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Dear reviewers,

we would first of all like to thank you most sincerely for your comments on the first version of the text that we submitted to JSSE. We agree with all these remarks concerning the latter's weaknesses and we are trying to correct them as much as possible. The main objective of this article was to present the specific case of the SES in France, its initial project and its evolutions with the liking of the various attacks which were. In so doing, the aim was to show how these conflicts had not without paradox contributed to reinforcing a specific identity of the discipline, with reference to this original project. Thus, more than in the study of curricula, it is more a matter of a socio-history of "school culture" based mainly on archival and ethnographic sources, which have been further specified.

Addressing a foreign (but also French-speaking) audience that is not necessarily familiar with the history and debates related to the SES, we felt it necessary to summarize a certain number of elements already (and perhaps better) presented elsewhere. Nevertheless, this text seems to us to present three scientific contributions: First, to document more recent developments in curricular terms and controversies generated by the ESS; second, to analyse an association of specialists on the basis of the tools of the sociology of collective action, whereas these are generally studied under the sole prism of their curricular conceptions; and last but not least to present the debates within the discipline, polarized around an opposition between APSES and Alain Beitone to summarize it initiated twenty years ago, analysing its foundations, and outlining some elements to try to understand why the split caused by the latter fails to challenge the monopoly of representation of APSES vis-à-vis teachers.

It seemed to us that this situation referred to the particular professional socialization of SES teachers, having fostered among them an attachment to interdisciplinary pluralism and between economic currents, as well as to a valorisation of curricular knowledge distinct from scientific knowledge.

We have therefore chosen to add a new part to the initial structure of the article developing these different elements, while correcting and specifying the main thesis, deleting certain passages too descriptive and useless to the understanding of the general argument, as well as by specifying certain elements too imprecise (such as the meaning of heterodoxy as compared with ‘’mainstream’’ economics and by adding a certain number of theoretical references in order to better situate our purpose. As requested by the editors of the journal, we left these apparent changes in the document, hoping that this would not make reading too painful given their quantity.

We hope that this new version will seem considerably better than the previous one and we would of course like to hear your comments and advice to make it even more acceptable. We thank you in any case very sincerely for all the attention you have given to this text, aware of the free work that it represents.