

**Pessis, Celine**

**Bourbakists in politics. The movement survive and live: from “pure science” to political ecology (1970–1975).** (Des bourbakistes en politique. Le mouvement *Survivre et Vivre*: de la “science pure” à l’écologie politique (1970–1975).) (French) [Zbl 08061299](#)  
*Gaz. Math., Soc. Math. Fr.* 182, 40–51 (2024).

This article, based on a Master’s thesis on the *Survivre et Vivre* movement, analyzes – from a historical perspective – the sociological conditions that enabled the ideological transition of certain influential members of the Bourbaki group (namely Claude Chevalley, Alexandre Grothendieck, and Pierre Samuel) toward forms of political engagement and vehement criticism of the scientific-military-industrial complex, illustrated by the founding of the *Survivre* movement.

The first part of the article focuses on the elitist withdrawal of Chevalley, Grothendieck, and Samuel into “pure science” within the prestigious Bourbaki group.

It outlines a brief portrait of this collective of brilliant and ambitious mathematicians who shared not only an elitist conception and a strict hierarchy of mathematics based on their degree of purity and abstraction, but also a common goal: to dissociate a large part of pure mathematics from computational techniques and to reconstruct it on unified axiomatic and structural foundations. From the immediate post-war period to the late 1960s, the Bourbaki group, as is well known, came to occupy a dominant position in the mathematical field and sought to profoundly reshape mathematics education by systematically imposing a structuralist approach.

The author then points out that for P. Samuel – and even more so for C. Chevalley – who until then had experienced modernization within a comfortable aristocratic withdrawal, May 1968 came as a shock of extreme brutality. Suddenly feeling the intolerability of their mandarin-like position, they quickly embraced the social, political, cultural, and existential demands of the time. In doing so, they came to reject as illusory the ideology of “pure science” in which they had long operated. This section of the article also suggests, somewhat implicitly, that A. Grothendieck’s intellectual trajectory was both more subtle and more radical than that of his companions.

On July 27, 1970, the creation – alongside the *Séminaire de mathématiques supérieures* at the Université de Montréal – of the *Survivre* movement marked the moment of dissent for Chevalley, Grothendieck, and Samuel. Born at the heart of the Bourbaki stronghold, *Survivre* quickly came – as the author emphasizes – to combat its own ideological cement. Suddenly, the ideology of pure science, which had previously formed the foundation of the professional ethos of the three former Bourbakists, appeared to them as nothing more than an illusory conservative refuge. Alongside their denunciation of the social irresponsibility of scientists, they accused science and technology of being vectors of alienation. Finally, the author shows how A. Grothendieck – who adopted a posture of moral intransigence – contributed to anchoring the movement within the networks of conscientious objectors.

The final part of the article describes how *Survivre* – from its name change (becoming *Survivre et Vivre* in 1971) to its self-dissolution in 1975 – evolved from a movement denouncing the ties between the military and scientific research into a political group actively involved in the rise of the French anti-nuclear movement and the emergence of French political ecology. At the same time, it highlights how *Survivre et Vivre*’s radical critique of science, experts, and scientism led it to ally with individuals and movements challenging industrial civilization.

Reviewer: [Frédéric Morneau-Guérin \(Québec\)](#)

**MSC:**

[01A60](#) History of mathematics in the 20th century

**Keywords:**

[history of mathematics](#); [sociological conditions](#); [Bourbaki](#); [Survivre](#)