Introduction to *Homo Anthropologicus*

In reality, in our science, in sociology, we hardly ever find ... man divided into faculties. We are dealing with his body and his mentality in their entirety, given at once and all at once. Basically, body, soul, society, everything here is intertwined ... This is what I mean by phenomena of totality in which not only the group takes part, but also, through it, all the personalities, all the individuals in their moral, social and mental integrity, and all the individuals themselves in their moral, social, mental and, above all, bodily or material integrity. (Marcel Mauss)

No man is an island, a whole, ‘complete in itself’; the individual postured by economic theorists is too often perceived as ‘complete in itself’. (Amartya Sen)

Science would be doomed if (like sport) it placed competition above all else and if it clarified the rules of this competition by confining itself to narrowly defined specialities. The few scientists who have chosen to be nomads are essential to the intellectual well-being of the established disciplines. (Benoît Mandelbrot)

Management ... as a body of knowledge is based on four types of underlying sciences: the engineering sciences, the economic sciences, the sciences concerned with questions of physiology and individual psychology, and what are known as the behavioural or social sciences. (Lyndall Urwick)

Over the last few decades, the world has undergone considerable change. Historical capitalism, as Fernand Braudel and Immanuel Wallerstein called it (Braudel, 1985; Wallerstein, 1985, 2004) has conquered the entire planet. This triumph was made possible by a combination of factors, not least of which was the collapse of the Berlin Wall. The fall of communism was not just a physical event – the collapse of a wall – but also, and above all, the disappearance of an alternative socio-economic model that had been fighting against it until then. The ‘victory’ of the Western development model has thus once again confirmed the capitalist dynamic as the only way to create wealth, while illustrating once again the ability of this system to overcome crises and criticisms thanks to its process of relentless ‘destructive creation’, as Schumpeter once described it (Saussois, 2006). The Chinese model is one of its most recent singular manifestations, combining in its case ultra-capitalism with Chinese Communist Party leadership (Bergère, 2014).
This historic event had immediate consequences: it legitimised the idea of the market as the ultimate mechanism for coordinating economic activities; it promoted the enterprise as an efficient organisational model and as the ideal to be followed by all other organisational forms; and it established management, particularly private management, as the dominant category of thought. The first two elements, the market and the private firm, had already been well highlighted by Max Weber’s fundamental work on the genesis of capitalism, carried out at the turn of the twentieth century as an extension of Karl Marx’s pioneering thinking. While the third, management, emerged at the same time and was to form the basis of the functioning of the large organisations that were emerging, it was not taken up in these terms by Weber’s thinking, Max Weber preferring the term ‘bureaucracy’. But the developments of the last few decades, by giving to management a central role, seems to illustrate this rise in the rationalisation of the world, strongly emphasised by Weber’s analysis at the turn of the twentieth century.

There is no doubt that management ideas play an essential role in the dynamics of contemporary capitalism, inspiring the actions of companies. The key production players in the system come mainly from three sources: practitioners, consultants and academics. The first, the practitioners, are the most numerous, engineers being prominent among them since the nineteenth century; the second group, the consultants, exert a significant influence, with some elements belonging to the third group, the academics, whose numbers have grown steadily over the last 40 years in most industrialised countries (Chessel and Pavis, 2001; Dameron and Durand, 2017). This is due to a number of factors: the emergence of the management and administrative sciences, the explosion in management education programmes, the proliferation of publications in this field, and their widespread dissemination through the mainstream media (newspaper columns, specialist radio and television programmes), and more recently, through the development of websites dedicated to business and management issues.

In this world of constant change, the focus of managerial thinking is on a wide range of themes: strategic vision, positioning, structures, organisational identity, leadership, culture, technology, innovation, the organisational environment, the value chain, marketing, HR, logistics, accounting, and so on.

In this book, I will not repeat the many discussions that have already taken place in the field of management since its origins. There are many excellent works on the subject, and several are mentioned at the end in the bibliography. I will therefore focus on what seems to me the most salient from my anthropological point of view.

My reflection is based on a number of observations I have made about the social sciences and management sciences over the years, in particular about the need to broaden the dominant anthropological vision in economics and man-
management. This broader vision, which I will defend here, is based on, according to Marcel Mauss’s words, ‘the totality of the sciences, which consider human being as a living, conscious and sociable being’ (1968, p. 285), or again, like Edgar Morin, following on the work of Georges Gusdorf (1967), on a multi-dimensional science (articulating within it the biological, the sociological, the economic, the historical and the psychological) which helps us to understand the complex unity/diversity of human existence (Morin, 1999) and last from Maurice Dufour’s work who developed such a perspective at the end of the 1960s within the management field in France (Dufour, 1985).

The book is divided into nine chapters. The first looks back at the emergence of modern *homo administrativus*, and clarifies what one mean nowadays by management, managerialism and work. In each of the eight following chapters, I address each of the anthropological dimensions that seem to me to be central, under their Latin names: *homo socialis, homo politicus* (Chapter 2); *homo laborans, homo faber* (Chapter 3); *homo loquens* (Chapter 4); *homo symbolicus* (Chapter 5); *homo spatialis* (Chapter 6); *homo temporalis, homo historicus* (Chapter 7); *homo corporalis, homo doloris, homo gaudium* (Chapter 8) and *homo ethicus* (Chapter 9). While I have separated them here for pedagogical reasons, these dimensions, as we shall see, are always interdependent and integrated into concrete work situations.