif* demonstrated its success in achieving an impressive quantitative democratisation of secondary education by the end of the 1960s.

[102] Delahaye misrepresents Capelle's description as being a direct description of the system of *filières* established within the CES.

This indicated a more thorough actualisation of the community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education and therefore the more intense exercise of power, achieving a greater field of application and saturation of that field, in service of these logics. The number of pupils attending classes of the *premier cycle* of secondary education almost doubled from 1,229,800 in the 1958-59 school year, which represented 49.1% of children aged 11 to 15 years old, to 2,434,000 in 1968-69, 78.5% of this age group (Prost 2004: 294). Similarly, the number of pupils attending classes of the *second cycle* of secondary education also increased during this period from 259,200 in 1958-59 to 556,700 in 1968-69, with the percentage of a generation achieving one of the general *baccalauréats* that traditionnally completed a full secondary education increasing from 9.36% to 13.91% over this same period (Ibid. 303). Finally, technical education saw an impressive increase with the number of pupils undertaking a long course of technical education, for example, increasing from 71,100 to 184,800 between 1958-59 and 1968-69 (Ibid. 648). These increased figures included a higher percentage of children of manual workers in the classes of secondary education, a rudimentary indicator of the democratisation of this degree of education. However, as Prost (1997: 57) notes, this increase was more a result of the compulsory prolongation of studies and the incorporation of previously absent student populations. Indeed, despite these quantitative increases, by the 1970s, intensified demands that responded to the order-words of community, the individual and the economy had produced renewed critiques that highlighted the limitations of this disciplinary *dispositif*.

The limits of the Fouchet-Capelle reform and intensified demands leading to the 1975 *loi Haby* and the *collège unique*

The contemporary *collège* would emerge from the continuing demand for the intensification of the exercise of power in service of the order-words of community, the individual and the economy that were expressed in the new critiques and proposals for reform that developed from the mid-1960s and into the 1970s in response to the achievements and limitations of the Berthoin and Fouchet-Capelle reforms. Indeed, as Sadoun and Donegani (1976: 1125-1126, 1137-1140) have argued, following the implementation of the Berthoin and Fouchet-Capelle reforms, which had sought to respond to the demands for reform inspired by the idea of an *école unique* that had re-emerged in the post-war period, there began a period of 'réamplification de la demande' which saw the renewal and intensification of calls for reform. We will show in the following analysis how this period of renewed demands, through the critiques, reform proposals, developing practices and the successful and unsuccessful measures taken that express efforts to intensify the exercise of power through the educational *dispositif* in service of the order-words of community, the individual and the economy, led to a consensus for reform that would see the abolition of the disciplinary divisions that persisted in the form of the *filières* of the CES and the creation of a *collège unique*. We will also see an increasing insistence upon the disciplinary principle of the modulation of sanctions or punishments (SP: 314) expressed in calls for the adaptation of institutions, pedagogical practices and curricula to pupils and the school's local environment that will become significant for our concluding analysis of the *collège* as a *dispositif* of control.

First we will see how the ongoing studies of the INED and the seminal work of the Bourdieu and Passeron (1964) in the mid-1960s served to highlight the insufficiency of the Fouchet-Capelle's response to the critiques directed towards the Berthoin reform and brought a critique of the inequalities reproduced through the school to the forefront of public debate regarding the school. These works revealed how the *culture scolaire* that serves as the basis for the evaluation, and so *orientation*, of pupils within the school actually expressed the culture of the dominant social class and thus how the cumulative effect of these judgements served to advantage those from more privileged backgrounds and disadvantage those from less privileged backgrounds, thereby reproducing social hierarchies. The inequalities highlighted by these accounts will be seen to become more visible as the polyvalent CES bring the various *filières* together, with the least prestigious, economy-oriented third *filière* coming to highlight the educational disadvantages of those from more modest backgrounds and represent a *filière* of relegation. Both the INED and Bourdieu and Passeron (1964) make a case for a more responsive pedagogy and broader curriculum as a means of addressing these inequalities.

Next we will see how the development of these critiques was part of a wider movement calling for reform of the centralised disciplinary *dispositif* of French education by considering the debates of the emblematic *colloque d'Amiens* of March 1968. This conference developed a broad critique of the existing education system, denouncing the traditional pedagogy and curriculum of *l'enseignement secondaire*, the authoritarian processes of *orientation* and the separate *filières* of the CES as factors of inequality and obstacles to the realisation of individual pupils' potentials. Instead, the meeting

promoted a broadening of the traditional curriculum, the adoption of more active pedagogies inspired by the theories of *l'Éducation nouvelle*, the elimination of the barriers between different *filières* and the opening up of schools to their local community.

We will then see that a number of governmental efforts had been initiated in the period preceding 1968 to address the limitations of the current school *dispositif* in relation to the strategic objectives of community, the individual and the economy. We will highlight in particular: governmental support for new pedagogical methods and curricular reform of mathematics and French intended to overcome educational inequalities, and the development and introduction of the new subject of *technologie* in *voie* II of the CES to better respond to economic demands.

The impetus for reform given by the events of May 1968 will then be shown to lead to a number of reforms and further reflection to further the democratisation of the education system. These measures notably included the harmonisation of the curriculum, through the deferral of Latin in the classical sections of *voie* I and the experimental introduction of a modern language for *voie* III, to establishment of a true *tronc commun* for the classes of *sixième* and *cinquième*, the pursuit of curricular and pedagogical reforms, reforms of school administration, and the successful experimentation of alternatives to the organisation of the CES by *filières* under the direction of the *Institut pédagogique national* (IPN).

The conservative reaction to these reforms under the ministers appointed by President Pompidou, which saw the partial reversal of a number of the reforms mentioned in the previous paragraph and an insistence upon the

differences between the *filières* of the CES, will briefly be considered before we underline the continuation of attempts to intensify the operation of the school *dispositif* during this same period. This included the creation of commissions for further reflection upon curricular, pedagogical and structural reforms and the decline of pedagogical barriers between *voies* I and II of the CES due to the intermingling of their distinct teaching bodies.

Finally, we will stress the emergence by the mid-1970s of a growing consensus in favour of the elimination of the distinct enclosures of the *premier cycle* and, in particular, the integration of the maligned *voie* III, to a unified middle school such as the *collège*. This consensus will be shown to be supported by a multiplication and, in some cases, radicalisation of critiques of the French school, which expressed the community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education, and to find expression in the policies of parties in the legislative elections of 1973 and of candidates in the presidential election of 1974. Tensions between agents invested in the separate *filières* of the disciplinary education system will be seen to remain, however.

The calls for reform expressed over this broad period will be seen to develop from critiques that expressed the order-words of community, the individual and the economy and sought the intensified actualisation of the disciplinary logics responding to these various *mots d'ordre*. These critiques highlighted the limitations presented by the separate *filières* that persisted within the CES and the *orientation* that distributed pupils between these enclosures and, whilst also promoting an increased modulation of education in response to the diversity of pupils attending compulsory education, tended to converge towards the abolition of these separate courses of education and the

creation of a unified middle school. Firstly, some critiques expressed the order-words of community and the individual by highlighting the ongoing inequalities that continued to result from the distinctions between *filières* of the *premier cycle* and the *orientation* of pupils between them, which underlined both how this divided the body of French pupils, conferring advantages on some and disadvantages on others, and impeded the full realisation of individuals according to their aptitudes and interests. Secondly, other critiques of these enclosures and the process of *orientation* between them responded to the order-word of the economy by stressing the insufficient nature of the quantity and quality of pupils that went on to undertake vocational studies in this system, which was considered incompatible with new demands of the economy. The limited success of the number of measures taken in response to these critiques over the period led eventually to a renewed emphasis on proposals responding to the order-words of community, individual and economy that sought to remove the divisions between *filières* and resulted in the *loi Haby* of 11 July 1975 that created the *collège unique* as an institution of deleuzean control.

A - Revealing the limits of the CES: The INED, Bourdieu and Passeron and newly visible inequalities

If, as noted above, the Fouchet-Capelle reform was responding in part to the socio-economic and geographic inequalities in the *orientation* of pupils shown in the preliminary results of the INED's study presented in 1962, the continued revelation of these persistent inequalities by this ongoing study contributed to new critiques directed against the institutions established by this

reform (Chapoulie 2010: 470). The INED's cohort study followed a national sample of pupils due to enter into *sixième* in 1962, barring any *redoublements*, from the last class of primary education, CM2 (*cours moyen deuxième année*), through until 1972, by which time the vast majority of the cohort had completed their schooling and either entered higher education or the workforce (Chapoulie 2010: 462-463; Robert 2015: 67-69). Although the beginning of this study in 1962 preceded the Fouchet-Capelle reform, the publication of articles based on this research from 1963 onwards in the INED's journal *Population* contributed to the debate regarding the institutions established following the reform, which, as shown above, maintained the enclosures of the Berthoin reform through separate *filières*, and informed reflection regarding these institutions and the progress and *orientation* of pupils through the *second degré* by highlighting the significance of pupils' social origins for their schooling and the ongoing divisions of pupils in separate enclosures that persisted with these reforms (Masson 2001: 492; Prost 2004: 413-422; Chapoulie 2010: 462-467; Robert 2015: 67-70).[103] Indeed, the regular publication of results from these studies, alongside influential sociological works (Bourdieu and Passeron 1964; 1970; Bourdieu 1966; Baudelot and Establet 1971) that built upon the contribution of these findings, served to highlight the insufficiency of the Fouchet-Capelle reform's CES as a response to the inequalities that had engendered its formulation and helped make inequality in the education system and the necessity of its further democratisation publicly recognised and an omnipresent issue that demanded a

[103] The continuity between the separate institutions of the Berthoin reform and the distinct *filières* of the Fouchet-Capelle reform's CES is recognised in the final recapitulatory article of the INED study (Girard and Bastide 1973: 592).

response in educational debates by the turn of the 1970s (Chapoulie 2010: 457, 465; Legrand 1998: 37; Robert 2015: 67-70).

A 1965 article by Alfred Sauvy and Alain Girard provided the first published recapitulation of the INED's initial findings and both confirmed the correlation between a pupil's background and their progression at school and suggested this resulted from a cumulative process of selection throughout the education system that reaffirmed the initial inequalities arising from pupils' different backgrounds (Chapoulie 2010: 462-463). Analysing the cohort study's results alongside a consideration of the socio-economic background of university students in 1963, which showed a preponderance of children with more privileged backgrounds and a dearth of children of agricultural and industrial workers greatly disproportionate to the wider population (Sauvy and Girard 1965: 207-209), this article indicated the mechanisms that contributed to the cumulative entrenchment of these inequalities.

This article proceeds to suggest that the *orientation* of pupils at the threshold of the *premier cycle* demonstrates the influence that pupils' economic and cultural backgrounds have already had upon their success at school, highlighting, for example, that only 16% of children of agricultural and industrial workers entered the *sixième* of a *lycée* in 1962 compared to 75% of children with parents in the liberal professions or executive management positions (Sauvy and Girard 1965: 210). Indeed, while Sauvy and Girard point to how the unequal *orientation* of pupils at the threshold of the *premier degré* identified in the INED study results primarily from pupils' different levels of success in school, they also show that this varying *réussite scolaire* demonstrated a similar correlation with pupils' backgrounds, with the level of

pupils improving as one progresses from pupils whose father is a manual worker to those whose father is in a senior managerial position. Noting that the children of more educated *instituteurs* do better than those of shopkeepers despite their similar economic resources, Sauvy and Girard argue that it is the cultural milieu of a child, indicated by the parents' educational achievements, that has a greater influence on a pupil's success and future progression at school than their family's economic resources (Ibid. 212-215, 226-227). According to the authors, the economic status of pupils' parents appears to only partially compensate for the comparative disadvantage of having less educated parents and only becomes significant as pupils progress through their secondary education and the cost of forgoing a potential income becomes potentially more problematic for less well-off families while better off parents can pay for resources or tuition to support their child's progression (Ibid. 214, 226-227). The willingness for a family to forego this potential income and to push their child towards longer and more prestigious studies is related, according to Sauvy and Girard (Ibid. 226, 221-222), to the aspirations of parents for their children's education, which arise from the cultural level of parents and also tend to become greater as their socio-economic status increases, and again underlines the relationship between a pupil's background and their success or otherwise at school.

Drawing on the INED data, Sauvy and Girard (1965: 222-224, 232) suggest, furthermore, that teachers' evaluations of pupils implicitly take into account their background, and the educational aspirations of their parents that this implies, which serves to reinforce and entrench the disparities in pupils' *réussite scolaire* and *orientations* over the course of their schooling. This

influence on teachers' evaluations of their pupils results in more favourable evaluations and *orientation* recommendations for children of higher socio-economic categories and less favourable outcomes, such as lower marks, *redoublement* or *orientation* towards entering the primary *classes de fin d'études* or *sixième* in a CEG rather than in a *lycée* (the equivalents of *voie* III, II and I, respectively, following the Fouchet-Capelle reform) for those of less culturally and economically prestigious backgrounds, as the authors show in comparing the fortunes of pupils of similar academic level but with different backgrounds (Ibid. 221-225).[104] Sauvy and Girard (Ibid. 226-229, 231-232) argue that the effects of these socio-economic inequalities accumulate therefore in what amounts to a process of overselection over the course of pupils' schooling that progressively filters out those with parents with lower levels of academic achievement and/or belonging to lesser categories of employment, and accentuates any advantage or, conversely, disadvantage that arises from their disparate backgrounds, eventually leading to the unequal composition of the student body at the universities.

Further articles based on the findings of the INED study published up until 1973, including summaries of the study's results following the cohort's completion of the *premier cycle* (Girard and Bastide 1969a; 1969b) and the *second cycle* (Girard and Bastide 1973) of secondary education, served to confirm the initial findings reported in 1965 and highlight the importance of the initial *orientation* of pupils at the threshold of the *premier cycle du second degré*. As further findings related to the cumulative aggravation of any 'retard scolaire' gained by students through *redoublements* at any point in their

[104] As Prost (2013 :335) notes, this bias in teachers' evaluations had already been shown in a 1960 study conducted in the *académie* of Bordeaux.

schooling showed (Girard and Bastide 1969b: 229-230; 1973: 578-579), the school system tended to progressively magnify the advantages and disadvantages that pupils initially received from their family backgrounds. Indeed, the results of the INED study emphasise that the first *orientation* of a pupil at the end of their primary schooling, which, as we have seen, closely correlates with the pupil's social and cultural background, has 'un caractère très contraignant' (Girard and Bastide 1969b: 229) that served to condition the educational opportunities of pupils in their future schooling, with the percentage of pupils going on to receive a *baccalauréat* being barely 3% for those oriented towards the primary *classes de fin d'études* (the equivalent of *voie* III in a CES), increasing to 25% for those oriented to the *sixième* of a CEG (*voie* II) and almost 50% for those who entered the *sixième* of a *lycée* (*voie* I) (Girard and Bastide 1973: 584-587).

The deterministic weight of a pupil's background on their education exposed in the INED study was also emphasised by the works of Bourdieu and Passeron in the 1960s, which reached a wide audience and helped to popularise these findings beyond the milieu of researchers, administrators and policy-makers (Robert 2015: 69-70; Masson 2001: 492; 2005: 83-88, 95; Prost 2004: 414-422; Chapoulie 2010: 465-467). However, Bourdieu and Passeron also proposed a more radical critique of the conservative, inegalitarian function of the institutions of education and the class-based nature of the *culture scolaire* that operated through them and served as the basis of the evaluations and *orientations* throughout a pupil's schooling.

The inequalities evident in the makeup of the student body, highlighted in Sauvy and Girard's 1965 article discussed above, formed the object of

Bourdieu and Passeron's influential study *Les Héritiers* (1964), which elaborated upon the importance of one's cultural inheritance in one's access to and success in university and the sociocultural basis of teachers' judgements that determine this success. Analysing data on students, primarily those studying *Lettres* in public *universités*, between 1960 and 1964,[105] Bourdieu and Passeron argued that the *culture scolaire* that formed the basis of these studies in higher education did not constitute a neutral and universal *culture scolaire* but instead implicitly presupposed 'un corps de savoirs, de savoir-faire et surtout de savoir-dire qui constitu[ait] le patrimoine des classes cultivées' (1964: 36). This referred to, for example, a greater familiarity with artworks, a larger vocabulary and greater degree of linguistic dexterity, and an appreciation of abstract knowledge for its own sake (Ibid. 28, 31; Duru-Bellat and Van Zanten 2012: 245). According to Bourdieu and Passeron therefore, and contrary to what they refer to as the 'idéologie du don' (Bourdieu and Passeron 1964: 108), which supports the myth of a meritocratic education that reveals and rewards individual talents, the inequalities of both access to and success in education resulted from the advantages gained by those with more educated parents. From such parents pupils could inherit a greater part of this classed culture, whereas those with less educated parents would be relatively disadvantaged when confronted with a *culture scolaire* that expresses the culture of the dominant classes. The unacknowledged classed nature of this *culture scolaire* and the attendant assertion of a formal equality of all students in front of this culture, despite these socio-economic inequalities of background, meant that the education system, as represented in this text by the

[105] For a full account of the studies that informed this work, see Masson (2001: 497-503).

higher education institutions, served to 'consacrer les inégalités par la transformation du privilège social en don ou en mérite individuel' (Bourdieu and Passeron 1964: 44). Bourdieu and Passeron point to the *concours* as the ultimate example of this mechanism, where 'l'égalité formelle qu'assure le concours ne fait que transformer le privilège en mérite puisqu'il permet à l'action de l'origine sociale de continuer à s'exercer, mais par des voies plus secrètes' (Ibid. 104).

Drawing upon the INED studies that had been published at that time, Bourdieu published an article in 1966 that extended the analysis of higher education given in *Les Héritiers* to consider the school system more generally and how it served as an 'école conservatrice' that cumulatively reproduced and legitimated existing inequalities and social hierarchies, rather than as an 'école libératrice' that would attenuate social inequalities and enable social mobility according to individual merit (Chapoulie 2010: 464; Bourdieu 1966: 325-326). Bourdieu (1966: 330-336) emphasises in this article the cumulative nature of the production of inequalities in schooling and the determinant nature of the initial *orientation* of pupils at the end of their primary education for their future schooling. He suggests furthermore that this process of overselection in relation to a *culture scolaire*, which is presented as neutral and legitimate but, in its methods and content expresses the arbitrary cultural values of the dominant social group, has the effect of disadvantaging the disadvantaged and favouring the already favoured, as part of an avowedly objective process of schooling that, in fact, results in the reproduction and legitimation of the existing social order with its dominant and dominated groups (Ibid. 336-342; Duru Bellat and Van Zanten 2012: 246-247).

The cumulative inequalities and the continuing determinant nature of a pupil's initial *orientation* in the education system that manifest the influence of pupils' unequal backgrounds would not be resolved by the Fouchet-Capelle reform and the institution of the CES, despite its intentions. Indeed, the structures introduced by this reform would preserve and serve to magnify the shortcomings of the education sytem in responding to the inequalities derived from pupils' family backgrounds.

Although, as indicated above, the Fouchet-Capelle reform intended to facilitate the *réorientation* of pupils according to their aptitudes over the course of the *premier cycle* and mitigate the impact of any erroneous premature *orientations* by establishing CES bringing together the different *filières* of the first cycle of secondary education in one place, this innovation had hardly any effect on the *orientation* of pupils due, in part, to the continued curricular and pedagogical divisions between these courses of education with distinct teaching bodies and programmes of study and so the significance of one's background for one's education persisted (Prost 2004: 292; Lelièvre 1990: 186). The continued presence of Latin on the programmes of the classical course of long general education from the second term of *sixième* remained an obstacle to the *réorientation* of pupils to this strand of *voie* I, for example, while the lack of any modern language in the programmes of *voie* III added complications for pupils hoping to gain access to the *filières* of general education (Prost 2004: 356-357). A ministerial study cited by Lelièvre (1990: 186) that was published in 1971 confirmed the continued weight of the initial *orientation* of pupils that was suggested by the INED articles and Bourdieu, finding that in 1968 this *orientation* at the *sixième* was determinant and

irreversible for 90% of pupils in the *premier cycle* and that only 5% of pupils placed in *voie* III were reoriented into potentially longer courses of study over the course of the *premier cycle*.

The extension of compulsory education to the age of 16 years old and the reorganisation of the *premier cycle* of secondary education into distinct *filières* to be brought together in CES served to magnify the inequalities of *orientation* and the significance of a cumulative *retard scolaire* for many pupils. As Chapoulie (2010: 468) notes, the reunification of the distinct *filières* of the *premier cycle du second degré* in the CES and, to a lesser extent, CEG that would be destined to eventually become CES, encouraged the comparison of the performance and background of pupils in the different *filières* of these institutions, revealing to teachers and administrators the correlation, underlined by the studies discussed above, between pupils' schooling and their background. The prolongation of obligatory schooling by two years, introduced by the Berthoin reform, and the progressive closure of the *classes de fin d'études* of primary education as the *classes de transition* and *cycle terminal* of the Fouchet-Capelle reform's *voie* III opened in CEG and CES also highlighted the magnitude of the cumulative problem of *retard scolaire* due to the new visible presence in these polyvalent institutions of a significant number of pupils, mostly with working-class backgrounds, who would have previously completed their compulsory education in the terminal classes of primary education (Prost 2013: 133, 190; Chapoulie 2010: 468). As Chapoulie (2010: 468) notes, these pupils that were directed into *voie* III would tend to both be relatively older, due to prior *redoublements*, and relatively behind the official norms of progression through the education system, and included a

number of ‘mauvais élèves’, described by Prost (2013: 133) as ‘incapables de suivre une scolarité prolongée, même aménagée’. The *retard scolaire* of these pupils in particular highlighted the shortcomings of the education system leading to references from the early 1960s to an institutional *échec scolaire* (Chapoulie 2010: 469).

The institutional architecture of the CES also made the social hierarchy of the *filières* and the process of social selection that they operated more evident by bringing them together in a single space. As Lelièvre (2008: 106-107) notes, the structure of the CES promulgated in 1963 was recognised by both Pompidou and de Gaulle’s education advisor Jacques Narbonne as a means of maintaining the hierarchy between the different *filières* of education, in which there would be the selection of an elite to study in *voie* I with its traditional secondary courses of study and more prestigious options for further study and future, higher status employment. In this context therefore, as Lelièvre (Ibid.) states, the status of the normal *voie* II was diminished, but, furthermore, the very small chance of *réorientation* from *voie* III, the limited future professional prospects beyond manual labour that it offered, and the social and academic profile of its pupils, indicated above, meant that, compared with the general educations offered in both *voies* I and II, this third *filière* soon became considered a ‘filière de relégation’ (Chapoulie 2010: 500; Prost 1968: 425-426). The diminished status of this *filière* most closely associated with vocational studies was contrary to the intentions of the 1959 and 1963 reforms and the elimination of entry exams for the CET in 1967, further served to diminish the prestige of economy-centred studies in relation to the ‘voie “normale”’ from which this third vocational and practical *filière*

seemed to receive those who had been excluded due to their own ‘échec scolaire’ (Lembré 2016: 81, 84, 94). As Kahn (2008: 50) observes, ‘réunir dans un seul type d’établissement ces différents parcours scolaires […], c’est ouvrir la boîte de Pandore de la revendication démocratique, créer les conditions d’une indéfinie réclamation d’égalité dans les études’.

For both the researchers of the INED and Bourdieu and Passeron, a further such democratisation called for a reassessment of the methods and content of the schools. In *Les Héritiers*, Bourdieu and Passeron (1964: 115) called for the implementation of ‘une pédagogie réellement rationnelle, c’est-à-dire fondée sur une sociologie des inégalités culturelles,’ that would ‘neutraliser méthodiquement et continûment, de l’École maternelle à l’Université, l’action des facteurs sociaux d’inégalité culturelle’ in order to achieve a real democratisation of the education system, which would not be possible with the preservation and continued misrepresentation as neutral of a school culture and pedagogy derived from the culture of the dominant social group. This was a call that Bourdieu (1966: 336-337) repeated two years later. Indeed, stressing the apparent failure of the ‘égalité totale’ of the education offered in the primary school to compensate for the unequal backgrounds of pupils and suggesting greater attention should be given to the disparities in cultural background that help produce the inequalities that they identified, Sauvy and Girard (1965: 232) had expressed a similar plea for a renewed approach to a pedagogy that was more responsive to the inequalities between pupils. This appeal would be made explicit in Girard and Bastide’s 1969 recapitulation of the INED’s results where they recommended that the offer of education should be diversified in response to these inequalities to ensure the

equal progression of all pupils and also ‘permettre aux mieux doués d’avancer à leur propre rythme’ (Girard and Bastide 1969b: 233). Each of these calls reflect the disciplinary concern for a modulation of the exercise of disciplinary power in response to the individual cases considered to maximise its effect (SP: 314), but perhaps most significantly resonated with and reflected the resurgent interest in the 1960s in pedagogical and curricular reform that, inspired by the theories of *l’Éducation nouvelle*, sought to address the ongoing inequalities in the education system (Prost 2013: 143-147; Robert 2015: 80).

Indeed, the continuing prevalence of advantages and disadvantages at school derived from social inequalities and the classed nature of the *culture scolaire,* which the INED and Bourdieu and Passeron had revealed, highlighted the limitations on the school’s exercise of power in service of its various logics of education. These inequalities served to divide the community of pupils, limit the ability of all pupils to realise their individual potential, and thereby prevent the maximum contribution of all pupils to the economy. Responses seeking to overcome these limitations would emerge from both civil society and the state.

B - Broad contestation of the status quo: The Amiens colloquium of March 1968

Inspired by sociological research, such as that considered above,[106] new psychological approaches,[107] the practices developed in youth centres and in

[106] As Masson (2001: 490-493) notes, inequalities in the school came to be a major theme in the developing French sociology of education, with works by Girard and his INED colleagues, and Bourdieu and Passeron, but also those of Viviane Isambert-Jamati and her colleagues becoming important sources in these debates. These inequalities continue to be a significant

adult education,[108] renewed interest in the theories of *l'Éducation nouvelle,*[109] and examples of reform in other countries,[110] a vibrant movement of various associations and groups had developed in France by the mid-1960s promoting a range of pedagogical innovations and alternatives to the traditional pedagogy, curriculum and organisation of the school, which was condemned for its authoritarianism in both its selective process of *orientation* and in the rigid pedagogical relationships in its classrooms (Robert 2008: 29) and, given the findings of studies such as those cited above and the magnification of inequalities following the introduction of CES, was increasingly considered unsuited to the real democratisation of the education system that the

---

subject of sociological inquiry (See, for example, Felouzis 2014; Duru-Bellat and Van Zanten 2012: 39-61 and passim; Blanchard and Cayouette-Remblière 2016: 27-62; CNESCO 2016).

[107] Prost (2013: 145) notes the influence of psychological ideas from America, particularly those of Carl Rogers, who delivered a well-received seminar in France in 1966, and the therapeutic practice of self-directing T-groups, which was seen by some academics as an alternative to the traditional pedagogical organisation of the school. The influence of Rogers' person-centred approach, which emphasised a non-directive appeal to the individual's innate interests and activity, can also be traced in the association *Défense de la jeunesse scolaire* (DJS). Founded in 1963 and supported by a number of esteemed figures from the educational establishment, including *académiciens*, the directors of the ENS, the director of the *Collège de France*, *recteurs*, academics and medical experts, the DJS aimed to protect primary school pupils from the impositions of the education system. Its book *Rebâtir l'école*, published in 1967, went through four print runs by 1969 (Prost 2013: 145-146; Robert 2015: 74).

[108] Prost (2013: 143-145) highlights the contribution of the *Centres d'entraînement aux méthodes d'éducation active* (CEMEA) in training *animateurs* to lead social and cultural events at the *maisons des jeunes et de la culture* (MJC), which tripled in number to 539 between 1959 and 1965 and proved a successful means of interesting their public, of which two thirds was under the age of 21 years old, in literature, film and theatre, for example, outside the school. On the development of CEMEA and their influence, see Vannini (2012) and Sirota (2012), who discusses the influence of psychosociology and psychoanalysis on the CEMEA and their development after 1968. Prost (2013: 143-145) also notes the contribution of the *Ligue de l'enseignement* since the 1950s to the development of *l'éducation permanente* and the development of continuing education centres and courses by businesses. For more on this contribution, see Sévilla (2012).

[109] Robert (2015: 74) highlights the activity of the GFEN in this period and the formation in 1963 of the *Cercle de recherche et d'action pédagogique* (CRAP) around the publication *Les Cahiers pédagogiques*, which had been first published in 1945 to promote new pedagogical practices. For more on *Les Cahiers pédagogiques* and their contribution to debates in the 1960s, see Riondet (2012). For more on the broader development and contribution of *l'Éducation nouvelle* and related ideas in this period see the volume edited by Gutierrez et al. (2012), especially the chapter by Laot (2012).

[110] Mons (2007: 90-92) traces the increasingly global spread of comprehensive or common schooling from the USA, especially after the Second World War, and notes that France was late to adopt this model in the form of the *collège*. Louis Legrand (1998: 37) highlights the influence of developments in the UK and Quebec.

massification of the *second degré*, instigated by the Berthoin and Fouchet-Capelle reforms, had not fully addressed (Robert 2015: 74-75, 80-81; Prost 2013: 143-147; Laot 2012). A colloquium held in Amiens from 15 to 17 March 1968, organised by the *Association d'étude pour l'expansion de la recherche scientifique* (AEERS), who had organised another important colloquium in Caen on 11 to 13 November 1966, has come to be seen as emblematic of this movement (Robert 2015: 77-79; Prost 2013: 150-152), being described by Robert (2015: 75), for example, as 'révélateur d'un certain esprit du temps'.

Receiving unprecedented media coverage and bringing together over 600 teachers from primary, secondary and higher education, representatives of parents of pupils, architects, sociologists, economists, politicians, psychologists, trade union representatives and participants from the press, business, the civil service and the administration of *l'Éducation nationale*, this meeting in Amiens considered critiques and proposals regarding the objectives of the school, the nature of the *culture scolaire*, the structures and institutions of the education system, the initial and continuing education of teachers and their pedagogical practices, and the integration of new pedagogical research into the actual education system. In this way, it presented a programme of radical reform for the education system (Prost 2013: 150-151; Robert 2015: 75-77). The final agreed declaration of the *colloque* affirmed 'l'urgence d'une renovation éducative aussi bien que pédagogique' that entailed a rejection of the abstract *culture scolaire*, a transformation of pedagogical relationships that appealed to the initiative and interests of pupils through active methods, a renewed system of teacher training, a reform of school institutions and processes of *orientation*, and more collaborative working patterns amongst

teachers but also with pupils' parents as part of 'un style délibérément ouvert' (in Prost 2004: 336).

A number of elements of this urgent call for a renovation of the education system presented challenges to the existing disciplinary *dispositif* of the school, consolidated by the Berthoin and Fouchet-Capelle reforms, that responded to the findings of Bourdieu and Passeron and the INED and suggested an intensification of the different disciplinary logics actualised in the separate enclosures of this hierarchically organised system. This can be seen in the rejection of the traditional *culture scolaire* and consequent promotion of a broadening of this culture and new active pedagogical practices that showed the intensification and extension of the individual- and community-centred logics of education, in particular, and in the related critiques of the inefficiencies of the separate enclosures of this *dispositif* and the authoritarian and unequal process of selection that distributed pupils between them. These last critiques indicate the creation of a unified middle school as part of the intensification of the exercise of power in service of these logics.

Reflecting both Bourdieu and Passeron's (1964; Bourdieu 1966) critique of the *culture scolaire* and the fact, noted by Robert (2015: 80-81), that the *premier cycle du second degré* no longer just prepared pupils to pursue abstract and impractical studies to a *baccalauréat* or beyond and rather constituted, for many pupils, the final stage of education that needed to prepare pupils both to participate as a citizen of the French political community and a productive worker in a rapidly changing world, the Amiens meeting rejected the abstract and purely intellectualist focus of the traditional course of secondary education, which had continued to operate in *voie* I of the secondary

premier cycle and maintained its position of prestige in society. Instead, the meeting favoured what one of the preparatory reports produced for the *colloque* set out as 'une action concernant la personnalité totale de l'enfant et de l'adolescent, ainsi que son engagement dans un processus de développement économique et culturel' (in Robert 2008: 34).

This renewed attention to the unique interests and capacities of pupils as complete persons indicates an intensification of the individual-centred logic of education that had been promoted in the theories of *l'Éducation nouvelle*. As seen above, these extended the imperative of fully realising pupils' individual potential beyond the fostering of their intellectual abilities in accordance with the model of the extensively cultured and rational individual implicit in the traditional *culture scolaire* to encompass the full development of each pupil in accordance with their own unique interests and aptitudes, which may diverge from the those of the traditional norm. This orientation was reflected in the support expressed during the *colloque* for active pedagogical practices that would respond to the individual interests and current capacities of pupils and appeal to their own activity (Robert 2015: 78, 80-81).

The idea of an education that appeals to the whole personality of a pupil through an active pedagogy also serves to respond to the calls, such as those from Bourdieu and Passeron and the INED, mentioned above, for a renewed pedagogical approach that would take into account the differences between pupils in order to provide all pupils with equal opportunities to succeed as part of a more thorough democratisation of education, which indicates an intensification of the community-centred logic of education that expresses the republican principle of equality that formed part of the norm of a

republican community. This concern for an education that responded to the personality of the pupil to ensure their ability to successfully engage with their education was reflected in the contribution of the *conseiller d'État* Roger Gregoire to the Amiens meeting, where he affirmed that if a pupil was struggling to succeed at school it would be due to one or more of three potential reasons:

> - on tente de lui transmettre un patrimoine qui lui est indifférent;
> - on transmet ce patrimoine à travers des modèles qu'il rejette…
> - … à l'aide d'un système hiérarchique que son bon sens et sa dignité ne peuvent tolérer. (in Prost 2004: 336)

Gregoire's reasoning emphasises the disciplinary principle of the modulation of punishment, highlighted by Foucault (SP: 283-286, 314), where one is to tailor the disciplinary sanction, or exercise, to the individual subject in order to produce the best result based on one's knowledge of this individual's case, in relation to the pupils of the education system. This indicates a broadening of not just pedagogical practices, but also the knowledge to be taught to best address a given individual. Indeed, this contribution would seem to suggest a finer, more individualised modulation of the education to be given to a pupil than that offered by the system of *filières* that operated in the CES. This greater assertion of the principle of modulation beyond questions of *redoublement* and the *orientation* of pupils between different *filières* of schooling based, supposedly, upon their aptitudes, for example, also gestures towards the increasing prevalence of the modulation of the exercise of power

that would become dominant in the *dispositif* of control that emerges with the *collège*.

The concern for the global personality of pupils and their engagement in wider economic and cultural processes of development highlighted above indicates an interest in broadening the legitimate *culture scolaire* taught in schools that suggests the extension of the community- and economy-centred logics of education beyond the existing enclosures of primary education and *voie* II of the *premier cycle* of secondary education and the institutions of technical and professional education and *voie* III of the *premier cycle* to which, respectively, they correspond most. Again, this acknowledges the relatively new role of the *premier cycle* of secondary education in preparing pupils to participate in the French community and economy, in addition to its traditional role of preparing pupils for further study leading to a *baccalauréat* or beyond. It suggests a new emphasis on the common, general and practical 'culture usuelle' (Decaunes and Cavalier 1962: 42) that characterised the community-centred education of the *l'enseignement primaire* as a preparation to be part of a community and take full part in it, and what might be termed the *culture technique ou professionnelle* that characterised the economy-centred education of *l'enseignement technique ou professionnel*, which would exceed the existing enclosures intended to actualise these logics and thereby mark their intensification.

Although, as we will consider below, the economy-centred logic of education would increasingly become the subject of debates and be further asserted into the 1970s, the economy-centred aspect of this educative action would only receive this limited, allusive attention at the colloquium due to the

fact that the reform movement represented in Amiens tended to object to the *dirigiste* selection of pupils according to theories of human capital (Robert 2008: 31), the political function of the community-centred logic of education, on the other hand, was reasserted as part of the vision of a reformed education system. For example, during the debates at the Amiens meeting the gaullist former agriculture minister Edgar Pisani stated that the school should not just be a place for the transmission of knowledge but also 'une société modèle offrant l'image de la société future' (in Robert 2008: 34) and in the proceedings of the colloquium, published in 1969, the President of the AEERS, André Lichnerowicz, wrote that the school 'devrait devancer la société et la modeler plutôt que de la subir' (in Avanzini 1970: 44). This orientation evokes the mission of the republican school to transform the political landscape and educate citizens of the French Republic that responded to the order-word of community.

As part of this shift away from the traditional abstract *culture scolaire* and emphasis on active pedagogies that develop the full personality of the pupil in relation to broader processes of cultural and economic development, the colloquium proposed the development of 'une école largement ouverte vers l'extérieur' (Robert 2015: 77). Such a school would seek a greater participation of staff, parents and pupils in the life and operation of the school to form a 'véritable communauté culturelle' (Ibid.) that would complement the development of active pedagogies within the classroom. The involvement of the school community and the new margin of autonomy for each establishment that were part of this proposal (Robert 2008: 34-35) indicate again an interest in applying the disciplinary principle of modulation to the institution as a

whole to achieve the best possible result through the adaptation of the school to its local individual case, an intensification of the exercise of power in each institution. As we will see later in this chapter, this interest in a localised modulation of the institution to render more effective, and thereby intensify, its action would, when reiterated in the 1980s, eventually result in a decentralisation of powers that would grant secondary schools such an effective relative autonomy, which will be shown to be part of the *dispositif* of control that emerges with the *collège*.

This proposed opening up of the school also indicated a dissatisfaction with the rigid centralised administration of the education system, which was alluded to in the third point of Roger Gregoire's contribution to the colloquium, quoted above. This was clearly expressed in relation to the strict and somewhat authoritarian process of *orientation*, often simply referred to as 'la sélection', that was, according to Louis Legrand (1998: 37), 'violemment contestée' at the Amiens colloquium. As Danvers (2010: 101-104) shows with reference to the articles discussing the issue in *Le Monde* from 1965 to May 1968 and acknowledging the influence on public discourse of works such as Bourdieu and Passeron's *Les Héritiers*, *orientation* had become a major point of contention for those actors related to the school, being described by Antoine Prost in an article published in *Le Monde* on 4 January 1968 as 'fonctionellement monstreux' (in ibid.: 105). The authoritarian process of *orientation*, which had been set out in the *projets de décrets* adopted in the meeting of the cabinet committee on education (*conseil restreint*) on 26 May 1966, was contested by teachers' and parents' unions, with the *syndicat national des instituteurs* (SNI) warning of 'un dispositif qui sera pratiquement

sans appel', the *syndicat national des enseignants du second degré* (SNES) denouncing the government's proposals as a reinforcement of 'la prédétermination sociale et les mécanismes d'élimination', and parents' unions decrying 'une procédure administrative et paternaliste de sélection à partir des insuffisances' that was contrary to the educative mission of the school and placed too much emphasis on scholarly criteria to perform a premature *orientation* of pupils (in Danvers 2010: 105). The greater involvement of other actors in the operation and life of the school and a reduced emphasis on exam results, which reflected the much critiqued *culture scolaire*, as the key criteria for *orientation* that were promoted at the Amiens meeting can be seen as responses to these critiques of existing and proposed *orientation* practices (Robert 2008: 34-35).

The inequalities in schooling revealed by Bourdieu and Passeron's and the INED's studies, also, as Prost (2004: 422) notes, problematised the divisions between the different *filières* of the *premier cycle* whose separate enclosures contributed to the determinant nature of the first *orientation* at the threshold of the *sixième* on pupils' subsequent schooling and educational opportunities. This prompted the discussion at the Amiens colloquium of alternatives to these divisions and of greater unity of the education system, notably through a common initial education for all teachers of *l'Éducation nationale*. As Robert (2008: 34) notes, Louis Cros, who had served as *directeur de l'administration générale du ministère de l'Éducation nationale* from his appointment in 1959 until his resignation following the appointment of Pierre Laurent as *secrétaire général* of the ministry in 1964, rejected the strict selection of pupils supported by Charles de Gaulle at the colloquium and

underlined the inefficiency of the barriers dividing the various *filières* and subsequent courses of study. He cited Antoine Prost, representative of the *Syndicat général de l'Éducation nationale* (SGEN) at the colloquium, who had affirmed that the solution for the education system was 'non élever la digue, mais ouvrir de nouveaux canaux' (in Robert 2008: 34). This spirit of reducing boundaries between the different *filières* and courses of education was echoed by the commission considering teacher training at the Amiens *colloque* who, in their declaration issued at the end of the meeting, stated that it was 'nécessaire de tout faire pour mettre fin à l'actuelle division du corps enseignant' (in Heurdier and Prost 2014: 229). Proposals for a revised programme of initial teacher training that emphasised the dissemination of the active pedagogical methods discussed above and that would be followed by teachers of all institutions and degrees of the education system were recommended therefore with the intention of achieving this aforementioned unification that would end the divisions between the different bodies of teachers that could be found teaching in, for example, the different *filières* of the *premier cycle du second degré* (Robert 2008: 35; Prost 2013: 256-257). These proposals for teacher training that sought to produce a unified body of teachers trained in active pedagogical methods would only partially be realised in the 1980s,[111] but

[111] This unified institution for training teachers of all degrees of the education system that emphasised active pedagogies would only be realised with the establishment of an *Institut universitaire de formation des maîtres* (IUFM) in each *académie* at the *rentrée* of 1990 in application of article 17 of the *loi Jospin* of 10 July 1989. These institutions were much critiqued for their supposed *pédagogisme* and subject to a number of subsequent reforms, notably the controversial and short-lived *masterisation* of teacher training under President Sarkozy, before being replaced by *Écoles supérieures du professorat et de l'éducation* (ESPE) following the *loi Peillon* of 8 July 2013 (art. 68-76), which similarly fulfilled the role of training teachers and assistants for both primary and secondary education. For more information on the development of teacher training from the 1960s and through the establishment and operation of the IUFM, see Prost (2013: 255-279). For an early assessment of the introduction of the ESPE, see Louveaux (2013) or the initial *sénat* report (Magner

critiques of the divisions between the different courses of education that made up secondary education suggest the future development of an undifferentiated and unified middle school that would be realised with the creation of the contemporary *collège* in the 1970s as part of efforts to intensify the exercise of power in service of the order-words of community, the individual and the economy that had oriented the operation of various enclosures of the education system since the nineteenth century.

The broadening of the *culture scolaire*, development of active pedagogical methods, opening up of the school and reduction of divisions between the various *filières* of the *premier cycle* of secondary education proposed at the Amiens colloquium indicate a further interest in, and serious activity to move towards, the greater democratisation of education deemed necessary by Bourdieu and Passeron and the INED's studies that would also constitute an intensification of the both the community- and individual-centred logics of education. By preventing the potentially erroneous *orientation* of pupils at the threshold of the *premier cycle*, which may reflect a pupil's background rather than their individual performance, and mitigating the restrictive and determinant nature of any such *orientation*, this greater democratisation would extend the individual-centred logic to encompass a greater number of pupils who might be able to realise their potential through the pursuit of further studies that might otherwise have been denied to them due to their background or an erroneous *orientation.* This would also more intensely actualise the community-centred logic of education by ensuring a greater equality of opportunity that would be less determined by one's

---

2014), and more recently, see Dautresme's (2016) interview with the national president of the ESPE, Jacques Ginestié, and responding comments.

background and reducing the divisions between different *filières* that served to reproduce the divisions between social groups.

C - Ministerial initiatives before May 1968

Although, as noted above, the debates over the reform of the education system discussed at the Amiens *colloque* were informed by ideas from groups and associations that were marginal to the institutions of *l'Éducation nationale*, the significance of this movement for reform can be seen in the broad cross section of actors related to the education system that took part in this meeting and the active participation of the *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* Alain Peyrefitte in this *colloque*, which had been organised with the approval of both Peyrefitte and the *secrétaire général du ministère de l'Éducation nationale*, Pierre Laurent (Prost 2013: 151; Robert 2015: 75). Peyrefitte himself gave the closing address of the colloquium, in which he commended the debates and proposals that had emerged from them and committed to an 'opération de rénovation pédagogique', stating that 'Nous allons nous occuper d'assurer le relais de vos efforts' (in Robert 2015: 79). This willingness to take action to reform the education system in light of its shortcomings was reflected in Peyrefitte's presentation of a 27-point plan for the reform of the education system to a cabinet meeting on 28 February 1968. This plan reflected some of the ideas that would emerge from the Amiens colloquium, which opened two weeks later, and announced the creation of a 'commission de rénovation pédagogique' to further develop its proposals (Prost 2007: 199-202).

Indeed, in addition to the elaboration of the *carte scolaire* and new, rationalised processes of *orientation* detailed above,[112] the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale* also sought to respond to the shortcomings of the established education system and improve its effectiveness, i.e. intensify the exercise of power operating through this *dispositif*, by pursuing a number of initiatives that corresponded to some of the ideas and proposals for educational reform that were given expression at the Amiens colloquium and, with the added impetus of the events of 1968, enacting further reforms of the education system. These initiatives included pedagogical innovation and experimentation and curricular reform in relation to mathematics, French and the new subject of *technologie*.

- Pedagogical experimentation and innovation

The ministry supported, for example, the development of new pedagogies, practices and structures, which were intended at first to be implemented in the *écoles élémentaires* of primary education, but were also extended to parts of the *second degré*, contributing to the diffusion of these active pedagogical methods beyond the enclosure of primary education (Prost 2013: 135). As Prost (2013: 130-137) shows, the shift in focus of the primary school from ensuring pupils are in possession of the complete set of knowledge considered indispensable for entry into adult life to more simply preparing pupils to enter the *second degré*, which resulted from the Berthoin reform's extension of compulsory education to 16 years old and the Fouchet-Capelle reform's reorganisation of the *premier cycle du second degré* with the

[112] Although themselves subject to critique at the Amiens colloquium, as shown above, these measures were intended to achieve a more efficient, equal and effective distribution of pupils amongst the enclosures of the education system.

consequent progressive closure of the primary school's *classes de fin d'études*, led to a reconsideration of the pedagogical practices within the *écoles élémentares* and the development and implementation of a new model of active pedagogy intended to teach more effectively by adapting to each pupil's level of competency and appealing to their individual activity and interests (Vial 1967: 20-26). This new pedagogical approach influenced by the theories of *l'Éducation nouvelle* was developed, in particular, to better teach those pupils who were considered to be behind the normal level of their classmates and so was also extended to the *classes de transition* that made up the classes of *sixième* and *cinquième* of *voie* III of the *premier cycle*, which, as previously discussed, were taught by *instituteurs* who would have received the relevant *certificat d'aptitude* for teaching in these classes following its institution with *décret* 66-581 in July 1966 (Prost 2013: 133-135; Vial 1967: 17-18). This new pedagogy was set out and formalised for these *classes de transition* in the *instructions* of 15 July 1963. Further *instructions* and *circulaires* issued on 10 September 1963, 18 September 1964 and 5 April 1966 codified these practices and extended them to the classes of *quatrième* and *troisième* of *voie* III of the *premier cycle* (in Heurdier and Prost 2014: 218-225; Prost 2013: 134; Lelièvre 1990: 185). The slow recruitment of sufficient *professeurs* through the selective CAPES and *agrégation* in the early and mid-1960s, relative to the increase in pupil numbers in the burgeoning *second degré*, also presented an opportunity for practices of this active pedagogy to spread. In order to compensate for this shortage, the first *filière* of secondary education appealed to the more numerous body of *instituteurs*, including both those who had passed the CAPCEG to teach in the second *filière* or the *certificat d'aptitude*

for *voie* III and those without these qualifications, alongside a number of *maîtres auxiliaires* who had received a university education, but not the CAPES or *agrégation*. This served to partially undermine the pedagogical divisions between the enclosures of the different *filières* for a time and further diffuse the practices that made up this new active pedagogy (Legrand 1983: 283; Prost 2004: 324-328).

Further support for the development of more effective pedagogies, practices and structures for the education system in light of its shortcomings highlighted in studies such as those of the INED and Bourdieu and Passeron can also be seen in the new efforts from the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale* to encourage research and experimentation in these areas. Having initially been suggested as a necessary enterprise by De Gaulle's education advisor Jacques Narbonne in 1963, it was only in 1966, after one of Fouchet's advisors as *ministre de l'Éducation nationale*, Jean Knapp, identified 'l'organisation cohérente d'une véritable recherche pédagogique' as the most important contemporary problem for French education (in Prost 2013: 148), that clear actions were taken, with the creation of sections at universities that, from the *rentrée* of 1967, offered the possibility to study for *licences*, *maîtrises* or *doctorats* in *les sciences de l'éducation* and the revitalisation of the *Institut pédagogique national* (IPN)[113] (Prost 2013: 147-148). Provided with extra resources, the IPN was placed under the direction of Louis Legrand, a member

[113] The IPN had been established in 1956 as successor to the *Centre national de documentation pédagogique* (CNDP), itself created in 1954 in replacement of the *Musée pédagogique* founded in 1879 under Jules Ferry. In 1970 the IPN was dissolved and its research activities were continued by a new *Institut national de recherche et de documentation pédagogique* (INRDP), which was renamed the *Institut national de recherche pédagogique* (INRP) in 1976. For more information on the development and functions of these institutions, see Étévé (2005). The INRP was itself dissolved by decree in 2010 with its activities transferred to the ENS of Lyon where the *Institut français de l'éducation* (IFÉ) was established to continue these functions in April 2011.

of the AEERS that organised the Amiens colloquium and a pivotal figure for pedagogical research in this period and the later development of the *collège*. From his new position, Legrand launched the *Revue française de pédagogie* in 1967, and moved the IPN from facilitating meetings and research by pedagogical movements and reformers to acting as central leader of pedagogical reforms that could be tested in experimental trials through a network of institutions (Prost 2013: 342-343; Robert 2015: 75).

As *directeur de recherches* at the IPN, Legrand organised a study in 28 CES, with the approval of Peyrefitte, that, from the *rentrée* of 1967, would trial the introduction of aspects of the active pedagogy already in place for *voie* III for the pupils of *voie* II of the *premier cycle du second degré*, with the intention of developing a pedagogy for this second *filière* that would reduce the gap between the pedagogy pupils would have experienced in the primary school and in use in *voie* III and the more rigidly organised and directive pedagogy of this short course of general education. In this way it would facilitate the *réorientation* of pupils between the *filières* of the *premier cycle* sections that was meant to occur during the *cycles d'observation* and *d'orientation* (Legrand 1983: 283). This experiment required the usual teachers of this *filière* to take efforts to adjust their teaching to the levels of the individual pupils in their classes by providing extra support to those in need and, adopting the practice of the active pedagogies of the primary school and *voie* III, to treat all subjects other than the core of mathematics, French and a modern language as *disciplines d'éveil* where the teacher would use the subject material to appeal to the individual interests and activity of pupils. This particular trial in these *collèges expérimentaux*, which reduced the distinction

between practices in *voies* II and III and developed the greater modulation of practices in function of individual pupils to achieve a more efficient exercise of power, eventually proved to be successful, with the pupils in these sections outperforming those in the comparable modern sections of the *lycée*-type *voie* I at the BEPC (Legrand 1983: 283-284; 1998: 41-43). As we shall see this experiment continued until 1975 and, after 1968, evolved to include structural innovations that would suggest the unified pedagogical space to be achieved by the *loi Haby*'s creation of the *collège unique*.

- Curricular reform

The renewal of primary education that began after the Berthoin and Fouchet-Capelle reforms had altered its function in the education system also went beyond the question of pedagogical practices to examine the subjects taught in these institutions, leading to the establishment of a number of commissions whose remit was soon extended to include the *second degré* and whose scope expanded from simple adjustments to a more fundamental reconceptualisation of the subjects in question. As Harlé (2010: 66-67) and Cardon-Quint et al. (2015: 44-49) suggest, the proposals of these commissions and the concurrent reorientation of the curriculum to emphasise mathematics over *lettres* respond to a number of objectives, which we can read as the intensification of the operation of power through the *dispositif* of the school in service of the order-words of community, the individual and also the economy.

In the academic year 1962-1963 commissions were set up to consider the teaching of the fundamental subjects of French and arithmetic (*calcul*) in the primary school and propose any necessary adjustments to the programmes

for these subjects. The commission on French was placed under the authority of the *inspecteur général* Marcel Rouchette and was to build upon an earlier commission on the teaching of grammar, formed in 1961, that had already submitted its recommendations, while the commission on arithmetic was placed under the authority of another *inspecteur général*, Marius Beulaygue. The ambition of these commissions was limited at first and this was reflected in their initial proposals produced in early 1964, which only proposed adjustments to the existing programmes of the primary school. However, greater ambitions for these commissions as a means of achieving a renovation of the subjects of French and mathematics for the entirety of the education system were affirmed by Capelle in 1964, before his resignation as DGOPS later that year, and indicated by the growing involvement of academics and researchers in their deliberations. The Beulaygue commission, for example, began to work with the *Association des professeurs de mathématiques de l'enseignement public* (APMEP) and increasingly emphasised what were referred to as *les mathématiques modernes* while, between 1963 and 1966, the Rouchette commission moved from the revision and strengthening of existing programmes to the reconfiguration French as a discipline under the increasing influence of Roger Gal, an *agrégé* and *professeur* of *lettres classiques* who was involved in the GFEN, and then his successor as director of the IPN, Louis Legrand and came eventually to reflect the concerns of the *Association française des professeurs de français* (AFPF) (Alix et al. 2015: 91-93; Prost 2013: 136).

First expressed in the *projet d'instructions officielles* for primary education that was rewritten by Legrand and adopted unanimously by the

commission in 1966 (Prost 2013: 136), this more ambitious orientation of the Rouchette commission and the revised contours of French as a discipline that it intended to establish demonstrated an effort to broaden the traditional, literary conception of the subject in favour of a more scientific approach to language that would be both more rigorous and more democratic, serving to mitigate the advantages and disadvantages of social origins. Bourdieu and Passeron (1964: 25-26), citing the work of British sociologist Basil Bernstein, argued that the influence of a pupil's origins was particularly acute in their language usage and proficiency, as well as their familiarity with *la culture savante*, which included literary culture (Cardon-Quint et al. 2015: 47-48, 50). The proposed primary school programmes that were trialled through the IPN's network from the *rentrée* of 1967, emphasised the communicative function of French and encouraged the individual expression of pupils as part of this focus rather than the memorisation and application of grammatical rules (Prost 2013: 136-137).

The commission's subsequent deliberations showed the continuation of this orientation and the influence of the *Association française des professeurs de français* (AFPF), which was founded in 1967 and acted as 'porte-parole et lieu de rencontre des partisans de la rénovation' (Cardon-Quint et al. 2015: 50).[114] As the Charbonnières manifesto written in September 1969 and subsequently published in February 1970 indicates, the AFPF supported the reconceptualisation of French with a focus on its communicative function and rejected the monopoly that literature had held over the subject, recasting literature as one usage of language amongst others. Rejecting the idea of French as a process of acquisition of a 'culture-somme' made up of a

[114] This organisation would be renamed the *Association française des enseignants de français* (AFEF) in 1973 in recognition of its incorporation of *instituteurs* and ambition to represent teachers of French at all levels of the education system (Prost 2013: 156-157).

chronologically organised, national literary heritage, the AFPF drew instead upon linguistics and the structuralist approaches to literary criticism of figures such as Roland Barthes and Gérard Genette in order to propose a more scientific study of the language, in which a wide range of genres across a variety of periods would be studied and a broader range of compositional exercises, including commentaries and personal essays would be practiced (Cardon-Quint et al. 2015: 50; Prost 2013: 156-157).[115]

Informed by the AFPF's propositions, the continued trials of the Rouchette commission's 1966 proposals and further related meetings led to the formulation of an even more radical programme for French in the primary school that affirmed the priority to be given to the communicative function of French. After being piloted in the IPN's trials in 1968, this programme was included in the final report of the Rouchette commission that was first produced in November 1969 and, having eventually been published officially in an amended form in January 1971, informed the production of new programmes for the *école élémentaire* that were issued by *circulaire* 72-474 of 4 December 1972. Building upon the work of both the Rouchette commission and the AFPF, a new commission would be established in July 1969 to continue this renovation of the French curriculum in relation to the *second degré* (Prost 2013: 158; Cardon-Quint et al. 2015: 51-52, 55; Alix et al. 2015: 97-99; Bishop and Cardon-Quint 2015: 123-127).

The teaching of mathematics was similarly remodelled for the entirety of the education system with the intention of reflecting developments in the field but also of promoting a greater and more meritocratic democratisation of

[115] For a more thorough analysis of the AFPF/AFEF's proposals in its Charbonnières manifesto, see Guiney (2017: 126-136).

education. This was done in light of Bourdieu and Passeron's (1964: 25-26) findings regarding inequalities in education and, in particular, the weight of pupils' social background on their language proficiency and consequently on their success at school (Prost 2007: 204-205). This was to be achieved through the introduction of *les mathématiques modernes*, which focused on the mathematical principles and techniques behind the solution of practical, everyday maths problems rather than these problems themselves and thereby sought to bring the subject closer to the most recent developments in the field, reducing the dominance of classical Euclidean geometry, trigonometry and arithmetic, for example, in favour of principles and techniques drawing upon set theory, the calculation of probabilities and statistics (d'Enfert and Gispert 2010: 339). Developed through the preceding decades therefore and promoting the idea of a correspondence between the structures of mathematics and the mental structures of the child, these *mathématiques modernes* were presented as 'mathématiques pour tous' that offered a universal language seen as more objective and socially neutral than that which had been offered in the French classroom, which was presented as that of a Parisian bourgeois elite (Cardon-Quint et al. 2015: 48). In 1965, the Beulaygue commission began working with the APMEP, an influential association of mathematics teachers from all levels created in 1910 that supported this renewal of the subject (Harlé 2010: 67), on the latter's proposals for the *école élémentaire,* which sought to introduce *les mathématiques modernes* at this level. However, in October 1966, Fouchet announced the creation of a new commission with the mission of examining the teaching of mathematics 'de la Maternelle au Collège de France' that would be presided over by André Lichnerowicz, holder of the Chair in

Mathematical Physics at the *Collège de France* and the president of the AEERS that would organise the 1968 Amiens colloquium (Alix et al. 2015: 92, 94). The Lichnerowicz commission would elaborate new programmes for mathematics for the *second degré* that followed the principles of *les mathématiques modernes*, which, after partial trials through the IPN network beginning at the *rentrée* of 1968, were progressively introduced across the education system from the *rentrée* of 1969 onwards (Prost 2013: 150; Cardon-Quint et al. 2015: 49).

As implied in the preceding paragraphs, this reconfiguration of the mathematics and French curricula constituted an effort to intensify the exercise of power in service of the community-centred logic of education in light of the educational inequalities that were seen to eventually result in *orientations* that separated pupils due to the effects of their social background. As noted above, the findings of both the INED's and Bourdieu and Passeron's research found that the educational inequalities they revealed in the school system showed a correlation between a pupil's degree of success at school and their social background and the different cultural heritages they gained from these backgrounds in particular. The curricular response to these apparently socio-culturally determined inequalities seen in the revised programmes for these subjects addressed, in particular, Bourdieu and Passeron's (1964: 25-40) suggestion that the educational advantages or disadvantages of a given pupil derive especially from the language proficiency and degree of familiarity with the *culture savante* of the dominant classes, which formed the basis of the supposedly objective *culture scolaire*, that their background grants them. As Prost (2004: 420-421) notes, languages and literature were consequently

considered to be the vehicle for the reproduction of social inequalities in the school while the sciences and mathematics were considered more objective and less liable to reproduce socio-cultural advantages. Indeed, a putative correspondence between mathematical structures and the child's innate mental structures supported the claim that *les mathématiques modernes* constituted 'des "mathématiques pour tous"' (Cardon-Quint et al. 2015: 48). The reduced prominence of literature in the proposed new French curriculum and the introduction of *les mathématiques modernes* constituted therefore an effort to mitigate the translation of inequalities of cultural heritage into advantages or disadvantages in a pupil's schooling and thereby achieve a greater democratisation of the education system that offers more equal opportunity to all members of the republican community (Ibid. 47-48).

The increasing emphasis over the course of the 1960s on mathematics in decisions relating to the *orientation* of pupils in the education system further contributed to the effort to intensify the exercise of power in service of the order-word of community already shown in this process of curricular reform, but also indicated an intensification of the operation of the *dispositif* of the school in service of the individual-centred logic of education through an extension of this logic's field of operation and revision of its normative criteria. As Cardon-Quint et al. (2015: 45-46) note, in the 1960s, mathematics came to take on the role of 'matière discriminante' that had previously been played by Latin. This was partly due to the supposed 'transparence sociale' (Cardon-Quint et al. 2015: 48) of mathematics, which meant that this process was deemed to be more legitimate and democratic than one that, with reference to Latin in particular, emphasised language and literary culture (Prost 2004:

420-421). Mathematics thereby offered both an intensification of the exercise of power in service of the order-word of community, by providing all pupils with a more equal opportunity that overcomes the divisions of pupils' social origins, and a more thorough actualisation of the individual-centred logic of education, by extending its effective reach to all pupils and beyond those with privileged backgrounds, who would have had an advantage in Latin and literary studies. This selection by mathematics was also supported, however, by the prestige status gained by the subject as a universal language that represented both a model of logic and economy of thought and the key to a full general education. It therefore seemed to constitute a more reliable and objective indicator and normative model of individual merit than Latin and the literary subjects of the classical humanities, whose partiality had been underlined by Bourdieu and Passeron (Harlé 2010: 65-67, 72; Cardon-Quint et al. 2015: 49-50). Lichnerowicz underlines this centrality of mathematics and its significance as an indicator of individual excellence, stating in the March 1967 preliminary report of his commission that '[l]a mathématique joue un rôle privilégié pour l'intelligence de ce que nous nommons le réel, réel physique comme réel social' (in Cardon-Quint et al. 2015: 49), and affirming later, in a 1970 article for the APMEP's *Bulletin*, that an understanding and mastery of mathematics, although accessible in principle to all, attests to 'beaucoup de travail, une immense patience, une certaine forme de rigueur morale aussi', on the part of a successful pupil (in Harlé 2010: 65). The development of selection by mathematics can therefore be seen as an intensification of the exercise of power in service of the order-word of the individual through a more thorough examination and selection of those apt to

enter into the various enclosures of secondary education and beyond according to these refined, and apparently more objective, normative criteria that reflected the emphasis on scientific rationality in contemporary intellectual trends.[116] Indeed, as Prost (2004: 455-456) explains, this selection by mathematics began with the *grandes écoles* starting to raise their mathematics demands in the 1950s in order to discern the best candidates in the face of a growing number of *bacheliers* and became prevalent in the three years following Fouchet's reform of the *second cycle général du second degré* enacted by *décret* 65-438 of 10 June 1965. This *décret* established five narrowly specialised series of general *baccalauréat* that no longer allowed for a change of course in the first two years of the *second cycle*, therefore encouraging the *orientation* of the best pupils directly towards the *baccalauréat C* (*Mathématiques-Physique*), which offered pupils continued access to the most prestigious courses of further education while, as Cardon-Quint et al. (2015: 45) state, the formerly most prestigious, literary series A (*Lettres-Philosophie*), now offering fewer prestigious prospects, came to fulfil 'la fonction de "dépotoir"' for those pursuing study at this level considered inapt to study for the other more scientifically oriented series of *baccalauréat*.[117] As Cardon-Quint et al. (2015: 57) and Harlé (2010: 71-72) indicate, this process of selection by mathematics in the *second cycle* also extended into the *premier cycle*, with the distribution of pupils between the *filières* of the CES depending increasingly on one's performance in

[116] These trends can be seen above in the promotion of *les mathématiques modernes* and elements of the structuralist paradigm in the linguistic and critical approaches introduced in the new French curriculum. For more on this wider intellectual scene, see Dosse (2012: 249-263), Culler (2006), Paty (2006: 207-208) and Morange (2006), for example.

[117] For an outline of the preceding series of *baccalauréat* and the structure of the course of study in the *second cycle*, see Prost (2013: 112-113).

mathematics and those considered deficient in this subject tending to be directed towards *voie* III of these institutions (Harlé 2010: 71-72; Cardon-Quint et al. 2015: 57).

The new emphasis on mathematics in *orientation* and the more ambitious mathematics programmes that were developed over the course of the 1960s also reflected economic demands and indicate efforts towards an intensification of the operation of the school in service of the economy-centred logic of education. The *exposé des motifs* of the Berthoin reform had already asserted the need to reduce the number of pupils undertaking further studies in philosophy, law and *Lettres* in order to train more technicians and engineers (JORF 7/1/1959: 423) and, as Harlé (2010: 61-62) highlights, France's modernising economy needed technical professionals with a knowledge of the latest mathematics to face the development of computing and the industrial and commercial applications of this mathematics. In fact, the introduction of *les mathématiques modernes* into the curriculum followed the publication in 1961 of a report entitled 'Mathématiques nouvelles' by the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), which would become the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in 1963, that, following the curricular model of *les mathématiques modernes*, promoted the introduction of more modern mathematics into the school curriculum in order to stimulate economic growth (Harlé 2010: 62-64; Prost 2007: 203-204). As Cardon-Quint et al. (2015: 45) and Prost (2004: 454-455) suggest, the economic demand for engineers, senior technicians and the like contributed to the prestige of the *baccalauréat* C, which emphasised mathematics and the sciences, as the most desirable course of study.

Further efforts to intensify the operation of power in service of the economy-centred logic of education in this period following the Berthoin and Fouchet-Capelle reforms can be seen in the attempt to introduce a new discipline of *technologie* into the curriculum of general education of *voie* II and the modern sections of *voie* I of the *premier cycle* that was intended to make a course of long or short technical rather than general education in the *second cycle* of secondary education 'une orientation "positive"', a desirable *orientation* sought by parents and pupils, and thereby help respond to the economic need for qualified workers set out by the fourth (1962-1965) and fifth (1965-1970) Plans (Chapoulie 2010: 496; Lebeaume 2008: 114; Figeat and Lebeaume 2015: 26-27). This discipline was created from the *rentrée* of 1962 in the classes of *quatrième* and *troisième* of the antecedents of the aforementioned *filières* that were established by the 1963 Fouchet-Capelle reform by a number of directives signed by Capelle in 1962, beginning with an initial *circulaire* signed on 13 March that year (Lebeaume 2008: 112, 120). Although intended to vary according to the aptitudes of pupils and revised by numerous regulatory texts in the years following its institution (Lebeaume 2008: 114; Géminard 2010), this subject generally involved technical drawing and manual mechanical exercises and responded to the new economic demands for a 'réflexion technique rationnelle' in addition to manual technical skills that arose from increasing industrialisation and automation (Lebeaume 2008: 114). However, due to a lack of resources devoted to its development, the lack of dedicated teaching personnel and the contested status of this discipline that existed between technical education and experimental sciences, in the 1967-1968 academic year this subject was only taught in 25% of the intended

institutions and *filières* (Lebeaume 2008: 112; Chapoulie 2010: 496-497). Nonetheless, in the 27-point plan that he presented to the 28 February 1968 cabinet meeting, Peyrefitte expressed the intention to support the development of this subject as one of the three fundamental subjects to be studied by all pupils from *l'école primaire* to the *lycée*, hoping that this would encourage the *orientation* of pupils towards courses of technical education 'par attraction positive et non par déchet des sections classiques et modernes' (in Prost 2013: 152; Prost 2007: 201).

D - Reforms after 1968

Peyrefitte's ambitions to build upon the experimentation, proposals and reforms of the mid-1960s and pursue the radical reform of the education system presented at the Amiens colloquium were cut short by the events of May and June 1968, which led to his resignation on the 28 of May 1968, but also acted as 'révélateur, [...] catalyseur et [...] accélérateur à des tendances déjà en germe' (Michel 2008: 14). Indeed, Masson (2005: 83, 87-88, 91) shows how these events contributed to a broader dissemination of the theses of Bourdieu and Passeron's *Les Héritiers*, with 27,400 copies of the book printed to meet demand in the three years following May 1968 compared to 9,000 copies in the almost four years preceding these events since its first publication in 1964, and thereby both helped develop a greater public awareness of studies, such as those of the INED, that highlighted and examined inequalities of schooling and informed the public understanding of these inequalities and subsequent studies on this topic. This immediate effect enabled and accelerated the pursuit of reforms in the final years of the 1960s, initially under the

auspices of the new minister Edgar Faure who was appointed on 12 July 1968 following Pompidou's brief three-day interim stewardship of the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale* and the short tenure of François-Xavier Ortoli.

In a speech given to *l'Assemblée nationale* on 24 July 1968 that outlined the education policy that he would pursue, Faure presented the events of May 1968 as a challenge to the rigidity of the existing centralised education system and the inequalities it produced and stated that this challenge imposed 'la démocratisation de l'enseignement [...] tout entier, de la maternelle à l'Université' as a principal objective, an objective that would address the curricula and methods of teaching and assessment that currently served to advantage those from more privileged backgrounds as well as seeking to promote a more inclusive and autonomous governance of the classroom and the school (in Heurdier and Prost 2014: 232-233, 238-239).[118] Faure therefore demonstrated a commitment to following the spirit of the Amiens colloquium and realising its goals, with, as Robert (2015: 83) notes, a certain reformist effervescence taking hold of Faure's ministry. These principles of a "real" democratisation that would be achieved through reformed curriculum, pedagogy and governance were evident in the measures taken by Faure in relation to higher education (*loi Faure* of 12 November 1968) and primary education (the introduction of *le tiers-temps pédagogique*, where the daily timetable was split three ways between core disciplines, *disciplines d'éveil* and physical education, for example, that was completed by *Arrêté* of 7 August 1969 under Faure's successor, Olivier Guichard, after his departure) (Robert

[118] Faure would restate the centrality of this objective in an article written for the 27 February 1969 issue of *L'Éducation nationale*, arguing that 'une véritable démocratisation doit faire œuvre révolutionnaire en s'attaquant directement aux privilèges socio-économiques et aux prédestinations que ces privilèges entraînent' (in Chapoulie 2010: 457).

2015: 84, 87-89), but we will focus on those actions relevant to the *premier cycle* of secondary education, which would later be subsumed by the *collège*.

Faure's first achievement as minister was to remove the curricular barriers between the *filières* of the *premier cycle du second degré* for the classes of *sixième* and *cinquième*, thereby reducing the barriers to *réorientation* that contributed to the determinant nature of the initial *orientation* of pupils at the *sixième* and, through the perpetuation of the weight of a pupil's cultural and socio-economic background, constituted an obstacle to the more intensive actualisation of both the individual- and community-centred logics of education, as well as the economy-centred logic of education that demanded the optimal investment of human capital by, for example, preventing a pupil from training to become an engineer. In the aforementioned speech to *l'Assemblée nationale*, Faure (in Heurdier and Prost 2014: 236) asserted that '[l]e premier cycle, dans ses deux premières années [...] devrait comporter un enseignement totalement unifié', arguing that '[c]e sont des années d'orientation et d'observation, et il n'est pas possible […] de marquer dès le début une démarcation.' In order to achieve this unified *tronc commun*, Faure first recognised the necessity of addressing the teaching of Latin that began in the *sixième* for pupils of the classic section of *voie* I, which distinguished this course from both the modern section of this long general education and the short general education of *voie* II and created a barrier to *réorientation* to this classical *filière*. Faure announced the decision to defer the teaching of Latin to the beginning of *quatrième* in the above speech to *l'Assemblée nationale* and put this decision into effect for the *sixième* with the *arrêté* of 9 October 1968 and for the *cinquième* with the *arrêté* of 3 July 1969, which had been prepared

before his departure from the ministry on 22 June 1969. This measure that, according to Prost (1997: 164), would previously have been considered sacrilege to the traditional *culture scolaire* was approved by the main teachers' unions and all three main parents' associations of the public education system[119] and only faced opposition from staunch defenders of classical humanities, such as the *Société des professeurs de français et de langues anciennes* (known as *la Franco-ancienne*), teachers of Latin and Greek and the more conservative *Syndicat national des lycées et collèges* (SNALC), indicating both the mood in favour of egalitarian change that followed the events of May 1968 and the extent to which mathematics, taught to all pupils, was now the key, prestige subject rather than Latin (Lelièvre 1990: 187; 2008: 125). With this measure having removed any difference between the programmes of study of *voies* I and II, the gap between the curriculum of the *classes de transition* of *voie* III and these other *filières* was reduced by the, initially experimental, introduction of a modern language into these classes where possible (*Arrêté* of 3 July 1969; Prost 2004: 357; Lelièvre 1990: 187).

This movement towards curricular unification of the first years of the *premier cycle* was taken further in the *collèges expérimentaux* under the authority of Louis Legrand and the IPN where, following the events of May, the teachers in some of these schools sought to go beyond the scope of the initial study, intended to trial a more active *pédagogie de soutien* for the short general education of *filière* II, and develop an alternative to the organisation of the *premier cycle* by separate *filières* (Legrand 1998: 42). As Legrand (1983: 284-285; 1998: 42) explains, this plan for a new organisation of the *premier*

[119] See Kerrero (2013: 137-138) for more on parents' associations.

cycle emerged spontaneously from a realisation by the teachers of these schools, whose unions, notably the SNI, SNES and SGEN (Dorison and Kahn 2016: 126; Robert 2015: 86-87), supported the creation of a *tronc commun* and the abolition of the separate *filières*, that the placement of pupils in these *filières* was both socially segregative and somewhat haphazard and resulted in '[l]'impossibilité de constituer rationnellement des sections de force décroissante' (1983: 284). Eventually an alternative organisation, inspired by the example of British, German and Quebecois comprehensive schools, was codified in April 1970 in Saint-Quentin and split the timetable between the core subjects (Mathematics, French and a modern language), which would be taught in groups of similar levels of ability with the least advanced groups receiving extra support sessions and more advanced material being taught to groups of the best pupils, and mixed-ability, heterogeneous groups for all other subjects (Legrand 1983: 284-286; 1998: 42-43). The fruit of experimentation and debates within the relevant CES since the launch of the IPN's study in 1967, this *protocole de Saint-Quentin* was tested by seventeen *collèges* up to the *rentrée* of 1975 and was found to reduce the inequalities of achievement and selection found within the ordinary *premier cycle*, but a number of the implicated *professeurs* pushed for a greater unification of classes, considering the groups established according to pupils' abilities to also be too rigid to respond to the differing needs of pupils (Legrand 1983: 291-293; 1998: 43-44).

A similar organisation of the *premier cycle*, in which the separate *filières* of the CES would be eliminated, also formed part of the proposals of the *commission de rénovation pédagogique*, which had been put in place by Peyrefitte before the disturbance of the events of May, but was re-established

by Faure in September 1968 and submitted its reports in spring 1969 (Dorison and Kahn 2016: 124-128). The separate *filières* were described as 'tunnels parallèles' during the deliberations of this commission's subcommittee on the *premier cycle*, with the third *filière* of *classes de transition* and *classes pratiques* critiqued in particular as leading to 'impasses sans rattrapage', and so, despite opposition from a minority within the subcommittee more attached to the status quo who still favoured the introduction of separate sections from the *cinquième*, the institution of a *tronc commun* with a differentiation by options from the *quatrième* was proposed as a democratising solution, in which pupils would be grouped by ability for the core subjects, as in the IPN's *protocole de Saint-Quentin*, and extra hours of support would be offered to those having difficulties with these key disciplines (Ibid. 125-126). As Dorison and Kahn (2016: 126-129) note, however, this growing consensus for the abolition of *filières* as obstacles to equal opportunity and individual development was still somewhat equivocal at this time and while some on the subcommittee, in particular the representatives of the SNES and the SNI, defended a complete *tronc commun* and warned that any other divisions between pupils, even if justified on a psychological basis, would potentially camouflage and perpetuate social segregation, the final recommendations of this commission prescribed classes of *pédagogie adaptée* akin to those of the existing *voie* III for pupils considered especially unready for the more abstract thought demanded by secondary education, effectively maintaining a separate *filière* that fulfilled the same function as the *classes de transition* and *classes pratiques* that was justified by René Haby, Jean Capelle's deputy as DGOPS and future *ministre de l'Éducation* under Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, as a

pedagogical necessity despite the damaging sociological implications of such distinctions.

In addition to minimising the curricular differences between the different *filières* of the *premier cycle* in the context of increasing support for their elimination, Faure introduced changes to the administration of the institutions of the *second degré* that responded to '[l]a revendication de la cogestion' he identified in his speech of 24 July 1968 as a reaction to inefficient pedagogical practices that fail to take into account the needs of those being taught (in Heurdier and Prost 2014: 238). We can see this reorganisation therefore as an initial attempt to realise the modulation of the institution's operation in order to achieve greater efficiency in the achievement of its educational objectives that was indicated by the idea of opening up the school to its environment discussed at the Amiens colloquium. This can be considered the first indicator of a movement towards a localised modulation of the school that disrupts the hierarchical administration of this disciplinary *dispositif* which would be more fully realised with following the decentralising acts of the 1980s.

Décret 68-968 issued on 8 November 1968 established a single *conseil d'administration* in each of the institutions of the *second degré* of the public education system and granted parents, and, in the *second cycle*, pupils, significant representation on these management boards as well as on the *conseils de classe* and *conseils de discipline* in each institution. This single *conseil d'administration* replaced the separate *conseil d'administration*, which had governed the financial affairs of the institution, and *conseil d'intérieur*, which had included teachers' representatives and managed the internal

organisation of the school, with a single *conseil d'administration* in each of the relevant institutions (Prost 2004: 358) that, according to article 6 of this *décret*, managed 'tous les domaines qui intéressent la vie pédagogique, morale, financière et matérielle de l'établissement ainsi que son rayonnement', including the recruitment policy of the school, within the boundaries set by the provisions of the *carte scolaire*, the school rules (*règlement intérieur de l'établissement*) and school budget, under the authority of the relevant delegate of the central administration, *recteur* for *lycées* and *inspecteur d'académie* for CES and remaining CEG. Article 5 of this *décret* established that one sixth of this *conseil d'administration* would be made up by representatives of the school's administration; two sixths by elected representatives of the school's personnel, of which two thirds were to be representatives of teaching personnel; one sixth by elected representatives of parents of pupils; one sixth by elected representatives of pupils, except in institutions of just the *premier cycle*, such as CES, where they would be replaced by additional representatives elected among their parents, but a single pupil in the class of *troisième* could attend as a non-voting, consultative member (Art. 9); and one sixth by 'les personnalités intéressées aux activités de l'établissement', which could include a representative of the school's locality and other stakeholders, such as representatives of related educational institutions or potential local employers, for example. This *décret* also stipulated the presence of parent representatives on each institution's *conseil de discipline*, alongside two representatives from the class of the pupil who was subject of the *conseil*'s deliberations (Art. 16, 20), and on the *conseils de classe* of each institution that agreed the marks of

pupils in each class at the end of each term and decided upon their progression and *orientation* at the end of each year (Art. 25).

Although decried by teachers who opposed this organisational reform, and especially the presence of parents on the *conseils de classe*, as an attack on their authority within the education system (Prost 1997: 165; Robert 2015: 85-86), this *décret* did not in practice constitute a radical transformation of the administration of the school, but it did mark a significant symbolic shift towards a greater autonomy for institutions of secondary education and the participation of stakeholders from outside the hierarchical organisation of *l'Éducation nationale* in this process. The limitations of this seemingly dramatic reorganisation of the institutions of the *second degré*, emphasised by Forestier (2010: 188-189) and Prost (2004: 358-359), can be seen in the provisions of the *décret*, which stipulated that the *conseils de classe* would examine the case of each individual pupil and determine the relevant action to take without the presence of the parents' representatives (Art. 25) and did not provide any means for this expanded *conseil d'administration* to impose its will against that of the school's superior administrative authority, which nominated the *chef d'établissement* and could both reject or modify decisions of the *conseil* it did not agree with (Art. 6) and remove members from the *conseil* for behaviour it considered incompatible with its operation (Art. 15). It remains the case, however, that this administrative reform marked an unprecedented involvement of parents, who had previously been considered an influence to be kept outside the enclosed public space of the republican school (Kerrero 2013: 133-134), and pupils in the governance of the institutions of the *second degré*, and this participation was further promoted by *circulaires* issued

in December 1968 that encouraged the development of parents' associations for each of these schools and set out the operation of the *foyers socio-éducatif* that had been launched under Peyrefitte in January 1968 to enable teachers and pupils to jointly organise extracurricular clubs and activities (Robert 2015: 86).

The impetus for reform given by the events of May 1968 enabled further measures to be taken under Faure in pursuit of the pedagogical renovation of the school prefigured in preceding debates. Robert (2015: 86) considers the *circulaire* of 6 January 1969, for example, to be a highly significant indicator of this pedagogical shift. As Prost (2004: 357-358) shows, this text, which prescribed the replacement of the termly essay with more frequent assessment exercises in class to better represent a pupil's work over the semester and the substitution of a more formative grading system of A to E in place of the highly variable, traditional scale of 0 to 20 and subsequent public ranking of pupils that served to humiliate the worst pupils and flatter the best pupils, indicated the shift away from traditional practices that had been exposed as pedagogically inefficient or damagingly arbitrary in light of the debates that came to the fore in the education system during the events of May.

Further examples of the continued attempts to achieve this renewal of the school can be seen in curricular reforms that demonstrated the pursuit of ideas that had been developed in preceding debates and commissions. Taking advantage of the favourable conditions, Lichnerowicz obtained, for example, from Faure the progressive implementation of the new mathematics programmes of the *sixième* and *cinquième* and the *second cycle* from the *rentrée* of 1969 both before the trial of these programmes, initiated at the *rentrée* of 1968, had been completed and assessed and despite the disapproval

of *l'inspection générale* (Prost 2013: 155; Forestier 2010: 192). Furthermore, the programmes for the classes of *sixième* and *cinquième* set by the *arrêté* of 3 July 1969 were subdivided according to the three categories of *le tiers-temps pédagogique* that had been devised as part of the more active pedagogical approaches piloted in the primary school and experimented as part of the IPN's trials of a new pedagogy in 28 CES launched in 1967. These three categories of the *tiers-temps pédagogique* consisted here of the *disciplines fondamentales* (French, mathematics and a modern language), physical education, and the remaining *disciplines d'éveil*, which were to be taught through active pedagogical methods that appealed to the interests of pupils and, as Robert (2015: 88) observes in relation to their institution as part of this initiative in the primary school, constituted an important realisation of themes developed from *l'Éducation nouvelle* that were expressed at the Amiens colloquium of 1968.

In light of this attempt at a pedagogical renewal of the school, the creation of the new body of *professeurs d'enseignement général de collège* (PEGC) intended to teach in both CES and the remaining CEG by *décret* 69-493 of 30 May 1969, described by Prost (2007: 148) as a 'tentative pour constituer un corps enseignant propre aux collèges à partir du premier degré[, ...] intermédiaire entre la non-spécialisation des instituteurs et la spécialisation des professeurs de lycée', can be seen as an attempt to secure this renovation of pedagogical practices in the *premier cycle*. This distinct body of teachers, trained to teach two or three subjects, that was established by this *décret* remained closely associated to the teachers and pedagogical approach of the *premier degré*. Indeed, as Bret (2015: 156-157) underlines, PEGC were required, like *instituteurs*, to teach a greater number of hours per week than the

certifiés and *agrégés* of the traditional long secondary education, were subject to the same inspectorate as *instituteurs*, the IDEN, and tended to be members of the SNI. Indeed, as Bret (Ibid. 166-167) explains, the PEGC were also linked to the *premier degré* by

> leur origine (intégration des maîtres de CEG, ex-instituteurs, instituteurs des classes de transition et classes pratiques), les modalités de leur recrutement (instituteurs par la voie interne et la liste d'aptitude, majoritairement instituteurs ou élèves-maitres [des écoles normales] par la voie externe) ainsi que les lieux de leur formation annexés aux écoles normales primaires.

From these institutions, the PEGC received an initial training that largely adhered to the pedagogical norms of a primary education that had already developed to emulate many of the active pedagogical approaches proposed at the Amiens colloquium, for example (Ibid. 167).[120] With this more active pedagogical approach incorporated into the experimental pedagogy for the *premier cycle* that had been on trial in the IPN's network of CES from the *rentrée* of 1967, the institution of this new body of PEGC can be seen as an attempt to consolidate, at this level, a renewed, more democratic, pedagogy that would effectively address pupils of varying abilities in face of the 'secondarisation pédagogique rampante' (Legrand 1998: 39) following the Fouchet-Capelle reform of 1963 that saw teachers of the second *filière* begin to emulate the specialisation and traditional pedagogical models of the

[120] See Prost (2013: 130-138) for a discussion of this development in primary education.

professeurs certifiés or *agrégés*, with whom they shared the polyvalent institution of the CES and who benefitted from greater social and professional prestige and better pay and working conditions (Prost 1997: 102-103; 2004: 335), which Legrand had identified in 1967 as a potential threat to the continuation of the democratising successes of the short general education provided in the CEG and CES (Chapoulie 2010: 497-498).

In this brief period marked by the impetus for reform that immediately followed the disruption of May 1968, we see therefore the pursuit of a number of curricular, pedagogical and organisational measures, inspired by preceding debates, and further debate and experimentation of new ideas that intended to address the shortcomings of the French school particularly highlighted by the works of the INED and Bourdieu and Passeron. These measures can be thought of as efforts towards the intensification of the community-centred logic of education through the development of a common education for all at the level of the *premier cycle* of secondary education that also intended to contribute, alongside the administrative, curricular and pedagogical measures detailed above, to a democratisation of education resulting in a greater equality of opportunity, which would, by potentially broadening access to longer courses of study and enabling pupils to pursue the full realisation of their individual potential beyond the arbitrary limitations of their social origins, also serve to intensify the operation of the school in service of the order-word of the individual.

These actions expressed an intensification of the strategies of discipline but, at the same time, constituted a challenge to the disciplinary operation of the *dispositif* of the school as it had been established under the Third Republic

and maintained through the Berthoin and Fouchet-Capelle reforms and associated administrative reorganisations of the 1960s, prefiguring the *dispositif* of control that would emerge with the *collège*. The institution of new active pedagogical practices and the attempt to involve parents and pupils in the operation of secondary schools, for example, can both be considered as an intensification of the modulatory principle of discipline, discussed earlier, where the disciplinary exercise or sanction is adapted to the individual in question to achieve a greater outcome, but, by involving the pupils and parents as passive or active inputs to the operation of the disciplinary *dispositif* also begins to undermine the hierarchical authority that functions through the imposition and normalising examination of disciplinary exercise. Similarly, the modification of the curriculum to introduce *les mathématiques modernes,* defer the teaching of Latin and institute a *tronc commun* for all pupils extended the operation of the disciplinary logics to encompass all pupils in the public school and conduct a more thorough examination and subsequent distribution of these pupils that would be less prejudiced towards pupils by the advantages or disadvantages of their background, but at the same time, by bringing different educational logics to bear within the same space, threatened the enclosure and codification of classes primarily in relation to a single given *mot d'ordre* that existed with the separation of orders under the Third Republic and of *filières* in the CES.

E - Post-1968 conservative reaction

These movements towards more radical reform of the school that followed the events of May 1968, also provoked opposition from those who

sought to maintain the traditional practices, hierarchical authority and distinct enclosures of the existing disciplinary school *dispositif* and led to what Deleuze would refer to as 'combats d'arrière-garde' that marked the crisis of discipline and the emergence of a new control society (PP: 236). Indeed, as Prost (1997: 166-167) and Michel (2008: 21) stress, after the immediate effect of endorsing and facilitating reform, the events of May 1968, having given a subversive and politicised connotation to pedagogical debates that had previously appeared to be increasingly supported by a broad consensus amongst educators and relevant stakeholders, revealed increasingly aggressive divisions between traditionalists and those seeking reform, leading to what Robert (2015: 89) describes as a 'choc en retour' following the election of Pompidou, a *normalien, agrégé de lettres classiques* and staunch advocate and defender of traditional secondary education and the classical humanities (Prost 2013: 90-93), as president on the 15 June 1969, first under Olivier Guichard, who was named *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* on 22 June 1969 and then under his replacement Joseph Fontanet, who was appointed on 6 July 1972.

We can see in these conservative measures an effort to reassert the distinct enclosures of the disciplinary *dispositif* of the school and the hierarchical and centralised authority that operated them in face of the weakening of these enclosures and this authority by the actions undertaken by Faure. The *circulaires* 69-370 of 1 September 1969 and 71-228 of 9 July 1971 and *décret* 69-845 of 16 July 1969 partially reversed some of these actions by, respectively, restoring Latin to the programmes of the *cinquième*, reintroducing the 0 to 20 marking scale and, in response to the vigorous opposition to this measure, ending the obligation to include parents and pupils in the workings of

the *conseils de classe* (Robert 2015: 90). This reassertion of the disciplinary enclosures and hierarchies can also be seen in the measures taken by Guichard that completed the centralised *dispositif* of *orientation* and inspection, considered earlier, by establishing the ONISEP (*Décrets* 70-238 and 70-239 of 19 March 1970) and *centres d'information et d'orientation* (*Décret* 71-541 of 7 July 1971), creating the IDEN (*Décret* 69-1016 of 13 November 1969) and codifying and revising the organisation and function of the *inspecteurs de l'enseignement technique* and IDEN (*Décrets* 72-585 and 72-587 of 4 July 1972). The new processes of *orientation* introduced by *décret* 73-129 and its accompanying *arrêté* that were signed by Fontanet on 12 February 1973, and which were discussed earlier as a completion of the centralised *dispositif* of *orientation* that had been envisaged in 1966, further demonstrated this trend. While these 1973 texts introduced practices to ensure a greater dialogue with parents regarding the *orientation* of their children that reflected the opening up of the school that had been promoted at the 1968 Amiens colloquium and appeared more urgent following the events of May that year, the *orientation* procedures that they codified underlined the definitive authority of the *dispositif* of *l'Éducation nationale* to determine each pupil's future schooling within the limits of the provision of its *carte scolaire*, with the initial recommendations made by teachers on the *conseils de classe* and any subsequent appeals against these proposals from parents decided either by a local *commission d'appel*, made up of only three representatives of parents alongside thirteen various representatives of the school system, or by the child's performance in an exam organised by the *inspecteur d'académie* (Art.

1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 of *décret* 73-129, and Art.1, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 of the *arrêté* of 12 February 1973).

The restorative intention suggested by these measures was most evident, however, in efforts to insist upon the distinction between the long and short courses of general education of *voies* I and II and to emphasise the different, vocational orientation of the third *voie* of the *premier cycle*. The reassertion of the distinction between the first and second *filières* of this level of study was expressed most clearly in the *circulaire* of 11 October 1971 cited by Robert (2015: 90) while the differentiation of the third *filière* was achieved by a series of measures taken under Guichard that demonstrated efforts to intensify the exercise of power in service of the order-word of the economy.

As the Fouchet-Capelle reform stated when establishing the CES, the *filières* of the *premier cycle* were to be 'caractérisés par leur pédagogie propre' (*Décret* 63-794, Art. 1), but the curricular development of a *tronc commun* between the first and second sections in these polyvalent institutions after the events of May 1968 and the continuing tendency for teachers of *voie* II to emulate the practices of their colleagues that held the CAPES, as we briefly noted when discussing the creation of the PEGC above, contributed to a decline of the pedagogical distinction that separated these enclosures. Bret (2015: 168) highlights the distinction between the pedagogy of the PEGC, which had developed from the concerns and more adaptive and active practices of the primary school in which this body of teachers originated, and the secondary pedagogy of the *certifiés* and *agrégés*, of whom, as Prost (2004: 334-335, 378-384) notes, the majority continued to defer to the traditional models of teaching of the *lycée* even after the disruption of 1968 highlighted

the shortcomings of such an approach, by referring to the case of French, where 'la centration sur l'enseignement "mécanique" de la langue (grammaire, vocabulaire, orthographe) pour les professeurs de CEG s'oppose à la centration sur la langue comme objet pour les certifiés et les agrégés.' This example indicates the common and practical minimum culture that traditionally formed the primary objective of the community-centred logic of education that had been associated with *l'enseignement primaire* and the abstract, extensive and disinterested individual culture that formed the traditional principal objective of the individual-centred logic of education that had been actualised in *l'enseignement secondaire* respectively, through the differing emphases on a practical proficiency and an abstract mastery. As Prost (1997: 102-103) and Bret (2015: 167-172) note, however, the cohabitation of the polyvalent CES, and to a lesser extent CEG, by teachers of varying status and the curricular similarities that had been created between the first and second *filières* of the *premier cycle* following the events of May 1968 encouraged the mixing of PEGC, who were expected to teach the classes of the short general education of *voie* II, and *professeurs certifiés* or *agrégés*, who traditionally taught the classes of long general education offered in *voie* I, in the classes of the first and second *filières*, with PEGC teaching classes of *voie* I when the relevantly trained *professeur certifié* or *agrégé* was not available and vice versa with the classes of *voie* II,[121] while, as noted above in relation to the consolidation of this body of teachers, the PEGC tended to gradually abandon their distinctive pedagogical training to specialise in one subject and imitate the traditional

[121] Bret (2015: 169-172) details the variations in the division of labour between PEGC and *professeurs certifiés* or *agrégés* and the degree to which it was upheld in different contexts, with, for example, greater mixing of personnel in rural areas and a stricter division in former *lycées*.

pedagogy of their CAPES-holding colleagues who benefitted from greater prestige and higher pay for fewer required teaching hours.

In the face of this blurring of boundaries within the polyvalent CES between the curricula and teaching personnel of *voies* I and II of the *premier cycle*, the *circulaire* issued by Guichard on 11 October 1971, described by Robert (2015: 90) as 'un rappel à l'ordre' to respect the distinctions between the *filières* of the *premier cycle*, stressed the distinctions between these enclosures on the basis of their objectives and the different pedagogies considered appropriate for these ends, stating that '[l]a distinction entre les types d'enseignement I et II semble avoir été perdue de vue dans certains CES. Bien qu'ayant désormais des programmes identiques, les sections I et II demeurent pédagogiquement différenciées en fonction des aptitudes scolaires des élèves' (in Robert 2015: 90). Referring back to the fact that the three *filières* established by the Fouchet-Capelle reform were to be 'caractérisés par leur pédagogie propre' (*Décret* 63-794, Art. 1), this *circulaire* insisted upon the separation of these enclosures of *voies* I and II that were each intended to primarily actualise divergent logics of individual-centred and community-centred education, respectively, through the affirmation of these distinct pedagogies that were oriented towards the realisation of the different goals posited in these logics, and so also the separation of the bodies of teachers that exercised them in the relevant *filières*.

As indicated above, the economy-oriented studies of the third *filière* were further distinguished from the other sections of the *premier cycle* under Guichard through a more explicit focus on directly vocational education that was expressed in a redefinition of the classes of *quatrième* and *troisième* of

this *filière* and a revision of *orientation* practices for this type of study. This assertion of the specificity of this economy-centred education and its enclosure against the competing imperatives of other order-words followed the failure to meet the quantitative target of pupils completing a short course of technical education, leading to a CAP or BEP that had been set by the fifth Plan for 1966-1970;[122] the apparent dysfunction of the increasingly crowded classes of the third *filière*, which, accommodating 'ceux que l'école refuse, et ceux qui la refusent' (Prost 2004: 653), struggled both to prepare pupils for the obligations of the workplace and to help them successfully complete the *premier cycle*; and the proposals of the sixth Plan for 1971-1975, informed by these shortcomings, which underlined the need for further development of professional training beyond the structures of the school through a new emphasis on apprenticeships and vocational lifelong learning, and future economic demands that, due to the imagined consequences of greater automation, were considered to call for fewer moderately qualified workers and a greater number of lower qualified and highly qualified workers able to adapt to new technologies and the changes they may impose upon the tasks to be completed at work (Prost 2004: 650- 656; Chapoulie 2010: 478-480). Three laws passed on the 16 July 1971, the day after the sixth Plan was approved, sought to provide a comprehensive response to these failures of vocational education and new demands of the Plan by establishing a new framework for *la formation professionnelle permanente* (*Loi* 71-575), reconfiguring the organisation of apprenticeships through the establishment of *centres de formation d'apprentis* (CFA) (*loi* 71-576), and reorganising the vocational

[122] Although similarly unsuccessful in meeting the quantitative target set by the fifth Plan, the long courses of technical education, leading to *baccalauréats de technicien* and above, were considered more successful (Prost 2004: 643-650).

courses of study within the school under the new appellation of *l'enseignement technologique* (*loi* 71-577) (Chapoulie 2010: 476-478; Figeat and Lebeaume 2015: 29-30).

The last of these three laws seeking a *revalorisation* of these courses of study mainly defined the relationships between these three branches of vocational training, establishing the possibility of pursuing the same vocational qualifications in each of these branches and the legal equivalence of these qualifications with those awarded in the courses of general education, but also reintroduced the possibility of the *orientation* of pupils to a CET to study for a CAP over three years at the end of the *quatrième* (Art. 6). Such an early *orientation* had been rejected in principle by *décret* 63-793 of the Fouchet-Capelle reform's deferral of *orientation* to the end of the *premier cycle* (Art. 2) and stipulation that the CAP was to be completed in two years following the completion of the *premier cycle* rather than three years (Art. 4), but, as Lelièvre (1990: 192) notes, the three-year CAP had been maintained on a provisional basis alongside the two year course of study, which was considered by teachers to be too short for the completion of this qualification that was appreciated by employers (Prost 2004: 650-653).[123] Although the two-year CAP was maintained alongside the two-year BEP after *loi* 71-577 was passed, the possibility of leaving the *premier cycle* a year early to commence studies for a CAP in a CET indicated both a measure to achieve a more thorough actualisation of the economy-centred logic of this course of education and a more distinct separation of vocational education from the *premier cycle*'s *filières* of general education.

[123] For figures outlining the number of pupils studying for a BEP, a two-year CAP or a three-year CAP in the first twenty years of the Fifth Republic, see Prost (2004: 651).

This separation of vocational schooling from the other *filières* of the *premier cycle* and reassertion of the economy-centred educational logic that operated in this distinct series of disciplinary enclosures was further underlined by the reform of the *classes pratiques* making up the *quatrième* and *troisième* of *voie* III that followed these laws of 16 July 1971, creating *classes préprofessionnelles de niveau* (CPPN) and *classes préparatoires à l'apprentissage* (CPA) in their place that more explicitly linked this *filière* to preparation for employment. As *rapporteur* for *loi* 71-577 in the National Assembly, Capelle, a *député* since 30 June 1968, highlighted the apparent failure of the third *filière* of the *premier cycle*, presenting the difficulties of accommodating the pupils of these classes, who often resented, rejected or questioned the value of their continued schooling, and of implementing the innovative active pedagogy, set out for these classes in the *circulaires* and *instructions* of 15 July 1963, 10 September 1963, 18 September 1964 and 5 April 1966, that was intended to contribute to such an accommodation due to the insufficient training of many of the, often novice, teachers of this section and the increasing number of pupils in these classes (Chapoulie 2010: 500-501; Prost 2004: 654-655). Stressing the reputation of this *filière* as one of relegation, Capelle noted in his report that these classes had become 'un lieu d'humiliation permanente' for pupils and 'le rebut des postes déshérités' to teachers (in Chapoulie 2010: 500). The reform of the final two years of this *filière* was intended to address these shortcomings, to work more efficiently and produce better outcomes for the economy, and so can be seen as an effort to intensify the exercise of power in service of the economy-centred logic of education.

Indeed, according to *circulaire* 72-109 of 10 March 1972 that introduced the CPPN and CPA in response to this situation, this reform of the *classes pratiques* of this *filière* constituted 'la suite logique des lois du 16 juillet 1971' and, through these new appellations, served to confirm 'la finalité de chacunes des sections', emphasising their vocational objectives. Firstly, further codified by *circulaires* 72-228 of 13 June and 72-350 of 27 September 1972, the CPA, which were to be taught in CES, CEG, CET or CFA, were intended to prepare pupils aged 15 years old or over to undertake an apprenticeship the following year through a course taught *en alternance* and would therefore integrate a part-time work placement. Secondly, later adjusted by *circulaire* 72-270 of 5 July 1972, the CPPN, which were taught in CEG, CES or CET, were intended to accommodate those pupils considered incapable of following the classes of *quatrième* and *troisième* of either *voie* I or II and introduce them to the practices and careers of a broad range of economic sectors over one or two years, seeking to prepare these pupils for an *orientation* towards either study for a CAP in a CET, passage into a CPA ahead of an apprenticeship in a CFA, or entry into the workforce. In both CPPN and CPA, as *circulaire* 72-109 stipulated, '[t]out ce qui donnerait à ce[s] classe[s] un caractère trop scolaire et qui rappellerait l'enfance d[eva]it […] être rejeté' and instead classroom activities were to place pupils in conditions that were as close as possible to those of professional life (Lelièvre 1990: 190-191). The insistence on the vocational outcomes of study in this third *filière* and the possible exit of its pupils from the shared institutions of the CES and remaining CEG to be taught in CET or CFA accentuates the separation of this economy-centred education from the general education emphasised in *voies* I

and II and indicates, as Chapoulie (2010: 500-501) notes, the abandonment of the ambition of these classes to enable the *réorientation* and reintegration of the pupils of these classes into the "normal" course of general study that had been present in the 1963 Fouchet-Capelle reform, a shift made explicit by the insistence in *circulaire* 72-109 that those pupils of the third *filière* considered to have the potential to achieve such a reintegration would be accommodated in *classes aménagées* explicitly attached to the second *filière* from the end of the *cinquième* rather than the third *filière*. The *loi Royer* (*loi* 73-1193) of 27 December 1973 only served to further underline the clearer orientation towards economic goals and separation of these vocational course from the other general *filières* by introducing the possibility of a technical education *en alternance* from the age of 14 years old in the form of 'stages d'information et de formation pratique au cours des deux dernières années de [la] scolarité obligatoire' (Art. 57).

F - A continuation of reforms

However, this apparent 'reflux' (Prost 1997: 167), marked by the ministry's emphasis on the separation of the distinct courses of the *premier cycle* and a reassertion of the enclosure and centralised, hierarchical organisation of the disciplinary *dispositif* of education, belies the fact that there was, as Robert (2015: 91-92) acknowledges, 'une certaine continuité réformatrice' under Pompidou's presidency, despite the increased hostility of conservatives to educational reforms, seen increasingly in the wake of May 1968 as indicative of a radical and subversive Leftist politics. Although occasionally stymied somewhat by those who objected to such reforms (Prost

2004: 384-395), we can see this reformist continuity through the limited nature of the reversals mentioned above and the further exploration in the early 1970s of the curricular and pedagogical reforms mapped out in the preceding decade, notably a pursuit of the reform of French and mathematics and extension of the discipline of *technologie* and continued pedagogical reform and changes in practices that prolonged tendencies initially nurtured by the creation of the polyvalent CES, that demonstrated ongoing efforts to intensify the operation of the school in sevice of the order-words of community, the individual and the economy that undermined the distinction between and separation of the *filières* of the *premier cycle du second degré* as they extended the logics responding to these *mots d'ordre* beyond the boundaries of these enclosures that actualised them.

Indeed, although, as the *arrêté* of 19 March 1970 shows, the third *filière* continued without Latin, *circulaire* 69-370 of September 1969's reintroduction of Latin did not reimpose the distinction between the classical sections of *voie* I and the modern general sections of *voies* I and II, but rather instituted an introduction to Latin as part of the French programme of the *cinquième* in all of these classes. Furthermore, *circulaire* 71-228 of 9 July 1971 only stipulated a return to the 0 to 20 marking scale 'pour les classes d'examen', i.e. the classes of *troisième, prémière* and *terminale*, 'sans exclure nécessairement d'autres éléments d'appréciation' and the *décret* 69-845 of 16 July 1969 that ended the obligation to involve parent and pupil representatives in the operation of the *conseils de classe* did not require that they do not participate in these meetings, stating only that:

> Le conseil d'administration décide des modalités de la participation des représentants des parents et des délégués des élèves au conseil de classe, et notamment de l'opportunité de la présence de ces représentants et délégués lors de l'examen des cas individuels. (Art. 2)

As Robert (2015: 90) notes, this last measure can even be considered an early example of decentralisation, which we might understand as a modulation of the institution through local feedback.

The aforementioned insistence on the separation and enclosure of the different *filières* of the *premier cycle* of secondary education, which was expressed in the *circulaire* of 11 October and in the development of *l'enseignement technologique* that distanced *voie* III from the general education of the other two courses of study, can also be seen as a vain attempt to reassert these enclosures, which had developed from the distinct orders of the school of the Third Republic and separated the exercise of power oriented towards the order-words of community, the individual and the economy, as the intensification of the exercise of power in service of the community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education leads to the extension of these logics beyond these limits and the decline of these enclosures as they overlap in an increasingly shared pedagogical space. This process can be seen in the further development and generalisation of the subject of *technologie*, the broadening role of PEGC and the converging practices of PEGC and *professeurs certifiés* and *agrégés*.

The same concern that the French school respond more effectively to the order-word of the economy that prompted the laws of 16 July 1971 and the clearer vocational orientation of the classes of the third *filière* also led to the further expansion of the economy-centred disciplinary logic, which had already extended between the enclosures of *l'Éducation nationale* with the development of organised *orientation* procedures in which the model of human capital investment was implicit, through the establishment of the subject of *technologie* in the classes of *quatrième* and *troisième* of all the sections of general education (*Arrêté* of 19 March 1970). The extension of this subject that aimed to introduce pupils to technical knowledge and skills to the classical sections of *voie* I, in addition to those of *voie* II and the modern sections of *voie* I where, although scarcely implemented, it had been established from 1962, indicated an expansion of the economy-centred logic of education into all the enclosures of general education and, most significantly, into all classes of the first *filière*, which had developed as a continuation of the Third Republic's *enseignement secondaire* that had been dedicated to the full, disinterested development of individual potentials. New programmes for this discipline that mixed 'des contenus de l'initiation technique et de ceux de sciences physiques' (Lebeaume 2008: 113) were published in 1970 and outlined a discipline that privileged 'l'étude expérimentale de quelques objets matérialisant les mouvements de translation ou de rotation et leur composition, la représentation graphique associant dessin industriel et tracés des forces, les activités de mesurage et les premières notions de chimie' (Figeat and Lebeaume 2015: 28), while the *instructions* for these classes, issued on 27 August 1970, stated that this subject was intended as an 'élément important

d'orientation positive des élèves vers des études ultérieures à dominantes technologiques' (in Figeat and Lebeaume 2015: 28). For Figeat and Lebeaume (2015: 29), the 'rôle éminent' played by this discipline in these *filières* was underlined by *loi* 71-577 of 16 July 1971 whose fourth article stipulated that '[l]a formation dispensée à tous les élèves du cycle moyen comprend obligatoirement une initiation économique et sociale et une initiation technologique', and we can see the further extension of this subject as a response to the new ambition that no pupil leave the education system without 'une formation générale suffisante, assortie d'un début de formation professionnelle' and the corresponding main objective of this education system to ensure 'une meilleure préparation à la vie professionnelle'that were both set out in the sixth Plan (1971-1975) (in Chapoulie 2010: 479).

While the intensification of the exercise of power in service of the order-word of economy that saw the more distinctive development of the third *filière* of the *premier cycle* also promoted an extension of *technologie* into the *filières* of general education, the insistence upon the separation between the *filières* of the *premier cycle*, and *voies* I and II in particular, which was expressed in the *circulaire* of 11 October 1971 and the consolidation of the PEGC as a distinct body of teachers in 1969 intended to teach in *voie* II, failed to reinforce the enclosure of these sections. Despite these efforts to prevent these tendencies, the development of a curricular *tronc commun* between the first and second *filières*, which indicated a further effort to intensify the action of the individual- and community-centred logics of education that operated through these enclosures beyond the creation of the polyvalent CES in response to the limitations highlighted in critiques of educational inequalities

addressed above, led increasingly to the overlap of both the teaching personnel intended to teach in each of these sections and their distinct pedagogical approaches in these classes, eroding the distinction between these *filières*.

Such a tendency towards the overlapping of first and second *filières* of the *premier cycle* in light of the creation of the polyvalent CES and the development of a curricular *tronc commun* for these sections can be seen to have developed, contrary to the efforts to reassert their separation, in the division of labour between the PEGC and *professeurs certifiés* or *agrégés*, who were intended to teach the classes of *voie* II and I, respectively. As Bret (2015: 169-170) notes, the IGEN's reports produced at the end of 1974 and beginning of 1975 found that the separation of these *filières* and of their relevant teaching personnel was far from typical, with some institutions mixing these classes and teachers completely, others strictly separating them and others still operating a partial mixture of these classes and teachers. Bret (2015: 170) illustrates these findings through reference to the example of the 25 CES of Toulon, of which only seven maintained a strict separation of these *filières* while just as many had completely mixed the pupils of these *filières* and the PEGC and *professeurs certifiés* or *agrégés* who taught them, and the remaining eleven CES had developed practices somewhere between these two positions that mixed pupils or teaching staff to various degrees. Indeed, from these reports, Bret observes that the division of labour between PEGC and *certifiés* and *agrégés* tended increasingly towards a distribution of these groups of teachers by levels rather than by sections, whereby PEGC took charge of the classes of *sixième* and *cinquième* while *certifiés* and *agrégés* taught the classes of *quatrième* and *troisième*, reflecting both the implicit hierarchy of these

teaching bodies and offering some insulation for the *certifiés* and *agrégés* from the more diverse 'nouveaux publics' that would enter into the *sixième* (Ibid.).

The decline of the enclosure of these *filières* indicated in this mixing of teaching personnel was further demonstrated in the changing practices of these teachers who, in the same institutions and teaching the pupils of each other's classes, adapted aspects of the opposing teaching body's pedagogy that was meant to be 'propre' to each *filière* (*Décret* 63-794, Art. 1), a differentiation stressed by Guichard in his *circulaire* of 11 October 1971 (Robert 2015: 90). This is perhaps clearest in the ongoing gradual secondarisation of practices, the adoption of the traditional practices of teachers of the long course of secondary education, that had been identified amongst those teaching the classes of the short general education given in *voie* II since the establishment of the CES (Legrand 1998: 39). The difference in status that was reflected in the division of labour by levels rather than *filières*, and which was expressed in both the lower esteem the *professeurs certifiés* and *agrégés* had for the PEGC, whom they would readily denounce as 'ignares responsables de la baisse du niveau' (in Bret 2015: 170), and the higher pay and fewer required hours of service enjoyed by the *certifiés* and *agrégés*, continued to serve as a motivating factor in the ongoing tendency of PEGC to emulate the practices of the *professeurs certifiés* and *agrégés*. Other factors in this ongoing tendency can be seen in the necessity of adapting their practices to both the constraints of textbooks and programmes of study that continued to reflect the pedagogical concerns and practices of *certifiés* and *agrégés* rather than those of PEGC and the demands of working alongside less flexible colleagues who specialised in a single

subject.[124] These constraints and motivations would gradually lead PEGC to specialise in one discipline rather than teach across two to three different subjects and to increasingly abandon elements of their pedagogical training for the traditional practices of *professeurs certifiés* and *agrégés*. (Bret 2015: 167-175, 177; Legrand 1998: 39-40)

This mixing of pedagogies that were intended to respond to the different objectives of the separate *filières* can also be seen in the modified practices of those *professeurs certifiés* and *agrégés* who had inherited the traditional pedagogy of *l'enseignement secondaire*. Although, as Prost (2004: 378-384) shows, a signficant plurality of *professeurs certifiés* or *agrégés* rejected the pedagogical renovation carried by the events of May 1968 and fiercely defended the pedagogical tradition of the long course of secondary education against what they saw as its deleterious influence, some of these *professeurs* modified their traditional teaching practices to adapt a number of ideas drawn from this pedagogical movement which had informed the pedagogical training of the PEGC, with a 1972 study finding that 21% had abandoned the traditional *cours magistral* and 34% dedicated more than half their class time to group work, for example (Prost 2004: 375-376). Indeed, of the three quarters of *professeurs certifiés* and *agrégés* who were unionised, almost 80% were members of unions that, after May 1968, supported pedagogical reform under the Pompidou presidency, although the SNES, whose membership included 58.2% of unionised teachers in 1969 and 59.8% of them in 1972, was more cautious towards reform than the more enthusiastic SGEN, whose membership made up 17.6% of these teachers in 1969 and

[124] Bret (2015: 175) stresses the marginal role played by PEGC in the curricular reforms that were ongoing in the early 1970s due to their lower status and lack of involvement in pedagogical research.

19.1% in 1972, and the opinions of the membership of these teaching unions did not always coincide with their positions on reform (Prost 2004: 378-384).

These altered pedagogical practices further suggest an intermingling of the individual- and community-centred logics of education that, given their origins in the separate *dispositifs* of *l'enseignement primaire* and *l'enseignement secondaire*, had provided the first and second *filières* with their different primary normative orientations as those teachers who altered their pedagogy drew upon the pedagogical concerns of the other body of teachers. Bret (2015: 177) indicates that while for some PEGC the adoption of the pedagogical methods of *certifiés* and *agrégés* was principally motivated by a wish to gain equal status to these teachers, for others it was a means of better conducting pupils to complete longer studies at a *lycée* in the *second cycle*, of ensuring the maximum development of their individual capacities, by ensuring they had acquired the knowledge and habits expected in these institutions. Those *certifiés* and *agrégés* who, as Prost (2004: 373-378) notes, adapted their teaching practices following the upheaval of May 1968 to respond to the needs of a broader range of pupils who now entered these classes similarly indicated a concern for the common education of all the pupils in their classes rather than the full individual realisation of those few selected to pursue a long course of study.

This 'continuité réformatrice' (Robert 2015: 91), indicated by the limited nature of the reversal of certain measures taken by Faure and the curricular and pedagogical developments in this period that suggested a weakening of the separation and distinction between the *filières* of the *premier cycle* of secondary education considered in the paragraphs above, can also be

seen in the commissions established by Guichard that further pursued pedagogical, administrative and curricular reform that had been traced in the 1960s. The reform of the curriculum responding to the preceding decade's critiques of the traditional *culture scolaire* and seeking to better realise a greater, more socially just democratisation of the French school in line with the imperatives of community and individual as well as a more effective response to the demands of the economy would be furthered in the early 1970s by the Lichnerowicz commission and the new Emmanuel and Lagarrigue commissions while those critiques that had been directed towards the rigid, hierarchical organisation of the French school and its traditional pedagogical practices were echoed in the findings and proposals of the Joxe commission whose report was published in 1972.

Although Guichard established new commissions for the curricular development of French and the relatively new subject of *technologie*, the ongoing work of the Lichnerowicz commission on mathematics indicates most clearly the continuation of the curricular reforms that had begun in the 1960s with the intention of responding to the critiques of the traditional *culture scolaire* and seeking a greater democratisation of the education system through a renewal of the content of the French and mathematics programmes. Indeed, despite his own misgivings and those of *l'inspection générale* regarding the increased abstraction of these programmes and their articulation with those of the primary school, Guichard oversaw the publication, in an *arrêté* of 22 July 1971, and the implementation, from the *rentrée* of 1971, of the new mathematics programmes for the classes of *quatrième* and *troisième* that had been developed by the Lichnerowicz commission, completing the progressive

introduction of new mathematics programmes inspired by *les mathématiques modernes* in the *premier cycle* of secondary education that had commenced with those for the classes of *sixième* and *cinquième* at the *rentrée* of 1969 (Prost 2013: 155-156).

Responding to the AFPF's specific calls for a commisssion that would pursue a renovation of the subject of French 'de la maternelle à l'université' and the broader impression that, given the subject's significant role in the process of academic selection, a reform of French across the whole education system would be necessary to ensure a successful democratisation of the education system, Guichard also decided, upon his arrival at the ministry in July 1969, to create a commission that would expand upon the work of the Rouchette commission to formulate curricular and pedagogical propositions for a renovation of French in both the *premier dégré* and the *second degré*, officially establishing this commission under the authority of the poet and member of *l'Académie française* Pierre Emmanuel in March 1970 (Alix et al. 2015: 97; Bishop and Cardon-Quint 2015: 124-125; Cardon-Quint et al. 2015: 50). This commission quickly approved the Rouchette commission's plan for French in the primary school that had been written in November 1969 and, after 27 meetings in which, contrary to Guichard's intentions, discussion tended towards more general discussions of principle, objectives and methods rather than concrete programmes and instructions, produced a *Texte d'orientation* for the reform of French that was published in June 1972 and, again, emphasised the communicative function of French, treated literature as just one of a variety of forms of expression, and placed a new emphasis on linguistics (Bishop and Cardon-Quint 2015: 125-128; Alix et al. 2015: 98-99).

This proposed reconfiguration of the discipline of French faced opposition from Pompidou and conservative organisations such as the *Union nationale inter-universitaire*, a union of students, *lycéens* and *professeurs* that had been established after the events of May 1968, which served to hinder the official implementation of these proposals, but gained a broad unofficial diffusion by other means including teaching journals and textbooks, which quickly incorporated these new orientations, as well as what Bishop and Cardon-Quint (2015: 126) refer to as sources having a quasi-official character due to the proximity of their producers to official educational bodies, such as educational television programming for schools, official accounts of trials run by the INRDP, and an article written by an IGEN of *Lettres* (Bishop and Cardon-Quint 2015: 126-127). Indeed, when Guichard turned to the more traditionalist IGEN to write the concrete programmes for French that the Emmanuel commission had failed to produce in a timely fashion, the resulting texts would temper what were considered the more radical aspects of the Emmanuel and Rouchette commissions' proposals, but incorporate many of their key themes, notably a new emphasis on linguistics (Bishop and Cardon-Quint 2015: 127-134).

Curricular reform was also pursued in relation to the relatively new discipline of *technologie* as part of the deliberations of the *commission d'études pour l'enseignement des sciences physiques dans le second degré* that Guichard established under the physicist André Lagarrigue in May 1971 at the conference of the *Société française de physique*, whose president, Michel Soutif, stressed the economic importance of the commission and its mission of revising the programmes of physics, chemistry and technology in both *cycles*

of the *second degré* (Lebeaume et al. 2015: 214-215; Alix et al. 2015: 99-100). Drawing upon the typical study of the door bolt (*la targette*) in these classes, the various bodies of physicists and chemists represented on the Lagarrigue commission denounced the relatively simple nature of the devices studied and the specialist technical language used in the classes of *technologie* that had been generalised for the *quatrième* and *troisième* in 1970 as 'un mélange de quincaillerie et de formalisme pseudo-mathématique' (22 March 1974 issue of *Le Monde* quoted in Lebeaume 2008: 113) under the pejorative label of 'targettisme' or 'la technologie targette' and promoted the introduction of more complex scientific notions of electronics, electrical engineering and chemistry that underpinned the operation of the new technologies that pupils would be likely to encounter and work with later in their lives through the study of *technologie* (Lebeaume 2008: 113; Lebeaume et al. 2015: 215). The 'manifeste en faveur du développement des disciplines expérimentales dans l'enseignement secondaire' published in *Le Monde* on 27 October 1973 (Harlé 2010: 113) indicated support for an initiation into the experimental sciences through the discipline of *technologie* amongst figures from the *grandes écoles* and the wider economy, while others recognised the potential for such a practical and concrete introduction to the sciences as another means of democratising access to the increasingly prestigious and economically important science-based studies of the *second cycle* and beyond in light of the increased abstraction and formalism of the mathematics curriculum (Harlé 2010: 114), but the interest in developing *technologie* as an introduction to the sciences was balanced by another smaller group on the commission made up of those more closely associated with *l'enseignement technique* who sought to

valorise *technologie* as a subject more directly oriented towards the activity of work or production itself (Harlé 2010: 115-118; Lebeaume et al. 2015: 216). This commission's deliberations resulted in the proposition of a comprehensive 'initiation aux sciences et techniques' for the classes of *sixième* to *troisième*, which offered a synthesis of these positions through a modular course that included three modules retaining a specifically technical focus that sought to familiarise pupils with the processes of industrial manufacturing from planning to production and five others which introduced elements of physics and chemistry yet maintained a focus on the use of tools, such as microscopes, and the analysis of complex technical constructions, such as a fighter jet (Lebeaume et al. 2015: 215-216; Harlé 2010: 117-118). Although the Lagarrigue commission's initial report outlining these orientations for *la technologie* received no official response from the Ministry of Education under its new *ministre* Joseph Fontanet following its submission in 1973, the modular programmes that the commission had devised were trialled in classes of *quatrième* and *troisième* from the *rentrée* of 1974 and the commission would continue to meet following the death of Lagarrigue in January 1975 to contribute to the formulation of the programmes for the *collèges* that were created by the *loi Haby* of 11 July 1975 and would open at the *rentrée* of 1977 (Alix et al. 2015: 100-101).

In addition to these commissions examining curricular reforms, and in light of both the apparent shortcomings of the *dispositifs* of the French school and the challenges these faced, which had been dramatically revealed in the events of May 1968 and, as we shall show below, were further underlined and theorised in subsequent studies of the early 1970s, and the consequent

'malaise' amongst the teaching personnel of secondary education, in particular the *certifiés* and *agrégés*, as they saw their traditional practices and professional identities put in question (Prost 2004: 365-384, Joxe commission 1972: 23-27),[125] Guichard also established a commission to examine 'ce qu'est devenue et ce que va devenir la fonction enseignante dans le second degré' (Guichard's mission letter of 24 November 1971 in Joxe commission 1972: 119) in November 1971 under Louis Joxe, who had been *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* from 15 January to 22 November 1960. As Robert (2015: 92) observes, this commission reiterated, in its concerns and many of its propositions, the analysis developed at the Amiens colloquium of March 1968, leading to the adoption of a small number of proposed measures in the remainder of Pompidou's presidency. Indeed, the continuity between this commission's analysis and recommendations and those of the Amiens colloquium was already underlined by Jean Vial, a scholar of French education previously associated with the INRDP, formerly the IPN, in his 1973 review of the commission's report, which had been published in June 1972, just before Guichard was replaced as *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* by Joseph Fontanet on 5 July 1972 when Pierre Messmer took on the role of Prime Minister after the forced resignation of Jacques Chaban-Delmas. We should also note that the findings of this commission demonstrates some continuity with those of the *commission de rénovation pédagogique*, considered above, that reported to Edgar Faure in 1969, in its critiques of the *filières* of secondary education and its promotion of a modulation of the action of the institutions of education.

[125] For brevity, references to this report will be given in parentheses to the Joxe commission (1972), but details of this text are listed in the bibliography under the full name of the *Commission d'études sur la fonction enseignante dans le second degré*.

Echoing, as Vial (1973: 71-73) shows, the debates of the Amiens colloquium, the Joxe commission's report condemned the failure of the French school, with its rigid divisions and centralised administration, to respond to the challenges of mass secondary education and the economic and social transformations of the post-war period and, again, advocated a global reform that would establish new pedagogical and administrative structures and practices that would enable a less divided school to better respond to this new situation, local circumstances, and the different interests and expectations of the larger and more diverse pupil population. Repeating the Amiens colloquium's assertion of the need for renewed pedagogy (Vial 1973: 71-73), the Joxe commission (1972: 49) called for 'un nouveau style pédagogique' that rejected the subject discipline-based encyclopaedism and the traditional, rigid pedagogical models, found by the commission to still be dominant in the *second degré*, in favour of a focus on the global development of each pupil and the use of more flexible, active pedagogical methods that appealed to the interests and activity of pupils (Ibid. 25-34, 37-39). Such a pedagogical renewal was intended to address the 'crise du rapport pédagogique' (Joxe commission 1972: 25) that had resulted from the failure of teachers to adapt to the newly diverse backgrounds and interests of their pupils, but, according to the commission, would need to be part of 'une réforme globale' (50) that also resolved what the commission referred to as the 'rupture de cohérence des institutions' (35). Said to have arisen from insufficient reform of the secondary school's institutions in face of social change, resulting in a general intransigence of the *second degré* that preserved the divisions and rigid hierarchy of its structures and administration (48) and thereby hindering

pedagogical innovation (65-67) and perpetuating the selection of pupils 'par l'échec' (40-41, 61), this incoherence, between institutions themselves as well as with the society in which they were to function, would, according to the commission, be resolved by reforms that would facilitate the accordance of the mass secondary school with the transformations of French society by enabling its institutions and their personnel to adapt to their pupils and local circumstances to properly fulfill their functions (48-53).

Following on from the recommendations of the 1968 Amiens colloquium therefore, the key element of the reform proposed by the Joxe Commission was the adaptation of the pedagogical and institutional practices of the school to the new, broader interests and needs of their pupils and local circumstances in order to better fulfill the secondary school's centrally determined missions (Joxe commission 1972: 96-97), what we would recognise as a greater modulation of the exercise of power, according to the particularities of different cases, in order to achieve a more intense, thorough and effective, exercise of this power that is consistent with the principles of disciplinary power. This orientation of the commission's report can be seen in a number of its principles for reform of the education system and the eighteen measures that it consequently proposed. Amongst these ten principles, the commission (1972: 92) recommended 'la modulation des services' of each secondary school in function of its social environment[126] and the establishment of 'une organisation scolaire centrée sur les élèves et ouverte sur la vie', as opposed to what it claimed was currently 'une organisation uniquement fondée sur la simple juxtaposition des matières enseignées', that would be achieved

[126] The Joxe commission (1972: 71-72) also indicates 'la modulation des tâches' carried out by teachers as a necessary part of a more supple and responsive pedagogical approach.

through the responsibilisation of each establishment as a 'communauté[...] éducative[...]' and 'une vraie décentralisation' (91) that entailed a new emphasis on the role of the *chef d'établissement* and a reorganisation of the administration of *l'Éducation nationale*, including the role of the IGEN, to support and enable the development of administrative and pedagogical practices that would support such a modulation (93, 108-109). The Joxe commission translated these principles into many of its eighteen policy recommendations, which included allowing institutions of secondary education to organise both their allocated budgets and their own timetables within the limits of the centrally dictated annual requirements (97-98); reinforcing the training of *chefs d'établissement* to fulfil these managerial roles and to act as *animateurs* of the responsive pedagogical activity of their teaching staff (66-67); and instituting a greater degree of flexibility in the course of secondary education with pedagogical innovation and individual options alongside a common core curriculum intended to 'individualiser l'enseignement et de l'alléger de tout encyclopédisme pour le rendre plus efficace.' (Joxe commission 1972: 97). Of these proposals, which prefigured aspects of the future decentralisation of powers in the *second degré* in the 1980s that will be seen to suggest the emergence of a modulatory *dispositif* of control, the new minister, Fontanet, only pursued a limited number with *circulaires* published on 23 and 27 March 1973 (Prost 2004: 392): the freeing up of 10% of the allocated annual school timetable that, intended to allow innovative pedagogies and multidisciplinary and group study, was to be disposed of as each *chef d'établissement* saw fit (*Arrêté* of 13 July 1973, Art. 2), a consequent reinforcement of the powers and training of *chefs d'établissement*, and the

creation in each institution of *centres de documentation et d'information* (CDI) intended to encourage new pedagogical approaches and enable pupils to undertake individual work (Joxe commission 1972: 97-98, 100). As Prost (2004: 392) notes, these isolated measures met with mixed and limited success.

In addition to what amounted to an explicit promotion of the modulation of the *dispositif* of secondary education in function of each institution's pupils and local circumstances, however, the Joxe commission's report also critiqued the current divided architecture of the French secondary school as well as the traditional abstract culture that had dominated French secondary education, offering a more implicit endorsement of the unification of the separate *filières* of the *premier degré* of secondary education and a recognition of the multiple nature of the missions, which we can recognise as those centred on community, the individual and the economy that had animated the separate orders of education established under the third Republic and then the distinct *sections* of the CES, that this level of education was now expected to complete.

Having referred to the data produced by various studies, including those of the INED (Joxe commission 1972: 20-22), the Joxe commission argued that 'la structure en filières parallèles, ou en couloirs' that had been adopted in the *premier cycle* was inadequate to fulfil the mission of *orientation* of pupils according to their individual aptitudes that had been ascribed to this level of education and pointedly noted that '[b]ien des enseignants s'interrogent et se demandent si une structure ramifiée, à partir d'un tronc commun véritable, n'aurait pas été préférable' (41). The commission also questioned the capacity of this divided structure, with a separate, vocationally

oriented *filière*, to complete the economic mission of education, particularly due to the development of this third *filière* as one of relegation by the end of the 1960s (41-42) and highlighted the failure of the long secondary course of education to offer 'une référence même indirecte de préparation à la vie active' (22). Indeed, the commission also disputed the focus on the disinterested acquisition of disciplinary subject knowledge that underpinned the extensive, abstract culture of the traditional, long secondary education and continued to dominate the general sections of the *second degré*, arguing that this intellectualist culture was divorced from the contemporary world and, again, precluded a preparation for professional life as well as life as part of a group (42-44, 53-54). This critique suggests a renewed emphasis in the commission's report on the need for the institutions of the *premier cycle* of secondary education, as part of the period of compulsory education up to the age of 16 years old, to contribute to the transmission of a common culture of essential knowledges, which we have previously identified as the key objective of the community-centred logic of education. Indeed, the report states that '[l]'objectif premier de la formation initiale, […] c'est la maîtrise des outils intellectuels fondamentaux' and that '[l]'apprentissage de la vie en groupe, l'éducation au choix et à la responsabilité, sont des objectifs fondamentaux' (54).

These critiques of the intellectualist culture of secondary education and the existing divisions within the different sections of the *premier cycle* resulted in recommendations that suggest an eventual unification of the separate *filières* of the *premier cycle*, which seeks to respond to the order-words of community, the individual and the economy that had directed these separate sections. The

commission's unimplemented recommendation that immediate measures should be taken towards 'l'unification progressive des corps enseignants du second degré' (105), which would contribute to the emergence of a unified body of teachers that could collaborate as a single pedagogical team (72-75), is the most explicit indication of this vision of a unified *dispositif*, but the report's brief proposal for a new architecture of studies in the *second degré* evokes a single *tronc commun* offering a diversity of supplementary options. The Joxe report recommends therefore 'la possibilité de choisir un programme plus ou moins étendu, sous réserve d'un minimum obligatoire' and sets the objectives of 'l'acquisition des connaissances de base nécessaires à tout jeune Français quelle que soit son orientation ultérieure', as well as 'le développement de l'autonomie personnelle […] joint à l'exploitation optimum des capaités individuelles' of each pupil, and 'l'adaptation des connaissances acquises à une préformation professionnelle et sociale qui est offerte à tout élève avant qu'il achève sa scolarité' (96), which we can see as responses to the *mots d'ordre* of community, the individual and the economy respectively. Although the Joxe report highlighted the need for further reform of the system of *filières* operational in the institutions of the first cycle of secondary education and presented a number of principles for this, the Joxe commission's lack of a clear proposals regarding the reorganisation of the structures of the *premier cycle* of secondary education and the approach of the March 1973 legslative elections meant that further reflection upon a major reform of secondary education was briefly postponed (Prost 2004: 392-392).

G - Intensified critiques in the 1970s and the emergence of consensus for a *collège unique*

However, the question of a reform of the *premier cycle du second degré* became increasingly insistent in the early 1970s as the critiques of the production and reproduction of inequalities in the education system that had contributed to the contestation of May 1968 intensified in the years following these events, the curricular reforms intended to address these inequalities proved to be problematic, new economic demands weighed upon the school and the economic efficiency of central planning was questioned, leading to a greater political consensus regarding the need for reform, and in particular the elimination of *filières* to create a *collège unique* in the place of the divided CES, and remaining CEG. This elimination of the separate *voies* of the *premier cycle* at this stage, however, largely meant the integration of the classes of *l'enseignement terminal* given in the third *filière* with those of the first and second *filières* of long and short general education that had already, as we have seen above, largely become indistinguishable in practice by 1974 due to the removal of curricular differences and the mixing of and cooperation between PEGC and *certifiés* and *agrégés* (Chapoulie 2010: 498-500). This consensus would find expresssion initially in Fontanet's ultimately unsuccessful *projet de loi* of March 1974, which first proposed the abolition of *filières*, and then the subsequent introduction of the *collège unique* with the *loi Haby* of 11 July 1975.

As Prost (2013: 159-162; 2004: 422-438) has shown, there was a radicalisation of the critiques of the failure of democratisation of the education system in the wake of the events of May 1968, which, with the publication of a

number of more trenchant critiques of the school in the early 1970s, added to the public debate regarding inequalities in the education system, and, in particular, those arising from divisions introduced by separate *filières*, and to political pressure for action to address these inequalities and inefficiencies (Chapoulie 2010: 465; Legrand 1998: 37; Dorison and Kahn 2016: 130). As noted above, the events of May 1968 had contributed to a wider dissemination of Bourdieu and Passeron's (1964) *Les Héritiers* that helped further popularise their critiques of the *culture scolaire* and of the school's role in perpetuating inequalities and thereby inform the production and reception of other studies in the growing field of the sociology of education, in particular the cohort studies, discussed above, that were undertaken by the INED (Masson 2005: 83-88, 91; Chapoulie 2010: 463). The final article based on the INED studies was published in 1973 and affirmed the continuing relevance of its findings of the inequitable, cumulative impact of any given pupil's socio-cultural background on their future schooling to the tripartite architecture of the CES, despite its establishment after the study began in 1962 (Girard and Bastide 1973: 591-592). In addition to these studies, Prost (2013: 160-162; 2004: 422-423) also highlighted a number of other works published in this period that would seem to build upon the anarchic spirit of the events of May 1968 and the Amiens colloquium's endorsement of new pedagogical practices. These works, which include Ivan Ilich's *Une société sans école*, published in 1971 after he had written a series of articles following 1968, and the French translation of A. S. Neill's account of the experimental, non-directive pedagogical practices at Summerhill school in the UK that was published in 1970 as *Libres Enfants de Summerhill,* as well as other works that pursued the analyses of institutional

pedagogy and promoted ideas of *autogestion* by pupils, presented the traditional institution of the school as an authoritarian imposition that interfered with pupils' own self-realisation, and proposed a radically child-centred approach that did not conform to traditional institutional models as the key to undoing the constraints of the school and initiating wider social change. Prost (2013: 159-160) and Legrand (1998: 37) both emphasise, however, the influence of Bourdieu and Passeron's (1970) *La Reproduction* and Christian Baudelot and Roger Establet's (1971) *L'École capitaliste en France* and their contribution to the intensification of debates regarding the school in this period.

Bourdieu and Passeron's (1970) *La Reproduction* marked a significant radicalisation of their earlier (1964) critique of the classed nature of the traditional *culture scolaire* and the effect of the *idéologie du don*, which through the classed judgement of teachers served to legitimise the positions of dominant and dominated groups in society. Indeed, building upon Bourdieu's article of 1966, which, drawing upon the INED's findings, disputed the ideology of *l'école libératrice* that enabled social mobility according to one's merit and instead presented the function of the school as one of the conservation of existing social positions, *La Reproduction* argued that it was the function of the school to reproduce the existing social structures of the dominant and the dominated classes through the symbolic violence of the supposedly objective judgements upon pupils exercised by the school. As Duru-Bellat and Van Zanten (2012: 247) explain, this new text presented the reproduction and legitimisation of social advantage and disadvantage less as a disfunction of the school to be corrected and more as its necessary social

function in a social system marked by such relations of domination. Indeed, they (Ibid.) note that this reproductive function, assured by the apparent neutrality of the *culture scolaire* and of the teachers who have absorbed the principles and norms of this culture, would seem to undermine the idea that a *pédagogie rationnelle*, such as that discussed in *Les Héritiers* (Bourdieu and Passeron 1964: 110-115), or reform of the school would be able to resolve the inequalities that the school reproduces, with Prost (2013: 159-160), for example, arguing that such steps would rather, according to this theory, tend to further disguise and so better legitimise the supposedly inevitable, socially reproductive function of the school institution.

The failure of the curricular reforms in mathematics, presented above, that had been pursued, in part, as an effort to reduce the discriminatory effect of the traditional humanistic literary *culture scolaire* would seem to provide reason for such disillusionment and, as Prost (2013: 156) notes, served to discredit other efforts for curricular reform, including those of French, which we also discussed above. As Cardon-Quint et al. (2015: 52) highlight, although the new programmes that introduced modern mathematics into the classes of the *sixième* and *cinquième* at the *rentrées* of 1969 and 1970 seemed to enter into use without problems, the new programmes for the classes of *quatrième* and *troisième* that were introduced at the *rentrées* of 1971 and 1972 were judged to be too ambitious and unsuited for the vast majority of pupils, with the complexity and abstraction of this content, exemplified by the algebrisation of geometry problems, causing difficulties for both pupils and teachers and precluding the proposed active pedagogy focussing on the activity of the pupil (Prost 2013: 156). Rather than democratising education through presenting

mathematics as a universal language and removing barriers of social origin, this curricular reform was blamed for reinforcing the attainment gap between pupils of differing social backgrounds as it favoured a degree of abstraction and formalism that was thought to favour pupils of a more privileged background (Cardon-Quint et al. 2015: 53). Indeed, according to Prost (2004: 462), the modern mathematics became 'un impitoyable instrument de sélection' as only 15% of pupils mastered the new programmes by the end of *troisième*. The success of Stella Baruk's 1973 work *Échec et Maths* underlined the widespread recognition of the problematic nature of this new approach to mathematics and the further difficulties it generated (Cardon-Quint et al. 2015: 52). The hardening of opposition against curricular reform provoked by the failure of the mathematics reform and the intensification of debate in light of the events of May 1968, which was further fueled by works such as *La Reproduction*, is suggested by Prost (2013: 158-159, 162-164) to have contributed to the reluctance to enact the reform of the French curriculum formulated by the Rouchette and Emmanuel commissions, resulting in the more unofficial diffusion of their recommendations and the more cautious new official curriculum that was produced later by the IGEN.

The more explicitly Marxist analysis of the French school, inspired by Louis Althusser's (1976: 81-137) 1970 work on ideological state apparatuses, that was given by Baudelot and Establet in their 1971 work *L'École capitaliste en France* presented a similarly implacable process of social reproduction that functioned through the French school. For Baudelot and Establet (1971) the unity of the French school system was illusory and, behind this facade, they posited the operation instead of two separate and distinct networks that served

to separate pupils into the two unequal classes of capitalist relations of production on the basis of their socio-economic background and to inculcate them with the bourgeois ideology that would lead each group to accept their legitimate position as either dominant or dominated in these relations of production. Baudelot and Establet (1971) refer to these two networks within the school, which start following the final year of primary education, as the *réseau Secondaire-Supérieur*, consisting of the modern and classical sections of *voie* I of the *premier cycle*, the *lycées*, long courses of technical education and institutions of higher education and leading to positions of bourgeois dominance, and the *réseau Primaire-Professionnel*, consisting of the third *filière* and short technical courses of education and leading to proletarian positions of exploited labour. The intermediate position of the second *filière* of the *premier cycle* intended to offer a short, modern, general education is presented as ambiguous, but ultimately as a 'gare de triage entre les deux réseaux' (Ibid. 118). The existence of the separate *filières* of the *premier cycle* and the subsequent divisions of the *second cycle* of secondary education is therefore a key to the division of pupils into these two groups.

Each of these accounts of a French school that operates to reproduce capitalist society highlighted a failure of the democratisation of education and more specifically indicated limitations upon the broader and more intense actualisation of the disciplinary logics that respond to the order-words of community and the individual. The function of the apparently unified school *dispositif* that had emerged following the Berthoin reform of 1959 is described in each of these texts as one of dividing pupils, through the operation of the judgement of teachers and the various separate *filières* within the school, into

distinct and opposed groups, rather than one that fulfils the promise of uniting all the pupils as a single community presented by the *école unique* imagined by the *Compagnons de l'Université nouvelle* and the authors of the *Langevin-Wallon* report. The operation of *orientation* described in these two texts that limit each individual pupil's schooling based upon their class background or their inherited cultural capital also serves to impose limits upon the disinterested realisation of pupils' full potential as individuals.

These radicalised, polemical critiques of the school contributed to the ubiquity of the question of the incomplete democratisation of education and inequalities produced by the school, but they were also complemented by international interest in the reduction of educational inequalities and a growing international consensus in favour of a unified common school (Chapoulie 2010: 465-466). Studies conducted in the USA, UK and scandinavian countries had also demonstrated the existence of educational inequalities by the end of the 1960s and had become the object of conferences and reports by international organisations, with, for example, a UNESCO conference being held in Geneva in September 1971 on the theme 'Le milieu social des élèves et leurs chances de succès à l'école' (Ibid. 465). Amongst this international activity, the OECD published a summary report on the issue of education and pupils' social backgrounds in 1972 that was widely circulated in France within the administration of *l'Éducation nationale* and in political circles. Written by the Norwegian education scholar Torsten Husen, this report recommended the development of pre-school education and the elimination of distinctions between different sections or *filières* of education in order to reduce inequalities (Ibid.). This recommendation of the creation of a unified school

without separate sections reflects the international trend, traced by Mons (2007: 90-92), that, beginning with the USA in the 1920s, saw countries increasingly adopting various models of common school, first in a number of Asian countries, then in the countries of the Soviet bloc and across Western Europe, with Italy adopting a common school in 1970 and France being one of the last remaining Western European countries not under a military dictatorship to not have adopted such a school reform.

The OECD's concern for the reduction of inequalities in education reflected the objectives of the sixth Plan (1971-1976), approved by *loi 71-567* of 15 July 1971, suggesting economy-centred support for a reform of the education system that would seek to reduce educational inequalities (Chapoulie 2010: 479). Indeed, the sixth Plan listed amongst its overall objectives the aim of making 'de nouveaux progrès dans l'ordre de l'égalité et de la solidarité, notamment pour tout ce qui concerne l'éducation' and the chapter of the Plan specifically devoted to education stated that one of its fundamental objectives included 'une plus grande égalité des chances' (in ibid.). This common interest in the reduction of inequalities at school expressed in the OECD's report and in the sixth Plan can be understood as an intensification of the economic imperative to not waste resources, in this case human resources, that had been expressed in the Berthoin reform of 1959 and, indeed, the sixth Plan underlines this intention, stating that correcting these inequalities would 'redistribue[r] les chances et favorise[r] l'épanouissement des qualités de chacun' and as such constituted 'une des conditions majeures de la croissance et du plein emploi' (Commissariat général du Plan 1971: 60).

The sixth Plan also indicated further potential support for a reform reducing the barriers between the separate *filières* of the *premier cycle* as an intensification of the exercise of power in service of the economy due to the emergence of a scepticism regarding the possibility of effectively responding to economic demands through a centrally planned *orientation* that sought to organise the optimum investment of human capital and the new consequent insistence upon the provision of an adequate general education and minimum vocational education for all pupils so that they are better able to respond to the shifting demands of the economy. This shift in emphasis that suggested such support would first appear in the sixth Plan of 1971 before becoming more pronounced in the the seventh (1976-1980) and eighth (1981-1985) Plans that were produced in the following decade.[127]

As Charlot (1995: 87-88) and Chapoulie (2010: 480-482) show, despite the apparent detail of the techniques developed by the 1970s, the flaws in the forecasts and recommendations of the Plan were becoming more evident by the time the sixth Plan was approved in 1971, and would become clearer still as the economy became less predictable following the 1973 oil crisis that heralded the end of the *trente glorieuses* and the development of the problem of unemployment. Based upon linear extrapolations from existing tendencies as well as prescribed objectives for economic development, the recommendations of the Plan, which sought to guide practices of *orientation* and organise the education system's contribution to the economy, had increasingly failed to properly account for the complex interactions within the developing economy and proved to be behind this economy's changing

[127] This eighth Plan would be replaced before receiving parliamentary approval with an interim Plan (1982-1983) following the Left's electoral victories of 1981 (Charlot 1995: 88).

demands, leading to the oversupply of certain qualifications in relation to the demands of the job market and contributing to the growth of what would be called a 'chômage d'incohérence'. By the production of the seventh Plan in 1976 therefore the idea of organising the various sections of education and the flow of pupils between and through them to meet the developing demands of the economy was considered unrealistic in France and such doubts regarding the efficiency of the national direction of human capital investment were increasingly expressed internationally, eventually becoming the subject of an OECD study in 1983 (Chapoulie 2010: 481; Charlot 1995: 92). This difficulty of forecasting the future needs of the economy was recognised in the report of the preparatory 'Formation Qualification Professionnelle' group for the sixth Plan whose conclusion noted that 'on a fait reconnaître que les prévisions de formation ne pouvaient se déduire des prévisions de l'emploi' and was also recognised in the report of the Education commission for the sixth Plan which remarked that 'l'idée selon laquelle les flux de formation doivent se calquer sur les précisions d'avenir apparaîtra de plus en plus contestable sur le plan de l'analyse économique' (in Chapoulie 2010: 479).

As both Charlot (1995: 90-93) and Chapoulie (2010: 479-482) recognise, the sixth Plan was the first to demonstrate an awareness of the unreliability of central planning for economic prosperity and to place a new emphasis on an initial schooling that would provide every pupil with a sufficiently advanced general education and at least a minimum vocational education to ensure their future economic success in a rapidly developing job market, a shift in approach that would be further emphasised in the preparatory work and final reports for the subsequent seventh and eighth plans, which

more clearly expressed a reticence towards quantified objectives of the sort that had featured in the Plans of the 1960s. As Charlot (1995: 93) explains, in light of the failures of central planning, it came to be recognised that 'les mutations techniques et économiques se produisent à un rythme si rapide […] que la première qualité d'un travailleur n'est plus sa spécialisation, […] mais sa capacité d'adaptation, donc sa formation de base'. This new focus was introduced in the text of the sixth Plan, which stated that '[i]l faut viser à ce qu'aucun enfant ne puisse sortir du système éducatif sans une formation générale suffisante, assortie d'un début de formation professionnelle', while the preparatory report of the Education commission of the sixth Plan recommended a strenghtening of general education, which it argued to be essential for 'l'assimilation de technologies de base qui deviendront de plus en plus complexes' and for 'conversions fréquentes à d'autres activités qu'exigera l'accélération des évolutions techniques et économiques' (in Chapoulie 2010: 479-480). This recommendation echoes those calls, considered much earlier in this chapter, for an increase in the general level of education to improve France's economic performance that preceded the increase of compulsory schooling to the age of 16.

The sixth Plan's stipulation that no pupil should exit the education system without 'une formation générale suffisante, assortie d'un début de formation professionnelle' and additional fundamental objective of achieving 'une meilleure préparation à la vie professionnelle' (in Chapoulie 2010: 479) also appeared to support an extension of the economy-centred logic of education beyond the limits of its traditional enclosures of the third *filière* to be applied to all the pupils in the education system. This can be seen in the

development of the subject of *technologie*, which we have examined above, that had been introduced for all the sections of the first and second *filières* of general education in March 1970 and was the subject of further elaboration by the Lagarrigue commission established in 1971. As we have also considered above, this subject was presented by the official instructions of August 1970 as a means of encouraging the *orientation* of pupils towards further, more vocational studies (Figeat and Lebeaume 2015: 28) and as such formed part of a broader governmental effort to rehabilitate the image of manual labour that appeared to be less desirable (Lembré 2016: 92). This focus on a minimum professional education for all pupils also seems to coincide with the Plan's more sober predictions of a growing need for less qualified labour due to the development of the 'processus d'automatisation' (Chapoulie 2010: 480). The separate third *filière* of education, which had been described by Capelle, first in 1971 to *l'Assemblée nationale* and again in a book of 1974, as a relegatory 'lieu d'humiliation permanente' for pupils (Chapoulie 2010: 500) and which were often considered incapable of sufficiently teaching and socialising future workers (Prost 2004: 650-656), could not be adequate to this task alone.

Given the ongoing and intensifying debate regarding the continuing production of inequalities in the school, which we can understand as a limited realisation of the disciplinary logic responding to the order-word of community due to the unequal treatment and divisions it implies, a limited actualisation of the economic disciplinary logic in that it fails to develop economic forces to their optimum level, or a limited exercise of power in service of the *mot d'ordre* of the individual as it demonstrates a failure to fully realise every individual's potential, the theme of 'la lutte contre les inégalités scolaires'

became a frequent subject of party political debate and was addressed by every major political party contesting the legislative elections of March 1973 (Chapoulie 2010: 469). The party of the incumbent President Pompidou, the UDR, recognised the handicap of those pupils from less advantaged backgrounds and set out its intention to 'en attenuer l'effet sur les enfants et former ainsi, peu à peu, une société plus homogène', for example, while the party of the future President Giscard d'Estaing, *les Républicains indépendants* (RI), placed 'égalité des chances' amongst its 'cinq missions fondamentales' (in Chapoulie 2010: 469). The common programme of the PS and PCF was the most explicit in its intentions to achieve a 'démocratisation véritable' of the education system, stating that '[c]ela implique que l'on mette fin aux cloisonnements qui entretiennent les ségrégations scolaires: entre "filières" du CES, entre enseignement général et technique' and that '[c]ela suppose aussi que l'on adopte vis-à-vis des handicaps d'ordre socioculturel, une attitude résolument compensatoire.' (in Chapoulie 2010: 469). A political consensus had emerged in favour of significant reform of the education system to resolve the educational inequalities produced through the school that indicated the limits of the *dispositif* as it currently operated.

Indeed, following the success of the governing majority in the legislative elections of March 1973, Joseph Fontanet, who continued as *ministre de l'Éducation nationale*, decided to undertake a reform of the *second degré* that would constitute the first concrete proposal of a unified *collège* encompassing a single *premier cycle* without *filières,* but also reveal the continuing divergent visions of a unified middle school. Having instructed IFOP and Sofres to conduct a preparatory survey of the opinions, criticisms

and aspirarions of teachers, parents and pupils in relation to schools in June and July 1973, at the *rentrée* of 1973, Fontanet announced the creation of a prestigious committee and a 'grand colloque national' over 21 to 23 November 1973, which would be organised by this committee and preceded by numerous local studies and colloquia, to develop proposals for his reform (Prost 2004: 394). The resulting *projet de loi* presented to the *Conseil supérieur de l'Éducation nationale* on the 28 February 1974 and to the *conseil des ministres* on 13 March 1974 before being submitted to the *Assemblée nationale* on 29 March 1974 proposed the abolition of *filières*, a streamlined programme of study, the use of differentiated pedagogy, and the creation of a separate body of *professeurs de collège* in the *premier cycle* alongside a number of reforms of the *second cycle* (Prost 2004: 395; Robert 2015: 96).

The reactions of the various teachers' unions to these proposals highlighted a continued divergence of opinon regarding the desirable nature of any *école unique* that will be significant for our analysis of the *collège* as an institution of control in the final section of this thesis. This disagreement was redolent of the opposing visions for such a school that had both paralysed attempts at reform in the 1950s and resulted in the compromise of a divided structure of the institutions of the *premier cycle du second degré* in the reforms of 1959 and 1963 and, again, expressed the primacy that different groups of institutional agents gave to different and divergent order-words that had previously structured the separate orders of primary, secondary and technical education. The conservative SNALC, alongside the *société des agrégés* presented a typical rejection of proposals that emphasised the traditions of the individual-centred logic of secondary education at the colloquium of

November 1973, opposing the creation of a streamlined *tronc commun* created through the elimination of *filières* and any pedagogical practices that risked encouraging *professeurs* to instead act as *animateurs* (Prost 2004: 394-395), and were joined by the SNES which rejected the creation of a new, separate body of *professeurs de collège* specific to this new middle school, a measure which was seen as presenting a danger of a 'primarisation' of the *premier cycle* that would align this new body with that of the PEGC and entail an eviction of the single subject specialists of the *professeurs certifiés* or *agrégés* from these schools that would be indicative of a lowering of academic standards (Robert 2015: 96-97). The SNI on the other hand, approved the creation of this new body of teachers due to their apparent proximity to the PEGC that had initially emerged as an extension of the primary school's body of *instituteurs*, but, suspicious of the governmental bias towards secondary education and the SNES, criticised the separation of this school from the *premier degré* (Robert 2015: 97).

Although the death of Pompidou on 2 April 1974 interrupted the pursuit of this reform, the narrow election of Valéry Giscard d'Estaing as President on 19 May 1974 following an electoral campaign in which he publicly supported the creation of a *collège unique* led to the appointment of René Haby as *ministre de l'Éducation* on 28 May 1974 who would successfully complete the task given to him of creating this new institution with the *Loi Haby* of 11 July 1975. The compromises between the divergent positions highlighted above that were presented in the passing of this law will be seen as a contributing factor in the creation of the *collège* as an institution of control. The details of this law and the development of this *dispositif* as one

that expresses the power of control rather than that of discipline will be examined in the next section.

The creation of an education system with a *collège unique* at its centre with the *loi Haby* of 1975 can be understood as the latest iteration of the educational *dispositif* in an ongoing process of what Nealon (2008) would call the intensification of the exercise of power in these *dispositifs*, or what Foucault (2001: 299-300) would refer to as the '[p]rocessus de perpétuel remplissement stratégique' of these *dispositifs*, in service of the order-words of community, the individual and the economy that the preceding analysis has sought to trace through the development of the education system following the consolidation of the disciplinary *dispositifs* each operating separately in response to one of these aforementioned *mots d'ordre* under the Third Republic, which, as indicated in the previous chapter, was itself the product of a process of intensification of the exercise of power. The identification of the limitations of the Third Republic system of education led to the development of proposals for an *école unique*, which would prefigure the emergence of the *collège* as an institution that seeks to simultaneously actualise the divergent community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education, alongside other tools intended to enable the intensification of the exercise of power through the educational *dispositif*, such as the theories, and related pedagogical strategies and concepts of individual aptitudes, of *l'Éducation nouvelle*, and practices of *orientation* borrowed from the economic context. Further debate in the immediate post-war period eventually identified a number of measures

inspired by these previous debates that appeared to be supported by a consensus, but attempts for reform failed due to rivalries between those invested in the separate *dispositifs* of the tripartite education system. The separation of these *dispositifs* was preserved therefore in the Berthoin and Fouchet-Capelle reforms within an integrated education system that sought to organise the *orientation* of pupils within it through the development of a hierarchically organised disciplinary *dispositif*. The consistent critiques addressed towards this system in response to the order-words of community, the individual and the economy, after numerous attempts at more minor reforms, eventually produced the consensus for major reform and the creation of the *collège*. It will be argued in the final section that this new institution, although apparently emerging from an intensification of the exercise of disciplinary power in service of each of these order-words, does not conform to the diagram or abstract machine of disciplinary power and instead indicates, in both its initial constitution and subsequent development, the emergence of a *dispositif* of control in the French education system.

II - *Le collège*: An institution of control.

Prost (2013: 191) describes the Haby reform of 1975 that instituted the contemporary *collège* as 'un aboutissement plus qu'une rupture', but we will argue that this reform, although indeed the culmination of the processes of disciplinary intensification that sought the extension of given logics of education to encompass all pupils in an *école unique*, does constitute a rupture with the disciplinary enclosures that preceded it by creating an institution at the

confluence of these previously separate disciplinary logics intended to simultaneously actualise these divergent logics centred on community, the individual and the economy in a single space. The remainder of this final chapter will highlight how the institution of the *collège* differs from the disciplinary *dispositifs* of education that had preceded it and instead suggest a shift towards a *dispositif* of control.

This will first be seen in relation to how this institution is durably marked by the fact that it actualises multiple divergent logics leaving it with an unstable identity. As such, the *collège* represents a dividual institution of control marked by a modulation of multiple logics responding to different *mots d'ordre* that become 'des figures chiffrées, déformables et transformables, d'une même entreprise' (PP: 245).

We will then see how efforts to further intensify the exercise of power through these institutions, which encountered difficulties in accommodating such large heterogeneous student populations in undifferentiated classes, resulted in the promotion of practices, beginning in the 1980s, that opened up the fixed and disciplinary hierarchical relationship between these institutions and the *ministère d'Éducation nationale*, and encouraged the development of a shared governance of these institutions. These new practices indicated a shift from the fixed constitution of the disciplinary institution that converged towards the transcendent authority of its 'propriétaire' and towards the continuous negotiation of 'une même entreprise qui n'a plus que des gestionnaires' said to emerge with the control society (PP: 245). This will first be seen in relation to the decentralisation of power to *collèges* as *établissements publics locaux d'enseignement* (EPLE) and then in the

development of an educational quasi-market, which will be contrasted with the disciplinary *dispositif* of the *carte scolaire* examined earlier.

‘Un moulage auto-déformant qui changerait continûment, d’un instant à l’autre’: The *collège* as a dividual institution of control

The *loi Haby* of 11 July 1975 established the *collège* as an institution that was intended to simultaneously actualise the divergent community-, individual- and economy-centred logics within the same pedagogical space. However, the contradictions that could emerge between the order-words orienting these logics contribute to the ongoing instability of this institution that Jean-Paul Delahaye (2013: 175) still refers to as ‘une construction inachevée’. Indeed, as Jean-Louis Derouet (2003: 2-3) stated in relation to the multiple normative references of these institutions, ‘[c]es montages sont forcément instables, puisqu’en intégrant des rationalités différentes ils contiennent toujours en eux-mêmes les éléments nécessaires à leur propre critique.’ We will first briefly consider how this modulation of order-words marks this institution as a dividual institution of control, different from the individual institutions of discipline, before tracing this modulation through the official texts indicating the role of this institution.

As examined in the first chapter, a disciplinary institution constitutes a distinct mould that is constructed in response to a single *mot d’ordre* (PP: 242-244), understood by Deleuze and Guattari (MP: 120, 135-137, 139) as an abstract command that fixes certain variables as constants in relation to which distinct codified and defined forms are produced, giving the prescriptive norms

of disciplinary power (SP: 214-215; Foucault 2004a: 59) and the enclosed spaces and ranks of the disciplinary institution coded for this purpose (SP: 166-175). By seeking to actualise these divergent logics of education oriented by distinct order-words in the same space, without imposing one as the organising principle of the others, one makes each of the distinct disciplinary models built from the constants and fixed forms instituted by these *mots d'ordre* into '[d]es états métastables et coexistants d'une même modulation, comme un déformateur universel' (PP: 243) that Deleuze describes as part of the control society.

In this modulation there is a process of continuous variation in which the constants that had been fixed by these *mots d'ordre* become temporarily fixed and transitory variables or *mots de passe*, 'qui seraient comme de passage, des composantes de pasage [*sic*]' (MP: 139), which, according to Deleuze, regulate the control society in place of the *mots d'ordre* of the disciplinary society (PP: 243). In this modulation of *mots d'ordre* as *mots de passe*, the various disciplinary models of the school responding to the distinct logics oriented by the order-words of community, the individual or the economy become '[d]es figures chiffrées, déformables et transformables, d'une même entreprise' in a society of control (PP: 245).

Following Deleuze and Guattari's 1980 definition of the *dividuel* as an 'ensemble flou' (MP: 424), expressed again in Deleuze's (1983: 34) definition of the term as 'un mouvement qui fait que les choses entre lesquelles il s'établit ne cessent de se réunir en un tout, et le tout, de se diviser entre les choses', we can state that such an institution would no longer be a distinct individual institution with fixed contours that corresponds to the disciplinary society, but

rather an indistinct dividual institution that corresponds to the control society (PP: 244).

All of the order-words that are part of this modulation are inscribed in the *loi Haby* of 11 July 1975 that founded this institution intended to be put in place at the *rentrée* of 1977. That this new school was to provide to all children 'un enseignement commun, reparti sur quatre niveaux successifs' (Art. 4) indicates that it actualises the community-centred logic of education. The first two years would constitute, again, a *cycle d'observation* in which all pupils would follow the same curriculum and in the following two-year *cycle d'orientation* a core curriculum would remain common to all pupils. This community-forming objective was a central aspect of the reform. In his first press conference as President, Valéry Giscard d'Estaing said of this reform that 'Le premier objectif, c'est l'élévation du niveau de connaissance et de culture des Français' and suggested that it would respond to the obligation of 'donner à chaque Française et à chaque Français un savoir minimal'. Indeed, in 1975 he would refer to the reform as creating an institution in which all pupils would receive the same education and, during a 1977 cabinet meeting, underlined the theme of creating a common, national culture in stating that the *collège unique* would be 'un élément essentiel d'unité de la société française'. During his re-election campaign he would again talk of the common culture taught in the school as the means for giving the French 'leur unité culturelle' (quoted in Lelièvre 2008: 108-111). Additionally, the presence of elected class delegates on the *conseils de classes* and *conseil d'établissement* is highlighted in a 1976 Ministry of Education pamphlet seeking to explain and justify the reform as a

way of providing an 'apprentissage de la démocratie', again stressing this logic of education that seeks to form participants in the community.

Article 4 of the *loi Haby* also indicates that the individual-centred logic is actualised in this institution. It states that education in the *collège* 'repose sur un équilibre des disciplines intellectuelles, artistiques, manuelles, physiques et sportives et permet de révéler les aptitudes et les goûts', indicating the objective of developing the unique capacities of each individual pupil. This was to be enabled by the fact that pupils would chose a number of optional subjects to study in the *cycle d'orientation* (Art. 2, *Décret* 76-1303 of 28 December 1976). The traditional ideal cultural model of individual development that can be found in the Third Republic's *enseignement secondaire* also persists in the *collège*, whose very name, as Prost notes (2007: 137), suggests this tradition of secondary education. Article 4 states that the *collège* provides 'une formation secondaire' and, indeed, Prost (Ibid.) states that the secondary culture and practices of the *professeurs certifiés* that taught in these schools, initially alongside PEGC until they were no longer recruited in 1986, became the norm. Indeed, this school would continue to be the beginning of the traditional model of individual-centred education completed in the *lycée*.

Finally the economy-centred logic of education is also expressed in the *collège*. This economic imperative is already present in the argument for the development of a higher level of general education, which is considered a factor for economic growth in human capital theory, that was mobilised by Giscard. However, the economic logic of education is also actualised in the introduction of 'l'éducation manuelle et technique' which was obligatory for

all pupils as a core subject and intended to 'mettre très tôt les jeunes en contact avec les réalités du monde industriel dans lequel ils vivent' (1976 pamphlet). Additionally, article 4 of the *loi Haby* states that, of the optional subjects made available in the *cycle d'orientation* 'certains préparent à une formation professionnelle; ces derniers peuvent comporter des stages contrôlés par l'État et accomplis auprès de professionnels agréés', incorporating an economy-centred logic of education into the fabric of the school.

The long-awaited definition of a *socle commun de connaissances et de compétences* by *décret* 2006-830 of 11 July 2006 following the *loi Fillon* of 23 April 2005 and the recent redefinition of a *socle commun de connaissances, de compétences et de culture* established by *décret* 2015-372 of 31 March 2015 following the *loi Peillon* of 8 July 2013, which defined the curriculum to be covered over the course of compulsory education in France, i.e. until the end of *collège*, continued to reiterate this hybrid programme.[128] The community-centred orientation of these documents is apparent in the common and compulsory nature of these programmatic documents, which both include elements of civic education (2006 - *6. Les compétences sociales et civiques*; 2015 - *Domaine 3 - La formation de la personne et du citoyen*); the preamble of the first declaring that it constitutes 'le ciment de la Nation' (2006-830: 3) and the second that it presents the basis of a common culture (annex of 2015-372). The economy-centred orientation of the institution is also present in these documents. As Laval et al. (2011) noted, the seventh point of the 2006 *socle*, 'L'autnomie et l'initiative' seems to imply an apprenticeship in

[128] For a consideration of the long and problematic formulation of the *socle commun*, see Ahearne (2014: 38-53) and Raulin (2006: 127-154).

entrepreneurship, which remains a reference in the 2015 *socle*[129] alongside a number of references to understanding the economic world and processes of production. Also the 2013 *loi Peillon* modified the *collège* section of the *code de l'éducation* to state that 'un parcours individuel d'information, d'orientation et de découverte du monde économique et professionnel est proposé à chaque élève' (Art. 47).

Finally, the individual-centred programme of the *collège* is also present in both with a continuing reference to the importance of the personal realisation and autonomy of every student. The preamble of the 2015 *socle* for example, states that the intention of the *socle* is to enable each student to 's'épanouir personnellement.'

'[U]ne entreprise qui n'a plus que des gestionnaires': modulatory governance and the *collège*

As Prost (2013: 201-202) notes, this new institution was soon struggling to accommodate the heterogeneous pupils in its undifferentiated classes with high levels of violence and so, in 1981, the new *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* Alain Savary commissioned a report on the *collège* under the direction of Louis Legrand. This report, given to the minister in January 1983, recommended that *collèges* should be adapted to their local situation and pupils. This recommendation that can be seen as a further intensification of the disciplinary '[p]rincipe de la modulation de la peine' (SP: 314) was an extension of the same logic behind the successful introduction of

[129] 'L'élève sait prendre des initiatives, entreprendre et mettre en oeuvre des projets, après avoir évalué les conséquences de son action ; il prépare ainsi son orientation future et sa vie d'adulte.' *Domaine 3 - La formation de la personne et du citoyen*, *Décret* 2015-372.

the *Zones d'éducation prioritaire* (ZEP) at the *rentrée* of 1982. These recommendations can be seen to have led to the decentralisation of powers to *collèges* as *établissements publics locaux d'enseignement* (EPLE) following the laws of 22 July 1983 and 25 January 1985 and to the first *assouplissement* of the *carte scolaire* in 1984 that would encourage the development of a quasi-market in education (Van Zanten and Obin 2008: 17-19).

As we will see below, each of these measures will be seen to enable a shift towards the immanent co-construction of the school institution indicative of control in place of the centralised direction of the school by its central *propriétaire*.

A - *Établissements public locaux d'enseignement* and local initiatives

Based upon 'l'idée que la gestion locale garantit une meilleure prise en compte des spécificités du terrain et une meilleure efficacité de l'action public' (A. Legrand 2000: 96), the decentralisation acts of 1983 and 1985 codified both *collèges* and *lycées* as relatively autonomous EPLE, which were provided with a budget to invest in their development by the regional authority (*département* for *collèges*, region for *lycées*), thereby creating a second, regional centre of authority alongside the Ministry of Education's regional *académies*, and expected to engage with the particularities of their local environment and so-called *communauté éducative*. To effect this engagement, EPLE were to have a *conseil d'administration* made up not only of representatives of the institution's management and staff but also representatives from the local community (such as the mayor, or important local businessmen), and members elected by parents and students. This *conseil* became required by the 1989 *loi*

*J*ospin, to not only decide upon their own internal disciplinary policies and so forth, but to regularly (re-)elaborate their own distinctive *projet d'établissement* which establishes the objectives for the institution in question and the programmes by which these objectives would be achieved. This *dispositif*, strengthened to include greater possibilities of experimentation and autonomy in 2005, carried forward the objective of adapting the *collège* to its situation and population and also of involving all members of the *communauté educative* in the operation of the *collège* and the education it delivers, as was set out in an official *circulaire* published by the Ministry of Education on 2 June 1982. The 2013 *loi Peillon* proceeded to strengthen the influence of the school's local commune through the number of representatives on the *conseil d'administration* and the possibility of signing tripartite contracts with them and the regional authority (Simon et al. 2010: 328-348; Toulemonde 2013: 69-72).

Although part of the tasks of the EPLE was to enact national policies at the local level through their distinctive *projets d'établissement*, the creation of this alternative centre of power in the *collège* that could call upon the extra support of the local community or the financial backing of the *département*'s *conseil général* meant that the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale* no longer held a monopoly over the constitution of this institution and its practices (Dutercq 2000: 17).

B - *Le marché scolaire*

This loosening of the *carte scolaire* in 1984 that enabled families to choose to send their children to a school outside of their sector was repeated a

number times in the future.[130] The development of a quasi-market in education can be fruitfully compared to the authoritarian operation of the *carte scolaire*, discussed earlier in the context of the completion of the disciplinary *dispositif* of education in the 1960s, to highlight how this marketplace reduces the hierarchical authority of the state to determine the contours and operation of the educational institutions.

Whilst the operation of the central *carte scolaire* directed pupils as national investments of human capital, this introduction of choice enabled families to refer to their own criteria. Indeed, as Derouet and Dutercq (1997: 51) note '[l]e marché offre la liberté du choix mais ne dit pas comment choisir' and so a variety of consumer demands could be expressed. Whilst some parents seek access to certain subject options or academic support programmes, others will seek a welcoming environment, proximity to a particular area or what they consider to be the right mix of pupils (Duru-Bellat and Van Zanten 2012: 200-202). When confronted with these demands and competition for pupils, the EPLE respond by developing *projets d'établissement* that would help attract the pupils they want (Van Zanten and Obin 2008: 61-72).

These administrative changes result in what Choukri ben Ayed has referred to in 2009 as a 'nouvel ordre éducatif local' and Philippe Périer has described in 2010 as 'l'ordre scolaire négocié'. In these circumstances the school is no longer an enclosed space organised under a single central

[130] For details of these *assouplissements* see Van Zanten and Obin (2008: 17-23)

authority but rather an ongoing process of negotiation in which there are only *gestionnaires* (PP: 245).[131]

Conclusion

In this final chapter we continued to trace the development of the French education system through the twentieth century through attention to ongoing efforts to intensify the operation of power in service of the order-words of community, the individual and the economy. Having considered the emergence of new discourses and practices as part of this intensification, such as the idea of an *école unique* and practices of *orientation*, we saw the completion of a centralised disciplinary *dispositif* that maintained three separate enclosures analogous to those we had seen in the previous chapter before the limitations of such enclosures were identified and the intensification of power strategies eventually led to the establishment of the contemporary *collège* as a unified pedagogical space at the confluence of the three disciplinary logics that we have considered in the last two chapters. We then considered how this new institution expressed the emergence of a *dispositif* of control in the French education system. We concluded the chapter by examining the modulation of disciplinary logics that marks the *collège* to show that it constituties a dividual institution of control and then briefly considered how ongoing efforts to intensify the operation of this new *dispositif* further

[131] For further consideration and examples of the modulation of *collèges* and EPLE through decentralised governance practices and market pressures, see also Ahearne (2014: 55-58); Bouvier (2012); Buisson-Fenet (2008: 42-48, 71-81); Derouet and Dutercq (1997); Duru-Bellat and Van Zanten (2012); Dutercq (2000); Morel (2002); Van Zanten (2011: 86-113); and Van Zanten et al. (2002).

contributed to the emergence of strategies indicative of control that, through the decentralised powers of the EPLE and operation of a quasi-market of education, enabled the co-constitution of these *dispositifs* as ‘une même entreprise qui n’a plus que des gestionnaires’ (PP: 245) rather than their submission to a central proprietor.

Conclusion

In this thesis we have examined Gilles Deleuze's 1990 (PP: 236-238, 240-247) claim that, in the post-war period, we are experiencing the decline of the disciplinary society described by Foucault (SP) and the emergence of control societies in relation to the development of the French education system. In particular, we have examined this assertion in relation to the eventual emergence, through a process of the intensification of the exercise of power (Nealon 2008), of the institution of the French *collège* as a *dispositif* of power that, we argue, expresses this shift from discipline to control.

In the first chapter, we examined what Deleuze meant by his assertion of a shift from a disciplinary society to a control society, how this might occur and how this shift might manifest itself in institutions of education. Reviewing Foucault's theory of power and relating it to Deleuze and Guattari's (A-O; MP) concept of desire, we saw that institutions, such as the school, can be understood as *dispositifs* of power or *agencements* of desire, for Foucault and Deleuze and Guattari respectively, which gain their consistency from the regular deployment and articulation of discursive and non-discursive elements in function of producing a particular effect. We then noted that the concepts of discipline and control referred to abstract strategies, or diagrams, that could be actualised in various concrete *dispositifs* of power and the regularity of the deployment of such a strategy would allow us to identify a given *dispositif* as disciplinary or of control, for example. By extension we established that the generalisation of a such a diagram of power relations in a given society would allow us to determine that society as a society of that diagram of power. We

noted therefore that, in positing a shift from a disciplinary society to societies of control, Deleuze is suggesting a shift from a society in which the strategy of discipline is generalised to one dominated by the diagram of control. Taking Foucault's account of the emergence of a disciplinary society from the society of sovereign power as illustrative example, we then noted how such an epochal change occurs through gradual and piecemeal innovations and generalisations of new practices. This process, we argue, following Nealon (2008) results from a constant intensification of the exercise of power, understood, as how an exercise of power comes to be more concentrated or intensive, extensive and efficient in its action (Ibid. 32), which we relate to Foucault's (2001: 299-300) account of the emergence and development of *dispositifs* as the continuous process of 'perpétuel remplissement stratégique' of a *dispositif* in response to its set objective, or what we might call, following Deleuze and Guattari (MP: 96-97, 128, 135-136), its order-word (*mot d'ordre*). Having considered the type of shift posited by Deleuze and how such shifts might occur, we then examined Foucault's and Deleuze's texts, as well as other theoretical sources and sociological accounts, to identify a number of traits of discipline and of control. On one hand, the exercise of discipline indicated the operation of an enclosed space, or series thereof, by a regular and hierarchically organised *dispositif*, converging towards a central authority, which would function as a distinct mould to subject individuals within its enclosures to a fixed set of norms responding to the strategic objective, or *mot d'ordre*, given by its central authority. Control, on the other hand, features shifting and receding normative demands derived from a modulation of various *mots d'ordre* and the continuous immanent composition of a *dispositif* in a process in which there is

no central authority and all participants contribute to the ongoing *entreprise* of its production.

To conclude this chapter, referring to the small number of works that had considered the development of a school *dispositif* of control, we also considered how the strategy of control might be expressed in the *dispositif* of the school, noting that a school of control might be marked by an overlapping of multiple normative programmes across the space of the school, the decline of hierarchical authority over the school and a more participatory and immanent system of governance, or inflationary academic demands that make the school institution a necessary but insufficient stage of education in the face of a receding normative horizon. We considered how the *collège* manifested the first two of these features in the concluding part of the third chapter.

In the second chapter we traced, over the course of the long nineteenth century, the emergence of a tripartite disciplinary education system that would be consolidated under the Third Republic and which would form the starting point from which the contemporary education system emerges in the twentieth century. Indeed, we argue that this disciplinary education system corresponds to Deleuze's claim that 'les *sociétés disciplinaires* [...] atteignent à leur apogée au début du XXe [siècle]' (PP : 240). We show that the republican school consolidated under the Third Republic was, in fact, composed of three separate disciplinary orders of education, each with their own personnel, institutions, diplomas, and hierarchically constructed *dispositifs* of administration and inspection that converged towards the central authority of their own separate *directions* within the Ministry of Education. These three disciplinary *dispositifs* each responded primarily to a different strategic objective or order-word and

actualised within its disciplinary institutions logics that centred on these objectives, subordinating the operation of power in service of others. The community-centred logic of education sought to form members of the community by teaching a common culture of shared values and references that emphasised essential knowledge and practical knowledge and was the primary logic actualised in the free education offered by *l'enseignement primaire*. *L'enseignement secondaire*, on the other hand, was primarily oriented by the order-word of the individual and actualised an individual-centred logic of education that was animated by the objective of the full and disinterested realisation of its pupils' potentials as individuals, understood at the time to refer to the norm of the ideal extensively cultured and rational individual. Lastly, *l'enseignement technique et professionnel* was oriented by the order-word of the economy and actualised an economy-centred logic of education that sought to produce economically useful individuals by teaching relevant vocational knowledge and subjecting pupils to the norms of future employment. The emergence of each of these *dispositifs* and their completion over this period illustrated the process of the intensification of the exercise of power in service of each of these order-words as a driver of historical change, as suggested by Nealon (2008), as the initial disparate attempts to respond to these strategic objectives came to be institutionalised and then expand to form complete, hierarchical disciplinary edifices. As we demonstrated with the case study of the EPS in the inter-war years, the enclosure of these *dispositifs* and the divisions between them were shown to be strong, affirming their primary orientations by their respective logics of education.

Our third and final chapter sought to show the emergence of the *collège* from the continuing development of the *dispositif* of French education, driven by the logic of the intensification of the exercise of power, and then underline how this new middle school indicates a break from the disciplinary diagram and the emergence of a *dispositif* indicative of the post-war shift from a disciplinary society and towards a society of control asserted by Deleuze. Beginning from the tripartite system of disciplinary *dispositifs* established under the Third Republic, whose emergence was shown in chapter two, the process of intensification of the exercise of power is pursued, in our third chapter, through debates regarding the limits of the tripartite disciplinary structures of the school and the positing of potential solutions that began in the pre-war period and were followed by an iterative process of reform and continued critiques as new limitations were identified or reforms were shown to be insufficient. This process eventually saw the establishment in the 1960s of an integrated disciplinary *dispositif* of education that, through a hierarchically organised structure converging towards the authority of the *ministère de l'Éducation nationale*, continued to operate a series of distinct disciplinary enclosures analogous to those of the Third Republic before continued critiques of the separation of pupils between distinct disciplinary enclosures identified these enclosures as limitations upon the exercise of power in service of the order-words of community, the individual and the economy, and converged upon the desirability of eliminating these divisions and the creation of a single unified *dispositif* of education at the level of the *premier cycle du second degré*, the contemporary *collège*.

Our final step in the last chapter was to consider a limited number of features of the *collège* to illustrate how it no longer actualises a disciplinary model of power but indicates the emergent system of control outlined by Deleuze. Chief among these features is the fact that the *collège* does not constitute a disciplinary enclosure that operates as a distinct mould in response to a primary orientation by a single *mot d'ordre*. Instead, as indicated by the continued repetition of the divergent community-, individual- and economy-centred logics of education in the various texts defining its role and function, including the *socle commun des connaissances et des compétences* of 2007 and the updated *socle commun de connaissances, de compétences et de culture* of 2016, the *collège* constitutes a dividual institution of control marked by the continuous modulation of these normative demands and as such constitutes 'un moulage auto-déformant qui changerait continûment, d'un instant à l'autre' (PP: 242). Secondly, the development of the governance structures of the *collège* since its establishment, illustrated by the decentralisation of powers with the status of EPLE, which encouraged the input of local actors and the development of local variations between *collèges*, and the development of a quasi-market in education, which gives families the chance to express their own values and to influence the flows of pupils between the institutions of the education system, indicate the movement from the process of *assujettissement social*, where one is subjected to an external transcendant object, that we noted, in chapter one, to be indicative of disciplinary regimes, to a process of *asservissement machinique* where one is involved with the common, immanent constitution of a guiding object through a feedback loop, argued, also in chapter one, to be indicative of a system of control (MP: 570-573). These

examples illustrate how the *collège* has departed from the disciplinary model of the school as one of the many 'milieux analogiques distincts qui convergent vers un propriétaire, État ou puissance privée', indicative of the enclosed institutions of the disciplinary society, to resemble 'une même entreprise qui n'a plus que des gestionnaires' (PP: 245).[132]

There are a number of significant features of this thesis that constitute original contributions to scholarship on the French education system and in both Foucault and Deleuze studies. Firstly, this thesis constitutes the first application of the Deleuze's theory of the emergence of a society of control and the decline of the disciplinary society to the study of the development of the education system in France and the emergence of the *dispositif* of the *collège*. By returning Deleuze's theory to the context in which it was produced, we may recognise more stimuli to the development of this theory and links between the Deleuze's work and historical developments in France. Secondly, this thesis is the first to examine the development of the education system in France as a history of dispositifs of power and apply Nealon's (2008: 38) assertion that the 'the logic of intensification is Foucault's primary mechanism for explaining historical change' to consider this process of development. This approach, complemented by the perspective of the intensification of power as a driver of historical change, enabled us to give context to the development of new institutions, theories and practices and may prove useful to examining the emergence of other *dispositifs* or strategies of power in other areas of study.

[132] If more time and space were available for this study, we may have examined a number of other features of the *collège* at this point that suggest a departure from the disciplinary *dispositif*. In particular, it would have been interesting to highlight how, in the context of the policy of *80% au bac* and broader academic inflation, the *collège* can no longer act as a disciplinary institution that conferred qualifications that could reliably afford the recipients a given position, but rather only acts as a *contrôlat* threatening exclusion or acceptance in a society of control where 'on n'en finit jamais avec rien' (PP: 243).

By highlighting the specificity of the *collège* as the institution which emerges to mark the development of a new system of control, this thesis may contribute to a new approach to the apparent problematic nature of the *collège* as a more significant marker of a crisis of disciplinary enclosure that exceeds the stale debates regarding the crisis of the French school. Indeed, perhaps, as Prost (2004: 711) suggests, '[l]a vraie réforme ne consiste pas à sortir de la crise, mais à se donner les moyens de l'assumer lucidement, pour la rendre féconde'. Further study of the development of the French education system in the context of this posited shift from discipline to control could help contribute to the further exploration of this problem and overcome the polarised debates regarding a *crise scolaire*. Potential subjects of future study that might be of interest in this process might include an assessment of how this shift from discipline to control relates to the development of pedagogical practices and curricular content, or to the phenomena of *échec scolaire* and academic inflation.[133] We might wish to examine how this shift affects other institutions as well or pursue a similar study of the emergence of *dispositifs* of control elsewhere that might inform discussion.

The *collège* has again been the subject of controversy recently following the sensationalist reception of the attempted reform of the *collège* launched by the *ministre de l'Éducation nationale* Najat Vallaud-Belkacem in 2015 that was to come into effect at the *rentrée* of 2016, but it will likely persist in its current form as a comprehensive middle school for all French pupils aged 11 to 15. Vallaud-Belkacem's reform, which sought to introduce interdisciplinary studies into the *collège*, reduce the offer of Latin and Greek

[133] For some consideration of the issues of academic inflation and the perils of *échec scolaire*, see Duru-Bellat (2006) and Cahuc et al. (2013).

and eliminate bilingual sections offered by schools to a small minority of pupils in order to introduce a more standardised curriculum, was hotly debated in the run up to the 2017 presidential elections, with most candidates rejecting it whilst Marine Le Pen went further to suggest the abolition of the *collège unique*,[134] and the new president Emmanuel Macron's education minister, Michel Blanquer, soon reversed the measures provided for in this reform. The fact that this reform was opposed for trying to impose greater standardisation and remove an optional course might in fact suggest that the poorly defined identity of the *collège*, as a modulatory dividual institution of control, and the relative autonomy that it enjoys as an EPLE makes it more likely to adapt to local demands and survive. Indeed, a recent study produced by the successor organisation to the *Commissariat général du Plan*, *France Stratégie*, underlined the continuing importance of the three divergent logics of education oriented towards the formation of a community, the realisation of individual potentials and the preparation of pupils for economic activity (Ly 2016: 111) that had found in the unified *collège* proposed in the 1970s the means of intensifying the operation of power in service of each of them. It would seem likely that any proposal for replacing the *collège* would need to offer the continued intensification of the exercise of power in service of these three logics in order to gain approval. Until such a proposal emerges therefore, we believe that the *collège*, although often little-appreciated, will persist for the foreseeable future. Nonetheless, when discussing the emergence of the society of control and changing practices of education, Deleuze (1987) warned of the unforeseeable potential forms that the emerging power of control might bring

[134] 'La réforme du collège. Comparateur de programmes', *Lemonde.*fr, URL : http://www.lemonde.fr/programmes/systeme-educatif/la-reforme-du-college [accessed 24/01/2018]

forth: ‘ça pourra se faire tout à fait autrement, cela se fera par Minitel, enfin [...] tout ce que vous voudrez, l’épatant ce serait les formes de contrôle.’

Bibliography

Agamben, Giorgio. 2009. *What is an Apparatus? and Other Essays*, trans. by David Kishik and Stefan Pedatella (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press)

Ahearne, Jeremy. 2010. *Intellectuals, Culture and Public Policy in France: Approaches from the Left* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press)

——— 2014. *Government through Culture and the Contemporary French Right* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan)

d'Alembert, Jean Le Rond. 2010. 'D'Alembert contre les humanités classiques' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 405-408

Allègre, Claude, François Dubet and Philippe Meirieu (eds.). 2004. *Le Rapport Langevin-Wallon* (Paris: Mille et une nuits)

Alix, Philippe, Renaud d'Enfert and Hélène Gispert. 2015. 'Des commissions pour réformer les disciplines (1945-1980)' in d'Enfert, Renaud and Joël Lebaume (eds.). 2015. *Réformer les disciplines: Les savoirs scolaires à l'épreuve de la modernité 1945-1985* (Rennes: PUR), 85-111

Althusser, Louis. 1976. *Positions* (Paris: Éditions sociales)

Aubert, Nicole. 2006a. 'Un individu paradoxal' in Aubert, Nicole (ed.). 2006. *L'individu hypermoderne* (Saint-Agne: Éditions Érès)

——— 2006b. 'L'intensité de soi' in Aubert, Nicole. (ed.) 2006. *L'individu hypermoderne* (Saint-Agne: Érès)

——— (ed.) 2006. *L'individu hypermoderne* (Saint-Agne: Érès)

——— 2010a. ‘La société hypermoderne: une société "par excès"’ in Aubert, Nicole (ed.). 2010. *La société hypermoderne: ruptures et contradictions* (Paris: L’Harmattan)

——— (ed.). 2010. *La société hypermoderne: ruptures et contradictions* (Paris: L’Harmattan)

Audigier, François. 2010. ‘L’éducation civique’ in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l’école: Anthologie de l’éducation et de l’enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 303-310

Audureau, Jean-Pierre. 2003. ‘Assujettissement et subjectivation: réflexions sur l’usage de Foucault en éducation’ *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 143: 17-29

Avanzini, Guy. 1970. ‘Pour une école nouvelle: Formation des maîtres et recherche en éducation’, *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, 10: 43-44

Baczko, Bronislaw (ed.). 2000. *Une éducation pour la démocratie: Textes et projets de l’époque révolutionnaire* (Geneva: Droz)

Ball, Stephen J. (ed.). 1990. *Foucault and Education: Disciplines and Knowledge* (London: Routledge)

——— 2013. *Foucault, Power, and Education* (New York: Routledge)

Barreau, Jean-Michel and Jean-François Garcia. 1998. ‘L’école unique pendant l’entre-deux-guerres’ in Barreau, Jean-Michel, Jean-François Garcia and Louis Legrand. 1998. *L’école unique (de 1914 à nos jours)* (Paris: PUF), 5-26

Barreau, Jean-Michel, Jean-François Garcia and Louis Legrand. 1998. *L’école unique (de 1914 à nos jours)* (Paris: PUF)

Barry, Andrew, Thomas Osborne and Nikolas Rose (eds.) 1996. *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government* (London: UCL Press)

Barus-Michel, Jacqueline. 2010. 'La transgression comme norme de la société hypermoderne' in Aubert, Nicole (ed.) 2010. *La société hypermoderne: ruptures et contradictions* (Paris: L'Harmattan)

Baudelot, Christian and Roger Establet. 1971. *L'École capitaliste en France* (Paris: François Maspero)

Bauman, Zygmunt. 2001 'Foreword by Zygmunt Bauman: Individually, Together' in Beck, Ulrich and Elisabeth Beck-Gernsheim. 2001. *Individualization: Institutionalized Individualism and its Social and Political Consequences* (London: Sage)

——— 2004. *Wasted Lives: Modernity and its Outcasts* (Cambridge: Polity)

Beck, Ulrich. 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*, trans. by Mark Ritter (London: Sage)

Beck, Ulrich. and Elisabeth Beck-Gernsheim. 2001. *Individualization: Institutionalized Individualism and its Social and Political Consequences* (London: Sage)

Belhoste, Bruno. 2010. 'Les examens' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 251-258

Ben Ayed, Choukri. 2009. *Le nouvel ordre éducatif local: Mixité, disparité, luttes locales* (Paris: PUF)

Binkley, Sam and Jorge Capetillo (eds.). 2009. *A Foucault for the 21st Century: Governmentality, Biopolitics and Discipline in the new millenium* (Newcastle-Upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing)

Bishop, Marie-France and Clémence Cardon-Quint. 2015. 'L'enseignement du français et la fin des ordres scolaires, de 1945 aux années 1980' in d'Enfert, Renaud and Joël Lebaume (eds.). 2015. *Réformer les disciplines: Les savoirs scolaires à l'épreuve de la modernité 1945-1985* (Rennes: PUR), 113-135

Blanchard, Marianne and Joanie Cayouette-Remblière. 2016. *Sociologie de l'école* (Paris: La Découverte)

Boissinot, Alain. 2013. 'Le lycée, à la croisée des chemins' in Szymankiewicz, Christine (ed.). 2013. *Le système éducatif en France*, 4th edn. (Paris: La documentation Française)

Bonta, Mark. 2013. '"We're Tired of Trees": Machinic University Geography Teaching After Deleuze' in Semetsky, Inna and Diana Masny (eds.). 2013. *Deleuze and Education* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press), 57-73

Boudinet, Gilles. 2012. *Deleuze et l'anti-pédagogue: vers une esthétique de l'éducation* (Paris: L'Harmattan)

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1966. 'L'École conservatrice: Les inégalités devant l'école et devant la culture', *Revue française de sociologie*, 7.3: 325-347

Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron. 1964. *Les hérétiers: Les étudiants et la culture* (Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit)

——— 1970. *La reproduction: Éléments pour une théorie du système d'enseignement* (Paris: Minuit)

Bousquet, Pierre, Roland Drago, Paul Gerbod, Claude Goyard, Jean Imbert, Stéphane Rials, Guy Thuillier and Jean Tulard. 1983. *Histoire de l'administration de l'enseignement en France, 1789-1981* (Geneva: Droz)

Bouvier, Alain. 2012. *La gouvernance des systèmes éducatifs* (Paris: PUF)

Bowman, Mary Jean. 1966. 'The Human Investment Revolution in Economic Thought', *Sociology of Education,* 29.2: 111-137

Bret, Dominique. 2015. 'Les professeurs d'enseignement général de collège, un corps entre deux ordres' in D'Enfert and Lebaume (eds.). 2015. *Réformer les disciplines: Les savoirs scolaires à l'épreuve de la modernité 1945-1985* (Rennes: PUR)

Briand, Jean-Pierre and Jean-Michel Chapoulie. 1981. 'L'enseignement primaire supérieur des garçons en France, 1918-1942', *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales,* 39: 87-111

——— 2011. *Les collèges du peuple: L'enseignement primaire supérieur et le développement de la scolarisation prolongée sous la Troisième République* (Rennes: PUR)

Buchanan, Ian. 2015. 'Assemblage Theory and Its Discontents', *Deleuze Studies,* 9.3: 382-392

Buisson, Ferdinand. 1911a. 'Politique' in Buisson, Ferdinand (ed.). 1911. *Nouveau Dictionnaire de Pédagogie et d'Instruction Primaire,* 2nd edn., URL: http://www.inrp.fr/edition-electronique/lodel/dictionnaire-ferdinand-buisson/document.php?id=3406 [last accessed: 24/4/15]

——— 1911b. 'Inspecteurs d'académie' in Buisson, Ferdinand (ed.). 1911. *Nouveau Dictionnaire de Pédagogie et d'Instruction Primaire,* 2nd

edn., URL: http://www.inrp.fr/edition-electronique/lodel/dictionnaire-ferdinand-buisson/document.php?id=2914 [last accessed: 29/5/15]

——— 1911c. 'Préfet' in Buisson, Ferdinand (ed.). 1911. *Nouveau Dictionnaire de Pédagogie et d'Instruction Primaire*, 2nd edn., URL: http://www.inrp.fr/edition-electronique/lodel/dictionnaire-ferdinand-buisson/document.php?id=3434 [last accessed: 29/5/15]

——— 1911d. 'Instituteurs, institutrice' in Buisson, Ferdinand (ed.). 1911. *Nouveau Dictionnaire de Pédagogie et d'Instruction Primaire*, 2nd edn., URL: http://www.inrp.fr/edition-electronique/lodel/dictionnaire-ferdinand-buisson/document.php?id=2926 [last accessed: 6/8/15]

——— 2010 [1887]. 'L'instruction civique ou l'introduction de la politique à l'école' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 680-681

Buisson-Fenet, Hélène. 2008. *L'administration de l'Éducation nationale* (Paris: PUF)

Bulle, Nathalie. 2012a. 'Collège unique: le bilan', *Cahiers Français*, 368: 24-30

——— 2012b. *Républicains contre pédagogistes: Décryptage du débat pédagogique*. <http://education.francetv.fr/dossier/republicains-contre-pedagogistes-decryptage-du-debat-pedagogique-o29265> [last accessed: 13/3/2015]

Burroughs, William S. 1998. *Word Virus: The William S. Burroughs Reader*, ed. by Grauerholz, James and Ira Silverberg (New York: Grove Press)

——— 2008. *Junky* (London: Penguin)

——— 2010a. *Naked Lunch: The restored text* (London: Fourth Estate)

——— 2010b. *The Soft Machine* (London: Fourth Estate)

——— 2010c. *The Ticket That Exploded* (London: Fourth Estate)

——— 2010d. *Nova Express* (London: Penguin)

——— 2013a. 'The Limits of Control' in Lotringer, Sylvère (ed.) 2013b. *Schizo-Culture: The Book 1978* (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e)), 38-42

——— 2013b. 'William Burroughs Q&A' in Lotringer, Sylvère and David Morris (eds.). 2013. *Schizo-Culture: The Event 1975* (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e)), 161-165

Bussolini, Jeffrey. 2010. 'What is a Dispositive?' *Foucault Studies*, 10: 85-107

Cahuc, Pierre; Stéphane Carcillo; Olivier Galland and André Zylberberg. 2013. *La Machine à trier: Comment la France divise sa jeunesse*, 2nd edn. (Paris: Groupe Eyrolles)

Capelle, Jean. 1966. *L'École de demain reste à faire* (Paris: PUF)

Caplat, Guy. 1984. 'Pour une histoire de l'administration de l'enseignement en France', *Histoire de l'éducation*, 22: 27-58

——— 1985. 'Pour une histoire de l'administration de l'enseignement en France (suite)', *Histoire de l'éducation*, 25: 11-51

Cardon-Quint, Clémence, Renaud d'Enfert and Hélène Gispert. 2015. 'Démocratiser, orienter, sélectionner: l'enseignement du français et des mathématiques dans le second degré (1945-années 1980)' in d'Enfert, Renaud and Joël Lebaume (eds.). 2015. *Réformer les disciplines: Les savoirs scolaires à l'épreuve de la modernité 1945-1985* (Rennes: PUR), 37-60

Castellanet, Gilbert (ed.). 2011. *Le collège unique ou L'intelligence humiliée: La fin des utopies?* (Paris: François-Xavier de Guibert)

Champy, Philippe and Christiane Étévé (eds.). 2005. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l'éducation et de la formation*, 3rd edn. (Paris: Retz)

Chapoulie, Jean-Michel. 2006. 'La sélection sociale dans l'école républicaine' in Troger, Vincent (ed.). 2006. *Une histoire de l'Éducation et de la formation* (Auxerre: Sciences Humaines), 111-120

——— 2010. *L'École d'État conquiert la France: Deux siècles de politique scolaire* (Rennes: PUR)

Charbonnier, Sébastien. 2009. *Deleuze pédagogue: La fonction transcendantale de l'apprentissage et du problème* (Paris: L'Harmattan)

Charlot, Bernard. 1995. 'La planification de l'éducation en France: l'évolution des problématiques' in Charlot, Bernard and Jacky Beillerot (eds.). 1995. *La Construction des politiques d'éducation et de formation* (Paris: PUF), 79-101

Château, Jean. 2010. 'Qu'est-ce que la culture générale?' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 938-941

Chervel, André and Marie-Madeleine Compère. 1997. 'Les humanités dans l'histoire de l'enseignement français', *Histoire de l'éducation*, 74: 5-38

Chevallier, Pierre and Bernard Grosperrin (eds.). 1971. *L'Enseignement français de la Révolution à nos jours, Tome II: Documents* (Paris: Mouton & Cie.)

Choat, Simon. 2010. *Marx Through Post-Structuralism: Lyotard, Derrida, Foucault, Deleuze* (London: Continuum)

CNESCO. 2016. *Comment l'école amplifie-t-elle les inégalités sociales et migratoires?* (Paris: CNESCO)

Cole, David R.. 2011. *Educational Life-Forms: Deleuzian Teaching and Learning Practice* (Rotterdam: Sense Publishers)

——— 2013. 'Affective Literacies: Deleuze, Discipline and Power' in Semetsky, Inna and Diana Masny (eds.). 2013. *Deleuze and Education* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press), 94-111

Commissariat général du Plan. 1971. *Sixième Plan de développement économique et social (1971-1975)* (Paris: Journaux officiels)

Commission d'études sur la fonction enseignante dans le second degré [Joxe commission]. 1972. *Rapport de la Commission d'études sur la fonction enseignante dans le second degré* (Paris: La Documentation française)

Commission ministérielle d'étude. 2004. 'La Réforme de l'enseignement, dit Rapport Langevin-Wallon' in Allègre et al. (eds.). 2004. *Le Rapport Langevin-Wallon* (Paris: Mille et une nuits), 13-102

Les Compagnons de l'Université nouvelle. 1998a. 'Extrait de *L'Université nouvelle* par "Les Compagnons", Tome I: *Les Principes*, p. 21-27 (Paris, Fischbacher, 1919, 2e édition)' in Barreau, Jean-Michel, Jean-François Garcia and Louis Legrand. 1998. *L'école unique (de 1914 à nos jours)* (Paris: PUF), 63-67

——— 1998b. 'Extrait de *L'Université nouvelle* par "Les Compagnons", Tome II: *Les applications de la doctrine*, p. 48-54 (Paris, Fischbacher, 1919, 2e édition)' in Barreau, Jean-Michel, Jean-François Garcia and

Louis Legrand. 1998. *L'école unique (de 1914 à nos jours)* (Paris: PUF), 68-71

——— 2010 [1918]. 'Une nouvelle espérance après la guerre de 1914: l'école unique' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 799-802

Compère, Marie-Madeleine. 2006. 'L'école des élites entre le XVIe et le XIXe siècle' in Vincent Troger (ed.). 2006. *Une histoire de l'Éducation et de la formation* (Auxerre: Sciences Humaines), 33-39

——— 2010. 'Les humanités et le latin' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 277-284

Compère, Marie-Madeleine and Philippe Savoie. 2005. 'L'histoire de l'école et de ce qu'on y apprend', *Revue française de pédagogie*, 152: 107-146

Condorcet, Jean-Antoine Nicolas de Caritat de. 2000 [1792]. 'Rapport et projet de décret sur l'organisation générale de l'instruction publique. Présentés à l'Assemblée nationale au nom du Comité d'Instruction Publique, les 20 et 21 avril 1792' in Baczko, Bronislaw (ed.). 2000. *Une éducation pour la démocratie: Textes et projets de l'époque révolutionnaire* (Geneva: Droz), 181-261

Cournut, Jean. 2006. 'Les défoncés' in Aubert, Nicole (ed.). 2006. *L'individu hypermoderne* (Saint-Agne: Éditions Érès)

Courtebras, Bernard. 2008. *La Structure des hiérarchies scolaires: Histoire de l'organisation de l'enseignement professionnel et technique* (Paris: Publibooks)

Culler, Jonathan. 2006. 'Structuralism' in Kritzman, Lawrence D. (ed.). 2006. *The Columbia History of Twentieth-century French Thought* (New York: Columbia University Press), 110-117

Dancel, Brigitte. 2010. 'L'enseignement primaire' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 129-137

Danvers, Francis. 2005. 'L'Orientation' in Champy, Philippe and Christiane Étévé (eds.). 2005. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l'éducation et de la formation*, 3rd edn. (Paris: Retz), 687-692

——— 2010. 'Les Événements de "Mai-Juin 1968" et l'orientation scolaire et universitaire: Une question de sens', *TransFormations*, 3: 97-120

Daunou, Pierre-Claude-François. 2000. 'Rapport sur l'instruction publique (23 vendémaire, an IV)' in Baczko, Bronislaw (ed.). 2000. *Une éducation pour la démocratie: Textes et projets de l'époque révolutionnaire* (Geneva: Droz), 504-513

Dautresme, Isabelle. 2016. 'ESPE: "La formation des enseignants est désormais bien installée"', *VousNousIls*, URL: http://www.vousnousils.fr/2016/12/05/espe-la-formation-des-enseignants-est-desormais-bien-installee-596715 [Accessed: 5/12/2016]

Deacon, Roger. 2002. 'An analytics of power relations: Foucault on the history of discipline', *History of the Human Sciences*, 15.1: 89-117

Decaunes, Luc and Marie-Louise Cavalier. 1962. *Réformes et projets de réforme de l'enseignement français de la Révolution à nos jours (1789-1960)* (Paris: Institut Pédagogique National)

Delahaye, Jean-Paul. 2006. *Le collège unique, pour quoi faire? Les élèves en difficulté au cœur de la question* (Paris: Retz)

——— 2007. 'Le collège unique, miroir grossissant des difficultés de gouverner l'éducation', *Pouvoirs*, 122: 5-17

——— 2013. 'Le collège : une construction inachevée' in Szymankiewicz, Christine (ed.). 2013. *Le système éducatif en France*, 4th edn. (Paris: La documentation Française), 175-189

Deleuze, Gilles. 1983. *L'Image-mouvement: Cinéma 1* (Paris: Minuit)

——— 1985. *L'Image-temps: Cinéma 2* (Paris: Minuit)

——— 1986. *Foucault* (Paris: Minuit)

——— 1987. *Qu'est-ce que l'acte de création? Conférence donnée dans le cadre des mardis de la fondation Fémis - 17/05/1987*, URL: http://www.webdeleuze.com/php/texte.php?cle=134&groupe=Conf%E9rences&langue=1 [accessed: 29/9/2015]

——— 1988. *Le pli: Leibniz et le baroque* (Paris: Minuit)

——— 1992. 'Postscript on the Societies of Control', trans. by unknown [assumed to be Martin Joughin], *October*, 59: 3-7

——— 1995. *Negotiations: 1972-1990*, trans. by Martin Joughin (New York: Columbia University Press)

——— 2002 [1981] *Francis Bacon: Logique de la sensation*, (Paris: Seuil)

——— 2003a [1990]. *Pourparlers: 1972-1990*, (Paris: Minuit)

——— 2003b. *Deux Régimes de Fous: Textes et entretiens 1975-1995*, (Paris: Minuit)

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 1972. *L'Anti-Œdipe: Capitalisme et schizophrénie 1* (Paris: Minuit)

——— 1975. *Kafka: Pour une littérature mineure* (Paris: Minuit)

——— 1980. *Mille Plateaux: Capitalisme et Schizophrénie 2* (Paris: Minuit)

——— 2005 [1991]. Q*u'est-ce que la philosophie?* (Paris: Minuit)

——— 2004a. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (London: Continuum)

——— 2004b. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. by Brian Massumi (London: Continuum)

Deleuze, Gilles and Claire Parnet. 1996. *Dialogues* (Paris: Flammarion)

Demailly, Lise. 1991. *Le Collège: Crise, mythes et métiers* (Lille: Presses universitaires de Lille)

Derouet, Jean-Louis (ed.). 2003. *Le collège unique en question* (Paris: PUF)

——— 2003. 'L'avenir d'une illusion ou Comment refonder le projet du collège unique dans une société postmoderne' in Derouet (ed.). 2003. *Le collège unique en question* (Paris: PUF), 1-28

Derouet, Jean-Louis and Yves Dutercq. 1997. *L'établissement scolaire, autonomie locale et service public* (Paris: ESF/INRP)

Devolvé, Jean. 1998. 'Extrait de la *Revue de métaphysique et de morale* par Jean Devolvé (n° 3, février 1928, p. 409-419)' in Barreau, Jean-Michel, Jean-François Garcia and Louis Legrand. 1998. *L'école unique (de 1914 à nos jours)* (Paris: PUF), 80-90

Dorison, Catherine. 2010. 'Orienter selon les aptitudes. Enjeux institutionnels et pédagogiques, 1936-1959' in d'Enfert, Renaud and Pierre Kahn (eds.). 2010. *En attendant la réforme: Disciplines scolaires et politiques éducatives sous la Quatrième République* (Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble), 37-50

Dorison, Catherine and Pierre Kahn. 2016. ‘René Haby et le problème du collège unique: quelles alternatives aux filières?’ in Gutierrez and Legris (eds.). 2016. *Le Collège unique: Éclairages socio-historiques sur la loi du 11 juillet 1975* (Rennes: PUR), 119-141

Dosse, François. 2009. *Gilles Deleuze et Félix Guattari: Biographie croisée* (Paris: La Découverte)

——— 2012. *Histoire du structuralisme: Tome I: Le champ du signe 1945-1966* (Paris: La Découverte)

Dubet, François. 2002. *Le Déclin de l'institution*, (Paris: Éditions du Seuil)

——— 2014. ‘Foucault et l’école: Une absence d’usage’ in Oulc’hen, Hervé (ed.). 2014. *Usages de Foucault* (Paris: PUF), 231-250

Dubet, François, Alain Bergounioux, and Marie Duru-Bellat. 1999. *Le Collège de l'an 2000: rapport à la ministre déléguée chargée de l'enseignement scolaire* (Paris: La Documentation francaise) [URL: http://www.ladocumentationfrancaise.fr/var/storage/rapports-publics/994001548/0000.pdf [last accessed: 16/1/2015]]

Dubet, François and Marie Duru-Bellat. 2000. *L’hypocrisie scolaire: Pour un collège enfin démocratique* (Paris: Seuil)

Dubois, Patrick. 2007. ‘Figures de l’école juste et politique scolaire dans les années fondatrices de la Troisième République’, *Revue française de pédagogie*, 159: 13-21

Dumazedier, Joffre. 2005. ‘Culture générale’ in Champy, Philippe and Christiane Étévé (eds.). 2005. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l’éducation et de la formation*, 3rd edn. (Paris: Retz), 232-234

Durkheim, Émile. 1911. 'Education' in Buisson, Ferdinand (ed.). 1911. *Nouveau Dictionnaire de Pédagogie et d'Instruction Primaire*, 2nd edn., URL : http://www.inrp.fr/edition-electronique/lodel/dictionnaire-ferdinand-buisson/document.php?id=2630 [accessed 27/2/2013]

Durning, Paul and Dominique Fablet. 2005. 'Internat' in Champy, Philippe and Christiane Étévé (eds.). 2005. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l'éducation et de la formation*, 3rd edn. (Paris: Retz), 537-540

Duru-Bellat, Marie. 2006. 'De quelques effets pervers de l'expansion scolaire', *Formation emploi*, 95: 89-96

Duru-Bellat, Marie and Agnès Van Zanten. 2012. *Sociologie de l'école*. 4th edn. (Paris: Armand Colin)

Dutercq, Yves. 2000. *Politiques éducatives et évaluation: Querelles de territoires* (Paris: PUF)

Dutercq, Yves and Jean-Louis Derouet (eds.). 2004. *Le collège en chantier* (Saint-Fons: Institut national de recherche pédagogique)

d'Enfert, Renaud. 2007. 'L'introduction du travail manuel dans les écoles primaires de garçons, 1880-1900', *Histoire de l'éducation*, 113: 31-67

d'Enfert, Renaud and François Jacquet-Francillon. 2010. 'La classe et l'organisation pédagogique' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 227-234

d'Enfert, Renaud and Hélène Gispert. 2010. 'L'enseignement mathématique dans le primaire et le secondaire' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 333-341

d'Enfert, Renaud and Pierre Kahn (eds.). 2010. *En attendant la réforme: Disciplines scolaires et politiques éducatives sous la Quatrième République* (Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble)

d'Enfert, Renaud and Joël Lebaume (eds.). 2015. *Réformer les disciplines: Les savoirs scolaires à l'épreuve de la modernité 1945-1985* (Rennes: PUR)

Enriquez, Eugène. 2006. 'L'idéal type de l'individu hypermoderne: l'individu pervers?' in Aubert, Nicole (ed.). 2006. *L'individu hypermoderne*, (Saint-Agne: Éditions Érès)

Erner, Guillaume. 2011. *Sociologie des tendances* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France)

Étévé, Christiane. 2005. 'Institut national de recherche pédagogique (INDP)' in Champy, Philippe and Christiane Étévé (eds.). 2005. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l'éducation et de la formation*, 3rd edn. (Paris: Retz), 508-510

Fabre, Michel. 2002. 'Les controverses françaises sur l'école: la schizophrénie républicaine', *Éducation et francophonie*, 30.1: 45-65

Falzon, Christopher, Timothy O'Leary and Jana Sawicki (eds). 2013. *A Companion to Foucault* (Chichester: Wiley)

Félouzis, Georges. 2014. *Les Inégalités scolaires* (Paris: PUF)

Ferry, Jules. 2010a [1879]. 'La liberté de l'enseignement doit être subordonnée aux intérêts de l'État' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 619-621

——— 2010b [1882]. ‘L'école primaire élémentaire au début de la troisième République’ in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l’école: Anthologie de l’éducation et de l’enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 655-659

Figeat, Madeleine and Joël Lebeaume. 2015. ‘Des travaux manuels à la technologie: enjeux économiques et politiques (1945-1985)’ in d’Enfert, Renaud and Joël Lebeaume (eds.). 2015. *Réformer les disciplines: Les savoirs scolaires à l’épreuve de la modernité 1945-1985* (Rennes: PUR), 17-35

Forestier, Yann. 2010. ‘Mai 68 et les paradoxes de la modernisation de l’école’, *Carrefours de l’éducation*, 29: 181-196

Foucault, Michel. 1970. ‘Theatrum philosophicum’, *Critique*, 282: 885-908

——— 1975. *Surveiller et punir: Naissance de la prison* (Paris: Gallimard)

——— 1976. *Histoire de la sexualité: La volonté de savoir* (Paris: Gallimard)

——— 1997. *“Il faut defendre la société”: Cours au Collège de France (1975-1976)* (Paris: Seuil/Gallimard)

——— 2001. *Dits et écrits 1954-1988*, 2 vols, II: 1976-1988 (Paris: Gallimard)

——— 2004a. *Sécurité, Territoire, Population: Cours au Collège de France (1977-1978)* (Paris: Seuil/Gallimard)

——— 2004b. *Naissance de la biopolitique: Cours au Collège de France (1978-1979)* (Paris: Seuil/Gallimard)

——— 2004c. ‘Preface’ in Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. 2004a. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen R. Lane (London: Continuum)

Fouillée, Augustine [G. Bruno]. 1913. *Le Tour de la France par Deux Enfants*, 364th edn. (Paris: Eugène Belin)

Fournier, Martine and Vincent Troger (eds.). 2005. *Les mutations de l'école: Le regard des sociologues* (Paris: Sciences Humaines Editions)

Fuglsang, Martin and Bent Meier Sørensen (eds.). 2006. *Deleuze and the Social* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

Gauchet, Michel. 1985. 'L'école à l'école d'elle-même', *Le Débat*, 37: 55-86

De Gaulejac, Vincent. 2006. 'Le sujet manqué: L'individu face aux contradictions de l'hypermodernité' in Aubert, Nicole (ed.). 2006. *L'individu hypermoderne* (Saint-Agne: Éditions Érès)

——— 2010. 'Le sujet face aux contradictions de la société hypermoderne' in Aubert, Nicole (ed.). 2010. *La société hypermoderne: ruptures et contradictions* (Paris: L'Harmattan)

Gauthier, Roger-Francois. 2005. 'Baccalauréat' in Champy, Philippe and Christiane Étévé (eds.). 2005. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l'éducation et de la formation*, 3rd edn. (Paris: Retz), 121-123

Géminard, Lucien. 2010 [1967]. 'Pédagogie et technologie' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 949-952

Gerbod, Paul. 1979. 'L'inspection générale de l'instruction publique depuis 1802', *La Revue administrative*, 32.189: 257-263

——— 1983. 'L'administration de l'Instruction publique (1815-1870)' in Bousquet et al. 1983. *Histoire de l'administration de l'enseignement en France, 1789-1981* (Geneva: Droz), 19-36

Girard, Alain and Henri Bastide. 1969a. ‘Orientation et sélection scolaire. Cinq années d’une promotion: de la fin du cycle élémentaire à l’entrée dans le 2e cycle du second degré. Première partie’, *Population*, 24.1: 9-46

——— 1969b. ‘Orientation et sélection scolaire. Cinq années d’une promotion: de la fin du cycle élémentaire à l’entrée dans le 2e cycle du second degré. Deuxième partie’, *Population*, 24.2: 195-261

——— 1973. ‘De la fin des études élémentaires à l’entrée dans la vie professionnelle ou à l’Université: La marche d’une promotion de 1962 à 1972’, *Population*, 28.3: 571-594

Giust-Desprairies, Florence. 2010. ‘La figure du sujet de l’Ecole Républicaine et ses avatars hyper-modernes’ in Aubert, Nicole (ed.). 2010. *La société hypermoderne: ruptures et contradictions* (Paris: L’Harmattan)

Goodchild, Philip. 1996. *Deleuze and Guattari: An Introduction to the Politics of Desire* (London: Sage)

Grandière, Marcel. 2010. ‘Les écoles normales et la formation des maîtres’ in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l’école: Anthologie de l’éducation et de l’enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 139-148

Gréard, Octave. 1904. *Éducation et instruction: Enseignement primaire*, 4th edn. (Paris: Hachette)

Guiney, M. Martin. 2004. *Teaching the Cult of Literature in the French Third Republic* (New York/Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan)

——— 2017. *Literature, Pedagogy, and Curriculum in Secondary Education: Examples from France* (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan)

Guizot, François. 2010. [1833] ‘La lettre de Guizot aux instituteurs’ in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l’école: Anthologie de l’éducation et de l’enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 501-504

Gutierrez, Laurent, Laurent Besse and Antoine Prost (eds.). 2012. *Reformer l’école: L’apport de l’Éducation nouvelle (1930-1970)* (Grenoble: PUG)

Gutierrez, Laurent and Patricia Legris (eds.). 2016. *Le Collège unique: Éclairages socio-historiques sur la loi du 11 juillet 1975* (Rennes: PUR),

Hardt, Michael. 1998a. ‘The Global Society of Control’, *Discourse*, 20.3: 139-152

——— 1998b. ‘The Withering of Civil Society’ in Kaufman, Eleanor and Kevin Jon Heller (eds.). 1998. *Deleuze & Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy and Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press), 23-29

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

Harlé, Isabelle. 2010. *La Fabrique des savoirs scolaires* (Paris: La Dispute)

Haut Conseil de l’Éducation. 2010. *Le collège: Bilan des résultats de l’École - 2010,* URL: www.hce.education.fr/gallery_files/site/21/105.pdf [accessed : 15/1/2014]

Heurdier, Lydie and Antoine Prost. 2014. *Les politiques de l’éducation en France* (Paris: La Documentation française)

Hier, Sean Patrick and Joshua Greenberg (eds.). 2007. *The Surveillance Studies Reader* (Maidenhead: Open University Press)

Hoffman, Marcelo. 2010. 'Disciplinary power' in Taylor, Diane (ed.). 2010. *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts* (Durham: Acumen), 27-39

Holland, Eugene W. 1998. 'From Schizophrenia to Social Control' in Kaufman, Eleanor and Kevin Jon Heller (eds.). 1998. *Deleuze & Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy and Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press), 65-73

——— 1999. *Deleuze and Guattari's* Anti-Oedipus*: Introduction to Schizoanalysis* (London: Routledge)

——— 2013. *Deleuze and Guattari's 'A Thousand Plateaus': A Reader's Guide* (London: Bloomsbury)

Hunter, Ian. 1996. 'Assembling the school' in Barry, Andrew, Thomas Osborne and Nikolas Rose (eds.). 1996. *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government* (London: UCL Press), 143-166

Isambert-Jamati, Viviane. 1985. 'Les primaires, ces "incapables pretentieux"', *Revue française de pédagogie*, 73: 57-65

Jacquet-Francillon, François. 2010a. 'Introduction' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 15-33

——— 2010b. 'Éducation, éducabilité' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 37-43

——— 2010c. ‘La culture scolaire’ in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l’école: Anthologie de l’éducation et de l’enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 269-276

Jacquet-Francillon, François, Renaud d’Enfert and Laurence Loeffel (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l’école: Anthologie de l’éducation et de l’enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz)

Jacquet-Francillon, François and Dominique Ottavi. 2010. ‘L’éducation de l’enfance’ in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l’école: Anthologie de l’éducation et de l’enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 45-52

Johnson, Christopher. 2012. ‘*Bricoleur* and *Bricolage*: From Metaphor to Universal Concept’, *Paragraph*, 35.3: 355-372

Kahn, Pierre. 2006. ‘Les laïcités de l'école républicaine’ in Troger, Vincent (ed.). 2006. *Une histoire de l’Éducation et de la formation* (Auxerre: Sciences Humaines Éditions), 99-110

——— 2008. ‘Observations sur la contribution d’André D. Robert’, *Les Sciences de l’éducation - Pour l’Ère nouvelle*, 41: 47-51

——— 2010. ‘L'enseignement des sciences’ in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l’école: Anthologie de l’éducation et de l’enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 343-350

Kaufman, Eleanor and Kevin Jon Heller (eds.). 1998. *Deleuze & Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy and Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press)

Kaufman, Jean-Claude. 2006. ‘Devoir s’inventer: Entretien avec Jean-Claude Kaufman’ in Molénat, Xavier (ed.). 2006. *L’individu contemporain: Regards sociologiques* (Auxerre: Sciences Humaines Éditions)

Kerrero, Christophe. 2013. ‘Le rôle des parents d’élèves et de leurs représentants’ in Szymankiewicz (ed.). 2013. *Le système éducatif en France*, 4th edn. (Paris: La documentation Française), 133-142

Klee, Paul. 1961. *The Thinking Eye: The notebooks of Paul Klee*, Spiller, J. (ed.), trans. by Manheim, R. with C. Weidler and J. Wittenborn (London: Lund Humphries)

Korkoreff, Michel and Jacques Rodriguez. 2006. ‘Une société de l’incertitude’ in Molénat, Xavier (ed.). 2006. *L’individu contemporain: Regards sociologiques* (Auxerre: Sciences Humaines Éditions)

Koskela, Hille. 2003. ‘“Cam Era” – the contemporary urban panopticon’, *Surveillance & Society*, 1.3: 292-313

Kritzman, Lawrence D. (ed.). 2006. *The Columbia History of Twentieth-century French Thought* (New York: Columbia University Press)

Kuntz, Bernard and Philippe Meirieu. 2009. *Faut-il en finir avec le collège unique?* (Paris: Magnard)

La Chalotais, Louis-René de Caradeuc de. 2010 [1763]. ‘Contre les congrégations enseignantes: une éducation par l’État, pour l’État’ in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l’école: Anthologie de l’éducation et de l’enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 417-418

Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe. 2001. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, 2nd edn. (London: Verso)

Lahire, Bernard. 2001. *L'homme pluriel: Les ressorts de l'action* (Paris: Armand Colin/Nathan)

——— 2006. 'L'homme pluriel: La sociologie à l'épreuve de l'individu' in Molénat, Xavier (ed.). 2006. *L'individu contemporain: Regards sociologiques* (Auxerre: Sciences Humaines Éditions)

——— 2013. *Dans les plis singuliers du social* (Paris: La Découverte)

Lakanal, Joseph. 2000. 'Rapport sur les Écoles centrales. 26 frimaire, an III' in Baczko, Bronislaw (ed.). 2000. *Une éducation pour la démocratie: Textes et projets de l'époque révolutionnaire* (Geneva: Droz), 490-497

Laot, Françoise F. 2012. 'Éducation nouvelle, populaire, permanente et naissance des Sciences de l'éducation: occasions de rencontres et influences réciproques dans les années 1960' in Gutierrez et al. (eds.). 2012. *Réformer l'école: L'apport de l'Éducation nouvelle (1930-1970)* (Grenoble: PUG), 377-386

Lapie, Paul. 1998. 'Extrait de la *Revue pédagogique* par Paul Lapie (n° 2, février 1922, p. 80-87)' in Barreau, Jean-Michel, Jean-François Garcia and Louis Legrand. 1998. *L'école unique (de 1914 à nos jours)* (Paris: PUF), 72-79

Laval, Christian, Francis Vergne, Pierre Clément, and Guy Dreux. 2011. *La nouvelle école capitaliste* (Paris: La Découverte)

Lazzarato, Maurizio. 2006. 'Life and the Living in the Societies of Control' in Fuglsang, Martin and Bent Meier Sørensen (eds.). 2006. *Deleuze and the Social* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press), 171-190

——— 2011. *La Fabrique de l'homme endetté: Essai sur la condition néolibérale* (Paris: Éditions Amsterdam)

Lebeaume, Joël. 2008. ‘La genèse de l’éducation technologique en directives’, *SPIRALE - Revue de recherches en éducation*, 42: 109-122

——— 2010. ‘Travail manuel, technologie’ in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l’école: Anthologie de l’éducation et de l’enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 359-366

Lebeaume, Joël, Muriel Guedj and Pierre Savaton. 2015. ‘Les sciences expérimentales et la technologie dans l’école moyenne: un équilibre sous tension (1950-1980)’ in d’Enfert, Renaud and Joël Lebaume (eds.). 2015. *Réformer les disciplines: Les savoirs scolaires à l’épreuve de la modernité 1945-1985* (Rennes: PUR), 199-219

Legrand, André. 2000. ‘Décentralisation et déconcentration’ in Van Zanten (ed.). 2000. *L’école: L’état des savoirs* (Paris: La Découverte), 94-102

——— 2005. ‘Inspection’ in Champy, Philippe and Christiane Étévé (eds.). 2005. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l’éducation et de la formation*, 3rd edn. (Paris: Retz), 505-508

Legrand, Louis. 1983. *Pour une collège démocratique: rapport au ministère de l’Education nationale* (Paris: La Documentation française)

——— 1998. ‘La réalisation du Collège unique: Son évolution et sa valeur aujourd’hui’ in Barreau, Jean-Michel, Jean-François Garcia and Louis Legrand. 1998. *L’école unique (de 1914 à nos jours)* (Paris: PUF), 27-62

Lelièvre, Claude. 1990. *Histoire des Institutions scolaires (1789-1989)* (Paris: Nathan)

——— 2005. ‘Collège’ in Champy, Philippe and Christiane Étévé (eds.). 2005. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l’éducation et de la formation*, 3rd edn. (Paris: Retz), 185-187

——— 2008. *Les politiques scolaires mises en examen: Onze questions en débat* (Issy-les-Moulineaux: ESF)

Lembré, Stéphane. 2016. *Histoire de l’enseignement technique* (Paris: La Découverte)

Lewis, Tyson E.. 2009. ‘Discipline-Sovereignty-Education’ in Binkley, Sam and Jorge Capetillo (eds.). 2009. *A Foucault for the 21st Century: Governmentality, Biopolitics and Discipline in the new millenium* (Newcastle-Upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing), 173-182

Leygues, Georges. 2014. ‘Lettre adressée par le ministre de l’Instruction publique (Georges Leygues) au président de la commission de l’enseignement (Alexandre Ribot) en janvier 1902’ in Heurdier, Lydie and Antoine Prost. 2014. *Les politiques de l’éducation en France* (Paris: La Documentation française), 82-93

Liard, Louis. 2010. [1904] ‘Pour des "humanités scientifiques" dans l’enseignement secondaire’ in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l’école: Anthologie de l’éducation et de l’enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 747-750

Lipovetsky, Gilles. 1987. *L’empire de l’éphémère: La mode et son destin dans les sociétés modernes* (Paris: Gallimard)

——— 1993. *L’Ere du vide* (Paris: Gallimard)

Lipovetsky, Gilles with Sébastien Charles. 2004. *Les Temps hypermodernes* (Paris: Grasset)

Loeffel, Laurence. 2010. ‘Éducation et morale’ in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l’école: Anthologie de l’éducation et de l’enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 79-85

Lotringer, Sylvère. 2013. ‘Introduction to Schizo-Culture’ in Lotringer, Sylvère and David Morris (eds.). 2013. *Schizo-Culture: The Event 1975* (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e)), 9-39

——— (ed.) 2013b. *Schizo-Culture: The Book 1978* (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e))

Lotringer, Sylvère and David Morris (eds.). 2013. *Schizo-Culture: The Event 1975* (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e))

Louveaux, François. 2013. ‘Les évolutions de la formation initiale et continue des enseignants’ in Szymankiewicz (ed.). 2013. *Le système éducatif en France*, 4th edn. (Paris: La documentation Française), 107-111

Luc, Jean-Noël. 2008. ‘Lycée’ in Van Zanten, Agnès (ed.). 2008. *Dictionnaire de l’éducation* (Paris: PUF), 450-455

Ly, Son Thierry. 2016. *Quelle finalité pour quelle école?* (Paris: France Stratégie)

Lynch, Richard. A.. 2010. ‘Foucault’s theory of power’ in Taylor, Dianna (ed.). 2010. *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts* (Durham: Acumen), 13-26

Lyon, David. 2007a. *Surveillance Studies: An overview* (Cambridge: Polity)

——— 2007b. ‘Everyday surveillance: personal data and social classifications’ in Hier, Sean Patrick and Joshua Greenberg (eds.). 2007. *The Surveillance Studies Reader* (Maidenhead: Open University Press), 136-146

Lyotard, Jean-François. 1979. *La Condition Postmoderne* (Paris: Les Éditions de minuit)

——— 2005. *Le Postmoderne expliqué aux enfants: Correspondance 1982-1985* (Paris: Galilée)

Magner, Jacques-Bernard. 2014. *L'An I des ÉSPÉ: Un chantier structurel*, URL: https://www.senat.fr/notice-rapport/2013/r13-579-notice.html [Accessed 5/12/2016]

Mallet, Daniel. 1981. 'L'Inspection Générale de l'Administration de l'Éducation Nationale', *La Revue administrative*, 34.200: 133-138

Marks, John. 1998. *Gilles Deleuze: Vitalism and Multiplicity* (London: Pluto Press)

——— 2010a. 'Control Society' in Parr, Adrian (ed.). 2010. *The Deleuze Dictionary: Revised Edition* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

——— 2010b. 'Foucault, Michel (1926-1984)' in Parr, Adrian (ed.). 2010. *The Deleuze Dictionary: Revised Edition* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

Martin, Jérôme. 2002. 'Aux origines de la "science des examens" (1920-1940)', *Histoire de l'éducation*, 94: 177-199

Marx, Gary T.. 2007 [2002]. 'What's new about the "new surveillance"? Classifying for change and continuity' in Hier, Sean Patrick and Joshua Greenberg (eds.). 2007. *The Surveillance Studies Reader* (Maidenhead: Open University Press), 83-94

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. 2002. *The Communist Manifesto* (London: Penguin)

Masson, Philippe. 2001. 'La fabrication des *Héritiers*', *Revue française de sociologie*, 42.3: 477-507

——— 2005. 'Premières réceptions et diffusions des *Héritiers* (1964-1973)', *Revue d'Histoire des Sciences Humaines*, 13: 68-98

Massumi, Brian. 1992. *A User's Guide to* Capitalism and Schizophrenia*: Deviations from Deleuze and Guattari* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press)

——— 1998. 'Requiem for Our Prospective Dead (Toward a Participatory Critique of Capitalist Power)' in Kaufman, Eleanor and Kevin Jon Heller (eds.). 1998. *Deleuze & Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy and Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press), 40-64

Mayeur, Françoise. 2004. *Histoire de l'enseignement et de l'éducation en France, Tome III: De la Révolution à l'École républicaine* (Paris: Perrin)

Mehl, Dominique. 2006. 'Confessions sur petit écran' in Molénat, Xavier (ed.). 2006. *L'individu contemporain: Regards sociologiques* (Auxerre: Sciences Humaines Éditions), 207-214

Michel, Youenn. 2008. 'Mai 68 et l'enseignement: Mise en place historique', *Les Sciences de l'éducation - Pour l'Ère nouvelle*, 41: 13-25

Mole, Frédéric. 2007. 'L'"égalité dans la diversité": un modèle de justice à la préhistoire de l'école unique (1898-1914)', *Revue française de pédagogie*, 159: 23-33

Molénat, Xavier (ed.). 2006. *L'individu contemporain: Regards sociologiques* (Auxerre: Sciences Humaines Éditions)

Monahan, Torin and Rodolfo D. Torres (eds.). 2010. *Schools under Surveillance: Cultures of Control in Public Education* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press)

Mons, Nathalie. 2007. *Les nouvelles politiques éducatives: La France fait-elle les bons choix?* (Paris: PUF)

Moore, Nathan. 2007. 'Nova Law: William S. Burroughs and the Logic of Control', *Law & Literature*, 19.3: 435-470

Morange, Michel. 2006. 'Life Sciences' in Kritzman, Lawrence D. (ed.). 2006. *The Columbia History of Twentieth-century French Thought* (New York: Columbia University Press), 279-282

Morar, Nicolae, Thomas Nail and Daniel W. Smith. 2014. 'Introduction: *Foucault Studies* Special Issue: Foucault and Deleuze, April 2014' *Foucault Studies*, 17: 4-10

Morel, Stéphanie. 2002. *École, territoire, identités: les politiques publiques françaises à l'épreuve de l'ethnicité* (Paris: L'Harmattan)

Nealon, Jeffrey T.. 2008. *Foucault Beyond Foucault: Power and its Intensifications since 1984* (Stanford: Stanford University Press)

Nora, Pierre (ed.). 1997. *Les lieux de mémoire*, 3 vols (Paris: Gallimard), I

Obin, Jean-Pierre. 2013. 'Les enseignants' in Szymankiewicz, Christine (ed.). 2013. *Le système éducatif en France*, 4th edn. (Paris: La documentation Française), 93-106

Oulc'hen, Hervé (ed.). 2014. *Usages de Foucault* (Paris: PUF)

Ozouf, Jacques and Mona Ozouf. 1997. '*Le Tour de la France par deux enfants*: Le petit livre rouge de la République' in Pierre Nora (ed.). 1997. *Les lieux de mémoire*, 3 vols (Paris: Gallimard), I, 277-301

Ozouf, Mona. 1963. *L'École, l'Église et la République 1871-1914* (Paris: Armand Colin)

Patton, Paul. 2006. 'Order, Exteriority and Flat Multiplicities in the Social' in Fuglsang, Martin and Bent Meier Sørensen (eds.). 2006. *Deleuze and the Social* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press), 21-38

Paty, Dominique. 1997. *12 collèges en France: Le fonctionnement réel des collèges publics*, 2nd edn. (Paris: La documentation Française)

Paty, Michel. 2006. 'The Exact Sciences' in Kritzman, Lawrence D. (ed.). 2006. *The Columbia History of Twentieth-century French Thought* (New York: Columbia University Press), 205-212

Péguy, Charles. 1961. *Œuvres en prose de Charles Péguy: 1909-1914* (Paris: Gallimard)

Périer, Philippe. 2010. *L'ordre scolaire négocié: Parents, élèves, professeurs dans les contextes difficiles* (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes)

Peters, Michael A., A.C. Besley, Mark Olssen, Susanne Maurer and Susanne Weber (eds.). 2009. *Governmentality Studies in Education* (Rotterdam: Sense Publishers)

Poisson de la Chabeaussière, Auguste-Étienne-Xavier. 2010 [1793]. 'Du catéchisme religieux au catéchisme républicain' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 446- 448

Poucet, Bruno. 2010a. 'Éducation et religion' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 69-77

——— 2010b. ‘L’enseignement de la philosophie’ in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l’école: Anthologie de l’éducation et de l’enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 311-317

Prost, Antoine. 1968. *Histoire de l’Enseignement en France 1800-1967* (Paris: Armand Colin)

——— 1997. *Éducation, société et politiques: Une histoire de l’enseignement en France de 1945 à nos jours* (Paris: Seuil)

——— 2004. *Histoire de l’enseignement et de l’éducation Tome IV: L’École et la famille dans une société en mutation (depuis 1930)* (Paris: Perrin)

——— 2007. *Regards historiques sur l’éducation en France: XIXe-XXe siècles* (Paris: Belin)

——— 2013. *Du changement dans l’école: Les réformes de l’éducation de 1936 à nos jours* (Paris: Seuil)

——— 2013b. ‘L’histoire du système éducatif français’ in Szymankiewicz, Christine (ed.). 2013. *Le système éducatif en France*, 4th edn. (Paris: La documentation Française), 11-18

Protevi, John. 2001. *Political Physics: Deleuze, Derrida and the Body Politic* (London: Athlone Press)

Raillon, Louis. 2005. ‘Éducation nouvelle’ in Champy, Philippe and Christiane Étévé (eds.). 2005. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l’éducation et de la formation*, 3rd edn. (Paris: Retz), 341-344

Raulin, Dominique. 2006. *Les programmes scolaires: Des disciplines souveraines au socle commun* (Paris: Retz)

Raynaud, Philippe. 2012. ‘La place de l’école dans la société’, *Cahiers Français*, 368: 2-8

Razac, Olivier. 2008. *Avec Foucault, Après Foucault: Disséquer la société de contrôle* (Paris: L'Harmattan)

Revel, Judith. 1996. 'Foucault lecteur de Deleuze: De l'écart à la différence', *Critique* 591-592: 727-735

——— 2002. *Le vocabulaire de Foucault* (Paris: Ellipses)

Rey, Alain (ed.). 2012. *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française*, 3 vols. (Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert)

Rhéaume, Jacques. 2010. 'Le travail comme injonction identitaire ou source de marginalisation et d'exclusion' in Aubert, Nicole (ed.). 2010. *La société hypermoderne: ruptures et contradictions* (Paris: L'Harmattan)

Riondet, Xavier. 2012. 'Réformer, changer, dans la revue *Les Cahiers pédagogiques*: Regards sur l'intrigue de la militance novatrice (1945-1970)' in Gutierrez et al. (eds.). 2012. *Réformer l'école: L'apport de l'Éducation nouvelle (1930-1970)* (Grenoble: PUG), 209-222

Robert, André. D.. 2005. 'Syndicalisme enseignant' in Champy, Philippe and Christiane Étévé (eds.). 2005. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l'éducation et de la formation*, 3rd edn. (Paris: Retz), 949-955

——— 2006. 'De Gaulle, l'école et l'économie' in Troger, Vincent (ed.). 2006. *Une histoire de l'Éducation et de la formation* (Auxerre: Sciences Humaines Éditions), 183-196

——— 2008. 'Autour de mai 1968, la pédagogie en question. Le colloque d'Amiens', *Les Sciences de l'éducation - Pour l'Ère nouvelle*, 41: 27-45

——— 2010. 'La Quatrième République et les questions de l'égalité et de la justice dans l'enseignement du second degré: le changement sans la

réforme' in d'Enfert, Renaud and Pierre Kahn (eds.). 2010. *En attendant la réforme: Disciplines scolaires et politiques éducatives sous la Quatrième République* (Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble), 17-36

——— 2015. *L'École en France de 1945 à nos jours*, 2nd edn. (Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble)

Rogers, Rebecca. 2010. 'L'éducation des filles' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 165-171

Rosen, Sherwin. 2008. 'Human capital' in Durlauf, Steven. N. and Lawrence E. Blume (eds). 2008. *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, 2nd edn. (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), URL: http://www.dictionaryofeconomics.com/article?id=pde2008_H000100 [accessed: 27/2/2014]

Sachs, Leon. 2014. *The Pedagogical Imagination: The Republican Legacy in Twenty-First-Century French Literature and Film* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press)

Sadoun, Marc and Jean-Marie Donegani. 1976. 'La réforme de l'enseignement secondaire en France depuis 1945: Analyse d'une non-décision', *Revue française de science politique*, 26.6: 1125-1146

Sauvy, Alfred and Alain Girard. 1965. 'Les diverses classes sociales devant l'enseignement: Mise au point général des résultats', *Population*, 20.2: 205-232

Savat, David. 2013. *Uncoding the Digital: Technology, Subjectivity and Action in the Control Society* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan)

Savoie, Philippe. 2010. 'L'enseignement secondaire' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 149-155

Savoye, Antoine. 2010. 'L'Éducation nouvelle' in Jacquet-Francillon et al. (eds.). 2010. *Une histoire de l'école: Anthologie de l'éducation et de l'enseignement en France XVIIIe–XXe siècle* (Paris: Retz), 111-117

Schrift, Alan. D.. 2013. 'Discipline and Punish' in Falzon et al. (eds). 2013. *A Companion to Foucault* (Chichester: Wiley), 137-153

Semetsky, Inna (ed.). 2008. *Nomadic Education: Variations on a Theme by Deleuze and Guattari* (Rotterdam: Sense Publishers)

Semetsky, Inna and Diana Masny (eds.). 2013. *Deleuze and Education* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

Sévilla, Nathalie. 2012. 'La Ligue francaise de l'enseignement: relais de l'Éducation nouvelle (1920-1960)?' in Gutierrez et al. (eds.). 2012. *Réformer l'école: L'apport de l'Éducation nouvelle (1930-1970)* (Grenoble: PUG), 275-285

Simon, Jacky, Gérard Lesage and Catherine Chazeau. 2010. *Organisation et gestion de l'Éducation nationale,* 10th edn. (Paris: Berger-Levrault)

Simmons, Lizbet. 2010. 'The Docile Body in School Space' in Monahan, Torin and Rodolfo D. Torres (eds.). 2010. *Schools under Surveillance: Cultures of Control in Public Education* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press), 55-70

Sirota, André. 2012. 'Temoignage: Un regard sur l'entrée de la psychosociologie et de la psychanalyse dans la formation aux CEMEA'

in Gutierrez et al. (eds.). 2012. *Réformer l'école: L'apport de l'Éducation nouvelle (1930-1970)* (Grenoble: PUG), 345-357

Smith, Daniel. W. 2012. *Essays on Deleuze* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

Solaux, Georges. 2008. 'Orientation des élèves' in Van Zanten, Agnès (ed.). 2008. *Dictionnaire de l'éducation* (Paris: PUF), 509-512

Stiegler, Bernard. 2008. *Prendre soin: 1. De la jeunesse et des générations* (Paris: Flammarion)

Stivale, Charles (ed.). 2011. *Gilles Deleuze: Key Concepts*, 2nd edn. (Durham: Acumen)

Szymankiewicz, Christine (ed.). 2013. *Le système éducatif en France*, 4th edn. (Paris: La documentation Française)

Taga, Shigeru. 2014. 'Foucault et Guattari: Au croisement de la théorie du micro-pouvoir et de la psychothérapie institutionnelle' in Oulc'hen, Hervé (ed.). 2014. *Usages de Foucault* (Paris: PUF), 99-107

Talbott, John E.. 1969. *The Politics of Educational Reform in France, 1918-1940* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press)

Talleyrand-Périgord, Charles Maurice de. 2000 [1791]. 'Rapport sur l'instruction publique, fait au nom du Comité de constitution, à l'Assemblée Nationale les 10, 11 et 19 septembre 1791' in Baczko, Bronislaw (ed.). 2000. *Une éducation pour la démocratie: Textes et projets de l'époque révolutionnaire* (Geneva: Droz)

Taylor, Charles. 2006. 'Individu et modernité: Rencontre avec Charles Taylor' in Molénat, Xavier (ed.). 2006. *L'individu contemporain: Regards sociologiques* (Auxerre: Sciences Humaines)

Taylor, Dianna (ed.). 2010. *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts* (Durham: Acumen)

Terranova, Tiziana. 2004. *Network Culture: Politics for the Information Age* (London: Pluto Press)

Thompson, Greg and Ian Cook. 2012. 'Spinning in the NAPLAN Ether: *Postscript on the Control Societies* and the Seduction of Education in Australia', *Deleuze Studies,* 6.4: 564-584

——— 2014. 'The Eternal Return of Teaching in the Time of the Corporation', *Deleuze Studies,* 8.2: 280-298

Toulemonde, Bernard. 2013. 'La décentralisation de l'éducation' in Szymankiewicz, Christine (ed.). 2013. *Le système éducatif en France*, 4th edn. (Paris: La documentation Française), 65-72

Troger, Vincent. 1989. 'L'histoire de 'enseignement technique: Entre les entreprises et l'Etat, la recherche d'une identité', *Histoire, économie et société*, 8: 593-611

——— (ed.). 2006. *Une histoire de l'Éducation et de la formation* (Auxerre: Sciences Humaines)

——— 2006a. 'De l'apprentissage à l'enseignement technique' in Troger, Vincent (ed.). 2006. *Une histoire de l'Éducation et de la formation* (Auxerre: Sciences Humaines)

Troger, Vincent and Jean-Claude Ruano-Borbalan. 2010. *Histoire du système éducatif* (Paris: PUF)

Trouvé, Alain. 2013. 'La controverse "républicains-pédagogues": Une polémique contre-productive?' in Vergnioux, Alain (ed.). 2013. *Grandes controverses en éducation* (Bern: Peter Lang), 187-212

Van Zanten, Agnès (ed.). 2000. *L'école: L'état des savoirs* (Paris: La Découverte)

——— (ed.) 2008. *Dictionnaire de l'éducation* (Paris: PUF)

——— 2011. *Les politiques d'éducation* (Paris: PUF)

Van Zanten, Agnès and Jean-Pierre Obin. 2008. *La Carte scolaire* (Paris: PUF)

Van Zanten, Agnès, Marie-France Grospirron, Martine Kherroubi and André D. Robert. 2002. *Quand l'école se mobilise: Les dynamiques professionnelles dans les établissements de banlieue* (Paris: La Dispute)

Vannini, Geneviève. 2012. 'Les CEMEA et la formation des moniteurs de colonies de vacances (1937-1950): un moyen efficace de diffusion de l'Éducation nouvelle?' in Gutierrez et al. (eds.). 2012. *Réformer l'école: L'apport de l'Éducation nouvelle (1930-1970)* (Grenoble: PUG), 287-296

Venard, Marc. 2006. 'L'école élémentaire du XVIe au XVIIIe siècle' in Vincent Troger (ed.). 2006. *Une histoire de l'Éducation et de la formation* (Auxerre: Sciences Humaines), 23-32

Vergnioux, Alain (ed.) 2013. *Grandes controverses en éducation* (Bern: Peter Lang)

Vial, Jean. 1967. 'La pédagogie des classes de transition', *Revue française de pédagogie*, 1: 17-27

——— 1973. 'Rapport de la Commission d'études sur la fonction enseignante dans le second degré', *Revue française de pédagogie*, 24: 70-73

Vincent, Guy. 1972. 'Histoire et structure du système éducatif français: l'enseignement primaire', *Revue française de sociologie*, 13: 59-79

Virilio, Paul. 1998a. ‘The State of Emergency’, trans. by Mark Polizzotti in Der Derian, James (ed.). 1998. *The Virilio Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell)

——— 1998b. ‘The Vision Machine’, trans. by Julie Rose in Der Derian, James (ed.). 1998. *The Virilio Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Virilio, Paul. and Sylvère Lotringer. 2008. *Pure War: Twenty-five years later* (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e))

Wallin, Jason J.. 2010. *A Deleuzian Approach to Curriculum: Essays on a Pedagogical Life* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan)

Webb, Taylor. 2009. *Teacher Assemblage* (Rotterdam: Sense Publishers)

——— 2011. ‘The evolution of accountability’, *Journal of Education Policy*, 26.6: 735-756

Wise, J. Macgregor. 2011. ‘Assemblage’ in Charles Stivale (ed.). 2011. *Gilles Deleuze: Key Concepts*, 2nd edn. (Durham: Acumen), 91-102

Zourabichvili, François. 2003. *Le vocabulaire de Deleuze* (Paris: Ellipses)

Laws and regulatory texts cited

Date of signature	Name and nature of text
1791	
14 June	*Décret relatif aux assemblées d'ouvriers et d'artisans* [*loi Le Chapelier*]
1795	
25 February	*Décret du 7 ventôse an III portant établissement d'écoles centrales pour l'enseignement des sciences, des lettres et des arts*
25 October	*Décret du 3 brumaire an IV sur l'organisation de l'instruction publique* [*loi Daunou*]
1802	
1 May	*Loi générale sur l'Instruction publique du 11 floréal an X*
1806	
10 May	*Décret-loi relatif à la formation d'une Université impériale et aux obligations particulières des membres du corps enseignant*
1808	
17 March	*Décret impérial portant organisation de l'Université*
1816	
29 February	*Ordonnance royale concernant l'instruction primaire*
1833	
28 June	*Loi sur l'Instruction primaire* [*loi Guizot*]

1835	
26 February	*Ordonnance du Roi qui établit dans chaque département un inspecteur spécial de l'instruction primaire*
27 February	*Règlement relatif aux Inspections des écoles primaires*
1837	
13 November	*Ordonnance portant création de sous-inspecteurs de l'instruction primaire*
1850	
15 March	*Loi sur l'enseignement* [*loi Falloux*]
1852	
10 April	*Décret relatif à l'instruction publique et à l'enseignement des lycées*
30 August	*Arrêté fixant le plan d'études des lycées*
1863	
2 October	*Instruction relative à l'établissement d'un enseignement secondaire dit professionnel dans les lycées impériaux*
1865	
21 June	*Loi portant organisation de l'enseignement secondaire spécial*
1867	
10 April	*Loi sur l'enseignement primaire*
1872	
27 September	*Circulaire à MM. les proviseurs sur l'enseignement secondaire*

1879	
9 August	*Loi ayant pour objet la création de nouvelles écoles normales* [*loi Bert*]
1880	
2 August	*Arrêté pour les programmes de l'enseignement secondaire classique*
11 December	*Loi sur les écoles manuelles d'apprentissage et les écoles d'enseignement primaire complémentaire assimilées aux écoles manuelles d'apprentissage*
21 December	*Loi sur l'enseignement secondaire des jeunes filles* [*loi Sée*]
1881	
8 January	*Décret instituant un concours annuel pour la délivrance d'un certificat d'aptitude aux fonctions de professeur des classes élémentaires de l'enseignement classique*
15 January	*Décret relatif à l'enseignement primaire supérieur* *Arrêté relatif à l'enseignement primaire supérieur*
16 June	*Loi établissant la gratuité absolue de l'enseignement primaire dans les écoles publiques* [*loi Ferry* 1/2]
30 July	*Décret relatif à l'organisation des écoles manuelles d'apprentissage*
1882	
28 March	*Loi sur l'enseignement primaire obligatoire* [*loi Ferry* 2/2]
27 July	*Arrêté réglant l'organisation pédagogique et le plan d'études des écoles primaires publiques*

1885	
22 January	*Arrêté apportant des allégements aux programmes de l'enseignement secondaire classique*
1886	
30 October	*Loi sur l'organisation de l'enseignement primaire* [*loi Goblet*]
1887	
18 January	*Décret relatif à l'enseignement public* *Arrêté relatif à l'enseignement public*
1888	
29 June	*Arrêté instituant un comité d'inspection de l'enseignement technique*
1889	
19 July	*Loi sur les dépenses ordinaires de l'instruction primaire publique et les traitements du personnel de ce service*
1890	
28 January	*Arrêté relatif aux programmes de l'enseignement secondaire classique*
12 June	*Arrêté relatif à l'emploi du temps dans les lycées et collèges*
8 August	*Décret instituant un baccalauréat unique de l'enseignement secondaire classique suivi d'un arrêté fixant les conditions de cet examen*
1891	
4 June	*Décret portant réorganisation de l'enseignement*

	secondaire spécial et donnant à cet enseignement le nom d'enseignement secondaire moderne
1892	
26 January	*Loi de finances*
1897	
20 July	*Arrêté réglant la répartition des heures de classe et de conférence dans les lycées et collèges de garçons*
1899	
9 December	*Arrêté relatif à l'inspection de l'enseignement technique*
1900	
13 February	*Loi de finances*
1901	
1 July	*Loi relative au contrat d'association*
1902	
31 May	*Décret relatif aux plans d'études secondaires* *Arrêté concernant la répartition des matières de l'enseignement secondaire et le régime des classes dans les lycées et collèges de garçons*
1903	
13 February	*Décret portant règlement des ENP*
1904	
7 July	*Loi relative à la suppression de l'enseignement congréganiste*
1909	
26 July	*Décret relatif aux EPS*

	Décret relatif à l'ENS d'enseignement primaire de Saint-Cloud
	Décret modifiant l'article 5 du décret du 14 août 1893, portant règlement d'administration publique pour les heures de service exigées du personnel des EPS et pour le mode de rétribution des heures de service supplémentaires
	Arrêté relatif aux EPS
1911	
24 October	*Décret instituant dans chaque département et dans chaque canton un comité de l'enseignement technique*
	Décret instituant le certificat de capacité professionnelle
1919	
25 July	*Loi relative à l'organisation de l'enseignement technique et industriel et commercial* [*loi Astier*]
1920	
20 January	*Décret portant nomination du sous-secrétaire d'État au ministère de l'Instruction publique, chargé de l'enseignement technique*
14 August	*Rapport du 14 août 1920 au Président de la République Française* [published in the *Journal Officiel* of 31 October 1920 with the texts issued on 18 August]
18 August	*Décret modifiant les chapitres 3, 4 et 5 du titre 1er et les chapitres 2 et 3 du titre II du décret organique du 18 janvier 1887*

	Arrêté modifiant les chapitres 3 et 4 du titre 1er et le chapitre 1er du titre II de l'arrêté organique du 18 janvier 1887
	Arrêté modifiant les programmes des EPS
30 September	*Instructions relatives à l'organisation des CC, des EPS et des écoles normales*
1921	
17 February	*Décret relatif à l'inspection de l'enseignement technique*
1922	
26 September	*Décret relatif à l'orientation professionnelle*
1923	
23 February	*Arrêté modifiant l'article 14 et le paragraphe V de l'article 19 de l'arrêté du 18 janvier 1887 relatifs à: 1° à la répartition des élèves dans les divers cours de l'école; 2° à la répartition pour les divers cours des trente heures de classes hebdomadaires*
	Arrêté modifiant les programmes des écoles primaires élémentaires
20 June	*Instructions relatives au nouveau plan d'études des écoles primaires élémentaires (Arrêtés du 23 février 1923)*
1924	
25 March	*Décret relatif au plan d'études de l'enseignement secondaire des jeunes filles*
1925	
13 May	*Décret relatif aux études de l'enseignement secondaire*

3 June	*Arrêté relatif aux horaires et aux programmes de l'enseignement secondaire dans les classes des lycées et collèges de garçons*
12 September	*Décret relatif au recrutement et à la nomination du personnel enseignant des classes primaires des lycées et collèges de garçons*
1926	
11 February	*Arrêté relatif aux programmes des classes enfantines primaires et élémentaires des lycées et collèges de garçons et de filles*
1927	
27 December	*Loi de finances de 1928*
1930	
16 April	*Loi de finances*
1932	
5 December	*Circulaire relative à l'inspection des instituteurs et institutrices dans les lycées et collèges*
1933	
31 May	*Loi de finances*
1 September	*Arrêté relatif à l'examen d'admission en classe de 6e dans les établissements publics de l'enseignement secondaire*
1936	
9 August	*Loi sur l'enseignement primaire obligatoire*

1937	
21 May	*Décret relatif à l'aménagement et à la coordination des programmes de l'enseignement secondaire, de l'enseignement primaire supérieur et de l'enseignement technique*
22 May	*Arrêté relatif à l'organisation à titre d'expérience des classes d'orientation*
1 June	*Décret portant dénomination d'une direction du premier degré et de l'éducation postscolaire et rattachement des établissements aux directions de l'enseignement du second degré et de l'enseignement supérieur*
30 August	*Arrêté fixant le programme des enseignements communs aux classes de 6e A et B de l'enseignement secondaire et aux cours préparatoires des écoles primaires et supérieures et des écoles pratiques*
1938	
23 March	*Arrêtés relatifs à des examens et programmes de l'enseignement primaire*
11 April	*Arrêté fixant les programmes des classes de 6e, 5e, 4e et 3e de l'enseignement secondaire et des classes préparatoires et de 1re, 2e et 3e années des EPS*
24 May	*Décret relatif à l'orientation et à la formation professionnelles*
20 September	*Instructions officielles*

1939	
21 September	*Décret organisant la formation professionnelle en temps de guerre*
1941	
15 August	*Loi relative à l'organisation générale de l'enseignement public* [*Loi Carcopino*]
1945	
3 March	*Ordonnance 45-318 portant suppression des classes primaires et élémentaires des lycées et collèges*
2 November	*Ordonnance 45-2630 - Il est créé […] cinq écoles normales d'enseignement professionnel […]*
1946	
6 May	*Décret 46-926 relatif au baccalauréat de l'enseignement secondaire*
1947	
16 January	*Décret 47-204 relatif aux écoles nationales supérieures d'ingénieurs*
24 July	*Arrêté - Horaires et programmes des CC*
20 October	*Décret 47-2052 instituant un BEPC du second degré*
1949	
21 February	*Loi 49-230 portant statut des CA*
1950	
1 April	*Décret 50-386 relatif à l'institution d'un professorat du second degré*

1952	
17 January	*Décret 52-91 relatif au certificat d'aptitude au professorat de l'enseignement public du second degré*
19 February	*Décret 52-178 portant création et fixation des dispositions générales des examens publics prévus par la loi du 4 août 1942, modifiée, relative à la délivrance des diplômes professionnels*
1958	
12 March	*Arrêté - Application des dispositions de l'article 3 du décret 56-916 relatif à la localisation des établissements d'enseignement*
1958	
29 December	*Décret 58-1473 relatif à la constitution de commissions académiques de la carte scolaire*
1959	
6 January	*Ordonnance 59-45 portant prolongation de la scolarité obligatoire* [*Réforme Berthoin* 1/2]
	Décret 59-57 portant réforme de l'enseignement public [*Réforme Berthoin* 2/2]
10 September	*Décret 59-1074 relatif au CAPET*
16 November	*Décret 59-1314 modifiant le BEPC*
31 December	*Loi 59-1557 sur les rapports entre l'État et les établissements d'enseignement privés* [*loi Debré*]
1960	
1 June	*Décret 60-556 sur l'organisation de l'administration*

	centrale du ministère de l'éducation nationale
	Arrêté - Attributions du DGOPS et des directeurs d'enseignement
	Arrêté - Attributions du chef de l'inspection générale
21 October	*Décret 60-1127 portant création d'un CAP-CEG*
	Décret 60-1128 portant organisation des centres régionaux de formation des futurs professeurs des CEG
1962	
26 February	*Décret 62-216 portant application des dispositions de l'article 35 du décret 59-57 du 6 janvier 1959 relatif à la réforme de l'enseignement public*
13 March	*Circulaire relative à la préparation de l'enseignement de la technologie dans les classes de 4e et 3e de la section moderne*
14 June	*Décret 62-671 modifiant certaines dispositions du décret 59-57 du 6 janvier 1959*
7 September	*Circulaire - Enseignement de la technologie (Directives et commentaires provisoires)*
1963	
3 May	*Circulaire relative à la carte scolaire du premier cycle*
15 July	*Instructions relatives aux classes de transition*
3 August	*Décret 63-793 modifiant certaines dispositions du décret 59-57* [Fouchet-Capelle reform 1/2]
	Décret 63-794 relatif à l'organisation pédagogique des CES [Fouchet-Capelle reform 2/2]

10 September	*Instructions relatives aux classes de quatrième et troisième du cycle terminal. Classes terminales pratiques.*
15 October	*Décret 63-1033 portant suppression et création d'emplois au ministère de l'éducation nationale*
	Décret 63-1034 relatif à l'organisation de l'administration centrale du ministère de l'éducation nationale
1964	
14 March	*Décret 64-241 complétant le décret 63-1034 du 15 octobre 1963 relatif à l'organisation de l'administration centrale du ministère de l'éducation nationale*
18 September	*Circulaire 64-382 - Enseignement dans les classes de transition. Annexe : Instructions concernant le fonctionnement des classes de 6e et 5e de transition*
5 November	*Instruction générale relative à l'exercice des missions des inspecteurs généraux de l'instruction publique*
	Arrêté - Organisation de l'inspection générale de l'instruction publique
8 December	*Décret 64-1209 relatif aux commissions académiques de la carte scolaire*
1965	
5 January	*Circulaire 65-6 sur la définition de la carte scolaire du second cycle*
14 April	*Décret 65-299 portant statut du corps de l'inspection générale de l'administration de l'Éducation nationale*

10 June	*Décret 65-438 modifiant les titres III, IV et X du décret 59-57*
1966	
5 April	*Instructions relatives au cycle terminal (Application de l'article 5 du décret 59-57 du 6 janvier 1959)*
27 July	*Décret 66-581 portant institution d'un certificat d'aptitude à l'enseignement dans les classes pratiques (cycle terminal)*
1968	
9 October	*Arrêté - Horaires des classes de 6e*
8 November	*Décret 68-968 relatif aux conseils des établissements d'enseignement public du niveau de second degré*
12 November	*Loi 68-978 d'orientation de l'enseignement supérieur* [*loi Faure*]
1969	
6 January	*Circulaire IV-69-1 - Premiers éléments relatif aux compositions. Notes et classements (premier et second degrés)*
30 May	*Décret 69-493 portant statut des PEGC*
3 July	*Arrêté - Horaires des classes de sixième et de cinquième pour l'année scolaire 1969-1970*
7 August	*Arrêté - Aménagement de la semaine scolaire et répartition de l'horaire hebdomadaire dans les écoles élémentaires et maternelles*
1 September	*Circulaire 69-370 Instructions relatives à l'enseignement*

	du français avec initiation au latin dans les classes de 5e I et II
16 September	*Décret 69-845 modifiant le décret 68-968 du 8 novembre 1968*
13 November	*Décret 69-1016 portant changement de dénomination des inspectrices et des inspecteurs de l'enseignement primaire*
1970	
17 February	*Arrêté - Horaires des classes de quatrième I et II pour l'année scolaire 1970-1971*
19 March	*Décret 70-238 relatif à l'ONISEP*
	Décret 70-239 relatif à l'organisation administrative et financière de l'ONISEP
	Arrêté - Horaires des classes de sixième et cinquième
	Arrêté fixant le programme de technologie de la classe de quatrième
27 August	*Instructions pédagogiques relatives à l'enseignement de la technologie en 4e et 3e*
1971	
22 June	*Arrêté - Horaires des classes de quatrième et troisième I et II*
7 July	*Décret 71-541 relatif à l'organisation des services chargés de l'information et l'orientation*
9 July	*Circulaire 71-228 - Notes et classements (premier et second degré)*

15 July	*Loi 71-567 portant approbation du VIe Plan de développement économique et social*
16 July	*Loi 71-575 portant organisation de la formation professionnelle continue dans le cadre de l'éducation permanente*
	Loi 71-576 relative à l'apprentissage
	Loi 71-577 d'orientation sur l'enseignement technologique
22 July	*Arrêté - Programme de mathématiques des classes de quatrième et troisième*
1972	
10 March	*Circulaire 72-109 donnant des indications générales sur la réforme du cycle pratique.*
13 June	*Circulaire 72-228 - Instructions sur les CPA*
4 July	*Décret 72-585 relatif au statut particulier des inspecteurs de l'enseignement technique*
	Décret 72-587 relatif au statut particulier des inspecteurs départementaux de l'éducation nationale
5 July	*Circulaire 72-270 - Instructions concernant les CPPN*
27 September	*Circulaire 72-350- compléments à la circulaire 72-228 du 13 juin 1972 (CPA)*
4 December	*Circulaire 72-474 - Instructions relatives à l'enseignement du français à l'école élémentaire*
1973	
12 February	*Décret 73-129 relatif aux procédures d'orientation dans le second degré de l'enseignement public*

	Arrêté - procédures d'orientation dans le second degré de l'enseignement public
13 July	*Arrêté - Allégements des programmes des enseignements du second degré pour l'année scolaire 1973-1974 (classes des premier et second cycles)*
27 December	*Loi 73-1193 relative à l'orientation du commerce et de l'artisanat* [*loi Royer*]
1975	
11 July	*Loi 75-620 relative à l'éducation* [*loi Haby*]
1976	
28 December	*Décret 76-1303 relatif à l'organisation de la formation et de l'orientation dans les collèges*
	Décret 76-1305 relatif à l'organisation administrative et financière des collèges et des lycées
1980	
2 January	*Arrêté - Dispositions relatives à la mission, au recrutement, à l'organisation et au fonctionnement de l'IGEN*
1983	
22 July	*Loi 83-663 complétant la loi 83-8 du 7 janvier 1983 relative à la répartition des compétences entre les communes, les départements, les régions et l'État*
1985	
25 January	*Loi 85-97 modifiant et complétant la loi 83-663 du 22 juillet 1983 et portant dispositions diverses relatives aux rapports entre l'État et les collectivités territoriales*

30 August	*Décret 85-924 relatif aux établissements publics locaux d'enseignement*
1989	
10 July	*Loi 89-486 d'orientation sur l'éducation* [*loi Jospin*]
2005	
23 April	*Loi 2005-380 d'orientation et de programme pour l'avenir de l'école* [*loi Fillon*]
2006	
11 July	*Décret 2006-830 relatif au socle commun des connaissances et des compétences et modifiant le code de l'éducation*
2013	
8 July	*Loi 2013-595 d'orientation et de programmation pour la réfondation de l'école de la République* [*loi Peillon*]
2015	
31 March	*Décret 2015-372 Socle commun de connaissances, de compétences et de culture*

Abbreviations

Texts written by Gilles Deleuze or Deleuze and Guattari

A-O	*L'Anti-Œdipe*
MP	*Mille plateaux*
PP	*Pourparlers*

Texts written by Michel Foucault

SP	*Surveiller et punir*

Terms relating to the French education system

AEERS	Association d'étude pour l'expansion de la recherche scientifique
AFPF	Association française des professeurs de français
APMEP	Association des professeurs de mathématiques de l'enseignement public
BE	Brevet élémentaire
BEP	Brevet d'études professionnelles
BNC	Brevet national des collèges
BEPS	Brevet d'études primaires supérieures
BS	Brevet supérieur
BTS	Brevet de technicien supérieur
CA	Centre d'apprentissage
CAEC	Certificat d'aptitude à l'enseignement des collèges
CAP	Certificat d'aptitude professionnelle

CAP-CEG	Certificat d'aptitude pédagogique pour les CEG
CAPES	Certificat d'aptitude au professorat de l'enseignement secondaire
CAPET	Certificat d'aptitude au professorat de l'enseignement technique
CC	Cours complémentaire
CEG	Collège d'enseignement général
CEP	Certificat d'études primaire
CEPS	Certificat d'études primaires supérieures
CES	Collège d'enseignement secondaire
CET	Collège d'enseignement technique
CFP	Centre de formation professionnelle
CNESCO	Conseil national d'évaluation du système scolaire
CPA	Classes préparatoire à l'apprentissage
CPPN	Classes préprofessionnelles de niveau
CPR	Centre pédagogique régional
DGOPS	Direction générale de l'organisation et des programmes scolaires
DNB	Diplôme national du brevet
ENNA	École normale nationale d'apprentissage
ENP	École nationale professionnelle
ENS	École normale supérieure
ENSET	École normale supérieure de l'enseignement technique
EPCI	École pratique du commerce et de l'industrie
EPLE	Établissement public local d'enseignement
EPS	École primaire supérieure

ESPE	École supérieure du professorat et de l'éducation
FEN	Fédération de l'Éducation nationale
GOD	Groupe d'observation dispersé
HCE	Haut conseil de l'éducation
GFEN	Groupe français de l'Éducation nouvelle
IDEN	Inspecteurs départementaux de l'Éducation nationale
IGAEN	Inspection général de l'administration de l'Éducation nationale
IGEN	Inspection général de l'Éducation nationale
INED	Institut national d'études démographiques
IPN	Institut pédagogique national
IPR	Inspecteurs pédagogiques régionaux
IUFM	Institut universitaire de formation des maîtres
JORF	Journal officiel de la République française
LEP	Lycée d'enseignement professionnel
LOLF	Loi organique sur les lois de finances
LP	Lycée professionnel
ONISEP	Office national d'information sur les enseignements et les professions
PEGC	Professeur d'enseignement général de collège
SGEN	Syndicat général de l'Éducation nationale
SNALC	Syndicat national des lycées et collèges
SNES	Syndicat national des enseignements du second degré
SNET	Syndicat national de l'enseignement technique
SNI	Syndicat national des instituteurs
ZEP	Zone d'éducation prioritaire