



**HAL**  
open science

## Capital and Scientifico-political power

Thibault Jean-Fred Masset

► **To cite this version:**

Thibault Jean-Fred Masset. Capital and Scientifico-political power: a presentation of the method used in Critical and clinical analysis of peace strategies in the 21st century. A Deleuzo-Guattarian critique of power in the 21st century.. 2020. halshs-02480107

**HAL Id: halshs-02480107**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-02480107>**

Preprint submitted on 15 Feb 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

Capital and Scientifico-political power, a presentation of the method used in

**Critical and clinical analysis of peace strategies in the 21st century.**

*A Deleuzo-Guattarian critique of power in the 21st century.*

by Thibault Jean-Fred Masset.

Main work available at this address any use must be cited.

<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-02298507/document>

**Abstract:**

Capital is not in itself the cause of the problems of increasing inequality but is the end product. Observing the product as the driving cause is a theoretical error. The cause of the increase in inequality is the nature of the capturing power generating such an accumulation. This cause is the emergence of scientifico-political power, of which Capital is only the main accumulation effect. Capital is the effect of scientifico-political power.

It is not Capital that creates the scientific division of labor, it is the emergence and establishment of scientifico-political power that generates the division of labor, its quantification and quantitative evaluation, and a scientific-political rationality that generates a spontaneous order in which accumulation originates in places with the most sophisticated systems of scientification of the means of accumulation.

This article only presents the method used to discover this advance, which is part of a long and much broader doctoral research work (cf. <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-02298507/document>) that formulates the historical proof of analysis from the self-critical method and according to a critical materialist approach from three currents: the Frankfurt School, the Deleuzo-Guattarian philosophy and the Marxist materialist approach from Althusser to Actuel Marx in France, as well as the Marxisms of Latin America.

Capital is not the priority critical target. The priority target to be weighed is scientifico-political power itself and its effects.

From the method used is then deduced other steps which consist in reconciling the materialist theoretical objective of analysis and the capacity for effectiveness and concrete action of transformation by declining into strategies of peace conceived as a reduction of the mutilating structures of existence.

Capital and Scientifico-political power, a presentation of the method used in

**Critical and clinical analysis of peace strategies in the 21st century.**

The research effort carried out in this thesis consisted in thinking a method of philosophical epistemology of the apprehension of the "political" object, in the pursuit of a tradition of french political philosophy of deleuzo-guattarian heritage, while presenting itself as a critical and self-critical effort and gesture of ortho-subjectivity and ortho-objectivity.

The aim was to reconcile theoretical political philosophy with the practical demands of political science in order to arrive at a formulation of concrete proposals for action based on a unified theory.

The approach employed consisted in taking up and adapting a method from the materialist tradition - nourishing its theoretical research effort by relying on documented scholarly academic historical information and on the knowledge elaborated and provided by the Human and Social Sciences - in order to carry out a critique of power while drawing inspiration from a critical gesture of Kantian (delimitation) and Cartesian inspiration (doubt, temporary suspension of judgment integrated into the research method as a tool for seeking a solution and assured foundation of knowledge).

The thesis is divided into six parts, which describe a movement of thought in main time from theory to action in a non-linear way respecting the order of the self-critical method: on the one hand, a first definitional and analytical step consisted in determining first of all an inference of a function of political philosophy from a definition of philosophy and politics leading to a consideration of political philosophy (thesis, p.11) as an explicit critical power of action since the creation of concepts of political order in order to understand the political field, as much as a collective de-limitative critical action from a philosophical principle of quantitative deliberation taking into account the diversity and globality of the *demos* in the *omnis*, the *omnis* being understood as the non-unified heterogeneous totality gathering the strata of the living and all the material strata supporting the greatest diversity of life forms, organised in the form of a spontaneous order expressing the greatest possible diversity of individual and collective ethnic, cultural, social forms and modes of existence inserted in a manner compatible with each other and with the greatest possible diversity of forms and modes of living existence in such a way

as to guarantee at least the reproduction of forms and modes of existence and of the environmental environment which guarantees this reproduction.

The aim of such a contrapositional approach of a political philosophy conceived as critical is therefore to guarantee protection against the overflow of organized collective action systems (politics), in particular decisive organized collective action systems (powers) as determining effects on *demos* and environments and thus on the *omnis* that can lead to the mutilation of existences.

Having passed this theoretical definitional stage, it is therefore a matter of carrying out this theoretical critical programme, starting with an identification of the nature, form and expression of contemporary powers synthesised into a concept of contemporary power to be identified and then carrying out a delimiting critique of it.

However, insofar as the concern for research imposes a rigour in the identification process, there was no question of establishing a designation of power without proof as a simple arbitrary designation of an object of vulgar criticism whose designation could have been the product of a simple passive or even admitted and accepted impregnation of the researcher accepting the compromise of his theoretical research project in the face of the scientific social pressure of an economic-university or even media context conditioning his choice and making him choose by pressure a simple fashion phenomenon as becoming his object of study or by simple subjective prejudice. In all rigour, it was therefore necessary to formulate first of all, during the first part, a historical proof allowing to establish a guarantee of identification.

For the second part, it was a question of then identifying the contemporary effects of this power and of carrying out the critical task of delimiting this power in order to restrict the mutilating overflows of the existences;

The third stage involved a self-critical approach that put into perspective the effort made by the university community in the field of social and human sciences to identify the powers currently in place (e.g. patriarchal power), seeking to determine how the critical analysis carried out could be integrated into the research trends existing in the contemporary academic world.

A problematic observation formed the dramatic crux of this part consisting in demonstrating the value of doubt and the capacity to solve a problem of theoretical compatibility of the diversity of identifications through a controlled self-critical gesture.

This phase having been developed, the fourth step that imposed itself theoretically was the identification of a common theoretical basis for the reasoning of a diversity of relevant analyses of power and for ensuring the coexistence of approaches to different aspects of power.

As has been the case since the beginning of the work, it was not a question of dogmatically establishing an adequate foundation but rather of searching for one. An exploratory serial analytical work having been carried out, the theoretical foundation discovered was discovered in Deleuze-Guattari work and was established.

In this way, the practical translation of the firmly established concepts could be carried out first of all in the fifth part a schematism and then finally in the last part into concrete strategic proposals for action to produce reductions in the mutilating overflows of existences.

All the work is inserted in a requirement of legitimization of the approach of critical theoretical intervention and the formulations of proposals of legal and political strategies in order to rebalance, delimit and reduce the annexations of powers on the mutilated existences are thought within the frameworks of law and of contemporary human and social sciences and political sciences. The underlying critical targets not thematized for themselves in a strategic concern for coherence were above all external to political philosophy: the political aspects of F. Hayek's thinking concerning the irrationality of social justice measures, the reactivation of a critical political philosophy, the question of formalism and the meaning-depleting effects associated with the extension of the process of division of labour.

\*

In the detail of the thesis study:

We therefore began our work with a definitional and conceptual approach to determine one possible task of a contemporary political philosophy among others to establish a critique of contemporary power.

However, trying to determine a majority aspect of the heterogeneous configuration of contemporary specific power imposed to go beyond immediate observation, which is not a sure or sufficient guarantee of relevance of identification. An additional theoretical means of identification had to be proposed in order to discover this majority aspect of a structural heterogeneous configuration of contemporary power(s).

The choice was that of going through an analogical and historical reasoning by making a detour through the analysis of the structure of a well-documented previous power, the

theological-political power, its effects, its modes of expression. Armed with this knowledge, we were able to discover comparatively the resumption of the function of an analogous contemporary power.

**From this analysis of the theological-political power, we have identified a power of similar extension in our time, the scientific-political power** that you have estimated from our historical research to have been born within a process of primitive accumulation proper to this power, the primitive accumulation of new knowledge of the graduates of the universities of the end of the medieval era and the period of the Renaissance : new elites exercised in the trivium whose conquering social future was expressed not in war but in commerce, creating a new capitalist class as a result of scientific-political power. As the primitive accumulation of materialist theorizations became an effect and not a cause of the specific form of capitalist accumulation, it is scientific-political power that generates primitive accumulation.

This scientific-political power identified in history from a study going back to Gerbert d'Aurillac and the contents of medieval formation, acquires preponderance over the theological-political power in the 17th century, through the critical action of historical-political figure-events (Hobbes, Descartes, Galileo, Spinoza, Newton) whose effects on the structure of knowledge-power have been historically decisive. Hobbes' work seemed particularly enlightening and central in its depth of political philosophy and was the subject of consequent developments to grasp the mutation of power.

The strongest contemporary effects of this scientific-political power seemed to us to be expressed in the sphere of production and thus of work, in the form of work and in the processes of evaluating productivity, studied from a Marxist materialist perspective and based on the work of B.Ogilvie and researchers in the humanities (D.Meda) as well as the main studies of statistical and social analysis bodies (OECD, ILO, INSEE, etc.). The critical positive proposal results in a table of items reducing the mutilation of lives at work (p.209).

Having exposed the main features of the identified power structure, we have noted in the third part a problematic aspect inviting a self-critical overcoming integrated into our critical method: contemporary militant movements and conceptualizations of current emancipations (feminists, anti-racists, critique of capitalism, ecologists, social critique of determinism) did not evoke the critique of such a scientific-political power. We therefore had to take note of a difficulty: that of the expression of heterogeneous critical movements that did not perceive the same

oppression or the same nature of mutilations of existence, revealing a variety of powers or specific expressions of domination.

Rather than rejecting our work, which attested to a form of domination that did not present an associated militant resistance, we sought to grasp the reason for such a discrepancy by admitting to examine the hypothesis of a plurality of powers at work within the same epoch, some of which could engage in militant action.

The hypothesis of superimposition ( superposition) and conservation of previous powers in the new power structures present in Deleuze-Guattari was a means of accounting for and resolving the gap between the theoretical production carried out and the absence of specific militancy or associated theoretical contemporary criticism, while maintaining the existence of a proven scientific-political power in the school selection of elites, decision-makers and officials, the places where elites are trained and the forms of contemporary dominant majority rationality, including in so-called literary teaching.

The requirement of demonstrating the theoretical approach made it necessary to determine whether such a hypothesis was founded: at the end of an examination, we observed that all power rested on a theoretical foundation, and we saw a serial analysis of the different types of foundation to determine which theoretically guaranteed the conception of a plurality of distinct power identifications whose effects are different and do not in any way stem from the same a priori generative point. The review listed the main foundations identified by previous political philosophers: the main foundation being the anthropological foundation in Hobbes, to this are added other theorizations of the foundations of politics and power, the foundation of interest, the foundation of force, the foundation of nature and life, the foundation of law, the foundation of history.

None of these foundations theoretically guaranteed the superimposition of all identifications because the diversity expressed was not reducible to a single one of all its aspects. Force cannot explain male domination simply (or for some, or on its own), and so on. We therefore had to find the basis of the theoretical foundations or their common point, as anthropology could not explain an extension beyond humanity and the arguments of the political foundations of power relations had already been legitimated by a natural foundation, we concluded by weighting and synthesizing the points of view that the theoretical basis for conceiving the value of the superposition hypothesis was that of the conceptualization of the foundation of desire according

to Deleuze-Guattari's conception, whose complexity imposed the scrupulous continuation of the guide to understanding provided by the work of Guillaume-Sibertin Blanc : in short, the concept of Deleuze-Guattarian desire guaranteed, in its immanence to the entire social field, the possibility of the synchronic coexistence of several powers and critics of power and the heterogeneity of its forms.

The foundation being established, the positive realization of criticism was possible. The theoretical description of the mechanisms of the form-state not reducible to the state, of these mutilating operations of power, of the nature of the striated space could be established. The form-State or striated space, conceived as non-equivalent expressions but close to the notion of scientific-political power, were studied on the basis of the work of G. Sibertin-Blanc in order to maintain a materialist coherence and materiality of the concepts. In the same way, as the declination of a certain materialist theory can consist in thinking a practice, we interpreted the materialist perspective as a call for the formulation of possible rebalances, theoretical interventions in the reality of contemporary situations and the formation of concrete proposals starting from a stage of schematism embodied in the theory of strategies through the formulation of contemporary diagnoses of contemporary situations concerning the actions of power that mutilate existences. Abstract theories give way to the analysis of the theoretical framework conditioning the determination of applied solutions and strategies of resolution.

We have therefore proposed elements of diagnosis concerning situations where the exercise of scientific-political power is particularly worrying nowadays: in particular the means of contemporary wars and we have placed the question of peace as the first conditional and final issue of the analysis of power and its critique and we have tried to think about the mechanisms of anticipation, prevention of wars and conflicts through a jurisprudential procedure of procedural law before, during and after the war (*jus ad bellum, in bello, post bellum*).

To this end, we have mobilised analyses of the forms of contemporary wars, the situations and theatres of new wars and new wars and their relationship to law (outer space, digital, and contemporary identity wars, etc.) and re-evaluated the contribution of traditional strategists by giving importance to the notion of war beyond limits of the two colonels of the Chinese army, Wang Xiangsui and Qiao Liang, strategists of the contemporary period, as well as certain notable works, notably the theory of drones by G. Chamayou. The question of migratory

wandering has been the focus of a critical political philosophy of migration law, forming a synthesis of the contributions of the main approaches of SHS - the history of migration (Noiriel), the anthropology of migration (M. Agier), the corpus of French law and migration demography (F. Héran/M. Héran), the history of migration (Noiriel) and the anthropology of migration (M. Agier) - to the corpus of French law and migration demography (F. Héran/M. Tribalat), from a critical Deleuzo-Guattarian and Balibar perspective and taking into account the work of the philosophy of hospitality movement: The inability to account for the inability to provide the continuous traces of existence required by the administrations and which give rise to rights and a political need for consultation between the countries of departure and arrival:

Finally, we have also formulated concrete proposals for strategies concerning social and economic justice, etc. (a pragmatic aspect imposed by the American director for the doctorate on works), while at the same time assuming the critical position of Deleuzo-Guattarianism, conceiving the guarantee of all social justice first of all in the political action of minorities.

An attempt was made to think of a project of ICRA- International Center of Research about Alterities), or IURA (University Institute of Research about Alterity) within an Institute of Peace. We were led to think that, in the last instance, the struggle of minorities and critical emancipation remain the main rebalancing actions allowing a collective emancipation accompanying a diplomatic work and a scholarly search for rational compromises.

It seemed to us that the implementation of a power-knowledge carried by philosophy in the face of a scientific-political power-knowledge remained one of the most efficient critical written forces. The theory exposed gave way to an open critical field of production.

In complementary notes, we recalled our attachment to the rich debate on primitive accumulation which discusses the origin of capitalism from various subjective angles and we sought to dialogue to determine a weighted place as a proposal of the concept of scientific-political knowledge-power in the origin of capitalism; the note on the analysis of the return of the religious wanted to study the importance of this contemporary phenomenon and allowed us to observe that the tradition of Marxist materialism, notably through one of its representatives (A. Tosel) has been able to demonstrate a current reactivation of forms of religious power in the present era; finally, to accompany the thesis, we have given a brief conceptual genealogy which has made it possible to formulate a concept of scientific-political power: the process of dissolution and division of labour in Marx; the process of Western Weberian rationalisation;

the position of the one-dimensional man in H.Marcuse, J. Ellul's questioning of the origin of value in the 20th century, and above all the concept of generalized decoding of flows in Deleuze-Guattari.

By this we wanted to make a contribution to the critical collective effort: Alongside researchers establishing knowledge of the causes, functioning and effects of colonial capitalist violence, racist from the triangular trade to the present day; of capitalist sexist violence against women since the XVI-XVII century, we have presented one aspect of this accumulated violence, the mode of schooling of the elites proper to a scientificized power-knowledge and a task of limiting the illegitimate extensions of the invasive tendencies of all powers according to an approach that seeks to respect a requirement of epistemology of the "political" object.

\*

The thesis is also inscribed in the critique in act that it proposes itself as a task of political philosophy. Thus, one challenge has been to constitute an anomalous form of theoretical object detached from the forms instituted by the academic division of academic work in order to produce an effect of meaning by shifting the form by imposing a difficulty in the evaluation of the object posing an epistemological problem of questioning the epistemological framework of evaluation itself and its very receptivity, risking a possibility of academic invisibility. The demand for authenticity in the critique of scientific-political power imposed such a form that was inseparable from the substance. This issue of form was already present but evacuated as a detail of the history of the philosophical tradition or even a defect and a weakness because of attacks by some rare but strongly propagated academic critics concerning the works of the French philosophers of the 1970s: Foucault, Derrida and especially Deleuze-Guattari, then later A.Badiou. Our work has also sought to rehabilitate the epistemological value and conceptual rigour and theoretical usefulness of Deleuze-Guattarian theorization and its fecundity in the wake of a rigorous work of analysis of the Deleuze-Guattarian corpus led by Guillaume Sibertin-Blanc, although conducted by other means and seeking to reconcile theory and practice according to a specific method.

The thesis work is intended for several potential readers who will be able to find at several levels and according to several perspectives in this thesis work at each stage theoretical critical tools (part I to V) or practical (last part) formulating specific proposals. The work is carried out according to a non-Smithian conceptualization of politics that guarantees, through the concept

of *omnis*, a respect for the diversities of people, cultural, social and ecological diversities. A process of formulating historical evidence has been carried out, establishing an epistemological debate with history, possibly posing a two-tier question. The first would consist in asking what epistemologically acceptable relationship philosophy can have with the historical material in contemporary political philosophy and its stakes.

A certain French philosophical heritage since the 1970s, formulated an almost forbidden use of encompassing or general concepts (as if it could be otherwise from the very pretension of any concept and of philosophy).), coupled with philosophical attempts to invest the historical field in the form of inductive surveys retracing singular or particular histories of groups or administrations that are worthy of being used as a light on contemporary reality (Foucault or Rancière) and the current hyper-specialization leading to histories of groups extraordinarily restricted to something specific (for example: fanny Gallot's thesis (*En découdre*, éd. la découverte), which is interesting but limited to a monograph on the status of women workers in a Moulinex company, elucidating the transformation of demands in a relationship with the unions within the company).

To have thought of a more global history attempts to regain a philosophical presence that makes it possible to give meaning to the central phenomena, having a greater power of intelligibility without leaving it to the media "ideology-historians".

In this thesis of political philosophy, the effort made has been to try to resolve the contradictions bequeathed by tradition, by seeking to make an anomalous history that is neither particular nor global, while being AND particular AND global at the same time, by seeking to identify a centrality, my object being power, by working the history of the place of its genesis and reproduction, so to speak, in order to grasp a form of understanding of the effects that flow from this mutation of power, as if a certain history were more causal and the other histories specific than mere effects or symptoms.

Secondly, to return to the content of historical evidence and the debate on it, it is the history of education and school content for the elites that has seemed the most fundamental for the critical theory of power, all of this taking into account the context of the futures of these elites.

The work discovered a two-stage emergence of scientific-political power that opened up for discussion: a proposal on the origin of capitalism. The origin of capitalism would be to be found in the scientific training from the quadrivium in medieval universities coupled with the culture of conquest and the ethos of domination of the elites whose social future could no longer be expressed by their new education in military warfare forms becoming a new social type of businessmen of the renaissance. Secondly, a mutation of central power in the seventeenth century was brought about by critics of the theological-political power, which brought about the emergence of a new knowledge power at the same time at the centre of the central power structures: The new scientific scholarly authorities and the scientific means that these scholars possessed to transform nature created a new form of trans-political power, the scientific-political power that gradually gained in insertion in the power structures (formation of elites, mode of reasoning) and in social and productive extension (systems of selection, configuration of modes of subjectivation, driving ideals, ideology, investments, etc.).)

One could retort that the proposals are already being made by the Frankfurt School and by a critical current of techno-science. However, although H. Marcuse and J. Ellul have made criticisms of techno-science, they have not formulated a historical proof of this. Ellul formed a critique of techno-science and its ideological effects, while Marcuse further emphasized his sharp critique of the political aspects of control and the need for critical philosophy as the sole bearer of the contradiction to this power and thus philosophy as the main spearhead of criticism in a normalized society where mental processes, social structures and the mode of production resonated with industrial, technical, (Marcuse thus influenced Marxist criticism and foreshadowed the possibility of an event-work such as Deleuze-Guattari's "capitalism and schizophrenia" which, through the theory of desire, founds the possibility of such connections and offers a key to the theoretical understanding of power).

In this thesis work, the legacy of Marcuse and Ellul is taken up in Deleuze-Guattari's theoretical framework of knowledge and by adopting their critical and anti-power scientific-political position. It is a contribution to the advancement of the Franco-German philosophical critical tradition.

Summarizing scientific-political power in one definition would be: division for productive efficiency and the form associated with this optimal division. Like any power, scientific-political power, as a process of division for productive efficiency and as a form associated with this optimal division, incenses types of humans adhering to this paradigm and creates monstrous emergences (radical populisms) in its opposition in the form of pure rejection and fertile criticisms that allow us to think of a restriction of its mutilating overflows for the existences and to restore a diversity and a structuring of the balanced social link with the natural environment.

Sustainable peace, based on the non-mutilation of existence, remains the spearhead of the political-philosophical criticism carried out in the thesis, the most important aspects of which are both negative preventive and positive (constructive). For the negative preventive aspect, it is a question of preventing conflicts, and it is on this point that history and anthropology have played a leading role in the thesis because history offers conflict resolution resources to the geography of conflicts: the question of social peace and religious tolerance in all societies can be addressed thanks to the legacy offered by the historical study of the position of Sebastian Castellion and the relationship to Michel Servet or the writings.

In the same way, the criteria of legitimacy of wars defined jurisprudentially or the effort to think a framework of the principles of legitimacy of conflicts guarantees a philosophical work taking up the Kantian requirement to work for peace on an international scale. From the given table of criteria for example (p.456) can be deduced an inflection of the decision-making structure for conflict resolution of the United Nations Organisation for example. Indeed, if the criteria are :

1. Severity of the threat: risk of genocide, massacres, proven imminent violence, violence already suffered.

2. Non-profit clause: even if the motive is established as legitimate, any entry into war is subject to a clause prohibiting the obtaining of goods or contracts and the use of the reserves and wealth of the territory undergoing the conflict.
3. 3. Last resort: entry into war must be the last resort after having exhausted all the usual gradual diplomatic alternatives of sanctions and all efforts at negotiation.
4. Proportionality of means and prohibition of illegitimate means (torture, unconventional weapons, bacteriological, etc.).
5. Limited ends: ends must be delimited and objectives circumscribed in space and time.
6. Principle of no lasting destabilization: the act of war must not lead to greater evil and chaos, such as the deliberate destruction of political organizations or of all the infrastructures for the viability of a civil society: public services of necessity (hospitals, schools, energy structures, agricultural fields, production structures satisfying the needs of the population, particularly food). Limitation of structural damage must be the principle.
7. The broadest possible basis of legitimacy: consultation must ensure that legitimacy is recognized by the broadest possible international community and not only by geostrategic, current or historical allies.
8. Maintenance of a principle of discrimination between soldiers and civilians even in situations of asymmetry.
9. Prohibition of the use of mercenaries to get rid of abuses that contravene the above-mentioned principles. Private military companies are therefore prohibited.
10. Reminder of the principle of responsibility at all levels of responsible leaders and implementers in passivity and in decision-making activity on the basis of the decision and the obtaining of information on acts that can be prevented. Likewise, for the executors, there must be a principle of responsibility and critical vigilance with regard to the orders given and the obedience due in order to grasp the limit between legitimate and illegitimate orders.
11. Delimitation of the category of enemy: An enemy is a State which has declared war aiming at the death of another State or of a population. The delimitation of the status is temporal and detailed. An ethnic definition and extension of the category of enemy has no legitimacy and is therefore inadmissible.

It can be inferred that a reform of the Security Council by increasing the level of responsibility and decision-making power of non-permanent members can be inferred from clause 2 of the conflict of interest, for the definition of the decision and the gradation of economic sanctions in a situation of committed interest of a member country in the continuation of hostilities or tactical or strategic victory of the supported camp, offering a perspective of conflict resolution that is less Westphalian and superior to the prevention that already exists, while respecting the peace effort already carried out by the UN and all its members, an indispensable effort to which this thesis wanted to contribute.

The risk of the scientific division of labour and all expressions of scientific-political power is to produce social structures that compartmentalize people and parts of people's existence according to a division that goes so far as to lose all meaning and make everything meaningless. For example, in the face of the scientific division of labour, whatever its academic nature, there is a bureaucracy of evaluation that becomes control, a quantification of acts that divides works and occupations into quantities of meaningless units, which rationalizes the time allocated and inhibits all creative gestures in absolute productive stress, by hyperspecializing them, by making any unit of action detached from its global meaning crushed in division, subjectivities no longer sometimes allow themselves to go beyond the delimitation prescribed by the rationality of scientific-political power. The discovery of this power and its history can enable us to limit the damage to humanity.

Thibault Jean-Fred Masset.



To discover the thesis:

<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-02298507/document>

Text open to diffusion but protected by copyright.

Any use must be the subject of a reference to the author and the thesis, HAL source.