

Davide Gallo Lassere and Frédéric Monferrand

Inquiry: Between Critique and Politics

Since the financial crisis of 2008 and the international cycle of struggles that it set off, we have witnessed a forceful return of the notion of “capitalism.” This raises two questions: first, what is capitalism?¹ And second, what justifies its critique?² From a Marxist perspective, the answer to the first question is hardly problematic, though it may be subject to diverging developments. *Capitalism* names a mode of production founded on the generalization of exchange, the exploitation of a “free” labor force, and the indefinite accumulation of surplus value. The answer to the second question, however, is less obvious, if only because Marx’s *Capital* (1976) provides different models for the critique of capitalism.

In the first two sections of volume I, Marx explains that exchange generates socially necessary illusions which impose unilateral social roles on individuals, transforming them into mere “bearers” of an anonymous and self-perpetuating valorization process. From a reading of the first hundred pages of *Capital*, we can thus glean the impression that capitalism, as a mode of production, must be critiqued because it deprives us of all control over our conditions of labor and life.

Yet such a critique, conducted from the objective point of view of capital, would remain merely formal were it not complemented by a description, conducted from the subjective point of view of labor, of the concrete effects of capitalist accumulation on the proletarian social experience. As soon as one leaves the sphere of circulation and descends into the “hidden abode of production,” Marx (1976: 297) explains, capital no longer appears as an “automatic subject” (255), but as a form of command over workers. This gives

rise to conflicts regarding the time and organization of activity, creates an opposition between strategies for the extraction of surplus labor and strategies for the refusal of exploitation, and leads to physical and moral degradation, which Marx describes in detail. In this second perspective, capitalism must be critiqued not because it constitutes an irrational and self-perpetuating system but because it produces negative effects on the physical, psychic, and social lives of the subjectivities it condemns to an unbearable existence.

The objective of this article is to develop this second critical model, which can be qualified as a “critique by effects.” We will demonstrate that this model gains a theoretical support and a political continuation from the practice of *militant inquiry*. Starting from a confrontation of the Engelsian description of the labor and life conditions of English workers with the early Marxian theory of alienation, we will maintain the thesis that the proletarian experience allows for a joining of the knowledge of social relations together with the anticipation of forms of organization equipped to support their transformation. Following the sequence that directed the developments of *Socialisme ou Barbarie* in France and *Quaderni rossi* as well as *Classe operaia* in Italy, we will attempt to demonstrate that the question of organization both provides the basis of militant inquiry and accounts for its different modalities.

Alienation and Description: The Prehistory of Militant Inquiry

The genealogy of militant inquiries is most often traced to the “workers’ inquiry” written by Marx for the *Revue socialiste* in 1880.¹ However, this inquiry itself rests on two principles formulated in 1845 by Engels (2009: 34, 32): the epistemological principle that “a knowledge of proletarian conditions is absolutely necessary to provide solid ground for socialist theories” and the political principle that the proletariat is “perfectly right in expecting no support whatever from [the bourgeoisie].” The history of militant inquiry should thus be traced to Marx and Engels’s texts of the 1840s; it appears, consequently, as constitutive of Marxism viewed as a *politics* of self-emancipation, supported by a *critical theory* of the effects of the economic organization of societies as they are subjectively experienced.

In *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, Engels paints an elaborate picture of the consequences of the economic centrality acquired by the “factory” in workers’ socio-physical experience: low wages, the intensity and duration of exploitation, the de-skilling and monotony entailed by the tasks performed, the despotism of the factory, chronic malnutrition, and inhumane

hygienic and sanitary conditions, in workplaces as well as in neighborhoods and homes, affecting not only men but also women and children. Engels's (2009: 35–36) descriptions fulfill a primarily critical function: it is a matter of defusing the ideological justifications of the emerging capitalism by exposing the negative experiences that the scientific and political discourses dictated by the dominant classes tend to either make invisible or understate.

The socio-medical perspective that Engels directs to the suffering of the English proletariat does not, however, lead him to depoliticize them. For describing the inhumane labor and life conditions of workers does not mean confining them to the position of powerless victims. On the contrary, it means promoting their constitution as an antagonistic class by revealing the *unitary* nature of their condition. To the process of social and economic standardization determined by the concentration and centralization of capital within the large factory there must indeed correspond a political process of working-class *unification*, capable of overcoming the multiple scissions artificially inscribed by the division of labor and the national borders within the class. This process of class unification is, in turn, identified by Engels with a process of *becoming conscious* of the destiny shared by workers. On one side, therefore, the Engelsian inquiry is intended to *reveal* a class unity that is already given. But on the other side, the objectivation of the proletarian condition in the textual space of the inquiry *anticipates* the formation of the political subject that it aims to bring about. We thus find, in Engels, the implicit formulation of a problem that his successors will make explicit: how can the *description* of a situation *create* the subjectivity capable of transforming it? This is precisely the problem addressed by the young Marx in his reflections on alienated labor in the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*.

Contrary to the interpretation that has become so commonplace its validity is hardly ever questioned, the function of the concept of alienation is not to found the critique of capitalism on a dogmatic theory of “the human essence.” Its function is rather to *explain* what Engels settles for *describing*, namely, the fact that the experience of labor turns, for the worker, into an experience of poverty, suffering, and dispossession. In this light, we can read the *Manuscripts of 1844* as the first philosophical justification of workers’ inquiry.

The logic at work in these manuscripts can be reconstructed as follows: Marx begins from the fact of working-class poverty, which he focuses on describing from the point of view of workers themselves in order to contest the descriptions offered by economists. He then moves backward from this “*actual* economic fact” to its *cause*: private property (Marx 1978: 71). It is

because the means of production are the private property of capitalists that workers are dispossessed of the products of their labor, that they experience a feeling of estrangement with regard to their activity, and that they relate to their peers competitively. Yet private property also appears as a *consequence* of alienated labor, since by producing, the worker increases the wealth of the capitalist, thus reproducing the conditions of the worker's alienation on a broader scale. Insofar as private property is both the cause and the consequence of alienated labor, we must recognize that there is *reciprocal action* between capital and labor. This means that, in good Hegelian logic, the relation at the basis of capitalist production is a *process* through which not only the technical, social, and institutional modalities of alienation are transformed, but also consequently the subjective forms in which the struggle against alienation is carried out (Marx 1978: 80).²

The extent to which the *Manuscripts of 1844* are populated by heterogeneous figures has rarely been noted. Within the generic concept of "worker," Marx includes, of course, industrial workers, but also artisans, slaves of colonial plantations, and all the populations that are dependent on the labor market all while being excluded from it: the unemployed, prostitutes, and *lumpen*. This heterogeneity is consistent with the theory of alienation developed in the *Manuscripts of 1844*, as this theory lists a series of formal conditions for belonging to the proletarian class (dispossession of the products of labor, a becoming-estranged from activity, the deterioration of relations with others) without prejudicing the concrete modalities in which subjectivities are put to work. For this reason, it raises a political problem that is absent from Engels's concerns: the problem of the *communicability* of heterogeneous experiences of alienation, and, beyond this, of the *circulation* among the specific sites of struggle that these experiences give rise to. Now, if we leap over the forty years that separate the early developments by Marx and Engels from the "workers' inquiry" of 1880, we see that this problem is at the heart of the questionnaire published in the *Revue socialiste*.

This questionnaire is organized in four parts, over the course of which it proceeds from very specific questions regarding the place and type of labor (I), to the hours, rhythms, and costs of life (II), to the wages and the relationship with the employer (III), and ends with larger questions concerning the state, workers' organizations, and forms of struggle (IV) (see Marx 1989). The workers' inquiry of 1880 thus aims to politicize the entirety of the proletarian experience of the social world. Furthermore, it bears witness to a workers' will to *direct involvement* in the production of a critical knowledge of capitalist societies, while the young Engels and the young Marx had settled

for assuming the proletariat's point of view on these societies. In this respect, it is important to recall that in 1866 Marx had written a letter to the International Workingmen's Association in which he called for the development of "a statistical inquiry into the condition of the working classes in all countries, conducted by the workers themselves." The function of such an inquiry would not only be to "know the way in which to act" and to raise workers' consciousness of their ability to "take their destiny into their own hands," following the young Engels's epistemo-political demand. In accordance with the insights of the *Manuscripts of 1844*, the inquiry's function would also be to arrive at "an international *coordination of efforts*" toward the self-construction of the proletariat as a class. Each of the Association's locations was to launch this inquiry and send the results to the central Council, where a general report would be drawn up and subsequently redistributed to the workers of Europe and the United States (Marx 1866).

From 1844 to 1880, the Marx-Engelsian conception of inquiry reveals itself to contain two problems: first, the problem of a description that would produce effects of political subjectivation, and second, the problem of coordinating heterogeneous sites of struggle. Faced with these problems, the heterodox Marxism of the 20th century would attempt to provide original answers.

The Worker Narrative and the Avant-Garde Network: The Contribution of *Socialisme ou Barbarie*

The editorial of *Socialisme ou Barbarie*'s eleventh issue, written by Claude Lefort, no doubt provides the most original re-orchestration of the first of these two problems. The objective of this editorial, significantly titled "Proletarian Experience," is, in effect, to demonstrate that the proletariat is neither the product of its position in production relations nor the passive object of anonymous economic processes, and still less a mass serving party interests. Rather, it is the subject of a specific social experience, inscribed within its own history; it entails a situated point of view on society and encompasses autonomous political aspirations (Lefort 1952: 2).³

For Lefort, the alienation that structures factory labor cannot reduce workers to mere subordinates of an economic development planned from above. Rather, this development must be interpreted as the product of a second rationalization of the innovations that workers spontaneously bring to the productive machine (Lefort 1952: 8). Importantly, this creativity authorizes the hypothesis of self-management upheld in *Socialisme ou Barbarie*. Therefore, "Proletarian Experience" ends with a call for the collection of nar-

ratives written by workers in the first person, on the model of *The American Worker* by Paul Romano, a member of the Johnson-Forest Tendency whose testimony of the experience of working in the automobile factories of Detroit was translated and published in the first issues of *Socialisme ou Barbarie* (Romano 1949).⁴ Through the comparative analysis of documents of this kind, Lefort hopes to cross the gap, created by class society, between the Marxist intellectual and the alienated worker, and to attain a proletarian experience unmediated by the discourse of parties, unions, or even minoritarian groups such as *Socialisme ou Barbarie*. On the one hand, this return to the very materiality of the proletarian experience is thus considered to justify the antibureaucratic line upheld in the journal; but on the other hand, it must reveal the fact that this line emerges organically from the life internal to the working class. Lefort's position is thus problematic, to say the least: while producing a theoretical discourse, he would like to be nothing but the transmitter of a pre-theoretical lived experience, the vanishing mediation between a structured militant vocabulary and myriad potentially political practices. It is through the invention of a *new form of organization* that Lefort attempts to get out of such an uncomfortable position.

This new form of organization would no longer be the external *importation* of a program but the *self-clarification*, by and for the class, of the revolutionary tendencies that motivate its struggles and aspirations. Against Cornelius Castoriadis, who was at that time campaigning for the construction of a party, Lefort argues, first of all, that the shared experience of labor is sufficient to generate egalitarian and concerted decision-making processes regarding the best way to achieve liberation from productive labor. He then opposes to the party's centralization of forces the proliferation of sites of struggle as the only means to exceed the bureaucratic state's control capacities. Finally, he opposes to the concentration of knowledge in the hands of party members the multiplication of interactions between situated forms of knowledge capable of spreading a revolutionary culture among the proletariat. The model of autonomous organization that Lefort advances is hence that of an "avant-garde network" composed of intellectuals and employed militants who, through the circulation of a journal, the composition of a newsletter, and the practice of "inquiry into the experience of life and labor" of workers, ensure both the communication of struggles and class unification (Lefort 1958).

As innovative as it may be, the Lefortian model of an "avant-garde network" presents certain difficulties, which Castoriadis addresses in the text that seals the break within *Socialisme ou Barbarie*, "The Proletariat and Organization." Here, he argues that the Lefortian model combines a "philosophy

of immediacy” with a “new philosophy of history” which, under examination, reveal themselves to be in contradiction with the political functions they are supposed to ensure (Castoriadis 1958: 59, 61).

With the term “philosophy of immediacy,” Castoriadis designates the relation of direct correspondence Lefort establishes between politics and production. In a Leninist vocabulary, one could say that this relation of direct correspondence displays an “economicist” tendency to reduce political activity to the conflicts emerging from production, and a “spontaneist” tendency to consider the shared experience of labor sufficient to endow the proletariat with a clear consciousness of the stakes, means, and scale of its struggle. Against the first tendency, Castoriadis (1958: 67) recalls that the proletarian is not only a worker but also “a consumer, a voter, a tenant, a mobilizable member of the second class, a parent of students, a reader of the newspaper, a filmgoer, etc.” He emphasizes that the totality of this experience constitutes the working class’s environment of politicization. Against the “spontaneist” tendency, he argues consequently that the politicization of workers’ relation to the social totality requires the construction of an organization for which the experience of factory work alone cannot supply the foundation (66–68). In this perspective, reducing politics to the immediate experience of production does not only mean neutralizing the antagonistic potential of class struggles by confining them to the space of the factory. It also means giving up in advance on the socialist project of the self-government of *all* social practices by “associated producers” (71). Castoriadis concludes that because Lefort abstractly separates the particular experience of production from the general experience of society, he is obliged to place socialism on the horizon of a “new philosophy of history.”

“New philosophy of history” here refers to the identification of the proletarian experience with a process of *Bildung* that would organically lead workers from the state of minority to that of autonomy. And just as his “philosophy of immediacy” contradicts the political *content* of the proletarian experience, Castoriadis claims that this teleological optimism contradicts the *form* of militancy that Lefort advances. For if there is reason to clarify the proletarian experience, this is because it is not immediately clear to itself, and contains contradictory tendencies between which decisions must be made. Such contradictions include conflicts between alienation and the struggle against alienation, between confidence in the communist party and the refusal of union bureaucracies, and between racism against immigrant workers and proletarian internationalism. In this perspective, the political “maturation” of the proletariat is not carried out *against* or despite the exter-

nal intervention of militants, as Lefort claims, but *thanks* to such intervention, which, even in the minimal form of workers' inquiry, always aims to enforce one tendency immanent to the proletarian experience against another (Castoriadis 1958: 64–65). Castoriadis remarks that to practice inquiry is already to take a position on the proletarian experience; the militants involved are motivated by convictions that are apparent in the choice of subjectivities they make contact with. Furthermore, the questions they ask these subjectivities display a certain idea of the social conditions that structure their experience, their possible future, and the means by which its antagonistic potential can be liberated. These ideas, as a group, form the outlines of a program of struggle that the militants can only hope those with whom they conduct the inquiry will coproduce, that is, appropriate, transform, and realize. And the collective implementation of this program, in turn, is nothing other than what is generally called a political organization. If he were consistent, Castoriadis concludes, Lefort would recognize that his “avant-garde network” is not the opposite of the party form, but a renewed form of party.

Two models of articulation between inquiry and organization thus arise from the Lefort/Castoriadis debate: for the first, inquiry is organization, which is consequently conceived of as an avant-garde network of militants inherent in the class. For the second, inquiry is only a *moment* of organization, here conceived in the form of a party that is relatively autonomous with respect to the class. This choice, however, rests on two problematic presuppositions: first, that the struggle against alienation is reducible to the struggle against labor, and second, that only the formation of a centralized party would carry this struggle outside the limits of the workplace. In order to move beyond this choice, the project of a mass inquiry “into the social level of proletarian autonomy” was developed in Italy in the 1960s and 1970s (Negri 2005: 171). This practice of inquiry aims to politicize the proletariat's relation not only to labor but also to the family and consumption, to transportation and housing, to the school and hobbies—in short, to the totality of social life.

From Political Inquiry to Co-research

In order to understand how *Potere Operaio* (1967–73), *Lotta continua* (1969–76), or the “Autonomia” groups (1973–79) multiplied the spaces of intervention on and in which to practice militant inquiry, we must quickly review the trajectory of early workerism, which redevelops the stakes regarding the *method*, the political *objectives*, and the *spatiotemporal coordinates* of inquiry.

Whereas the first of these stakes is inherent to the very organization of militant inquiry, the second and third concern the forms of organization that *emerge* from it. Indeed, the group involved in the first period of the journal *Quaderni rossi* (1962–64) was not at all homogeneous with regard to political views. It included militants close to parties and to mass unions as well as others who were much more critical of the traditional working-class movement. This heterogeneity of tactical and strategic orientations was reflected in a striking manner throughout the different practices of militant inquiry, that is, across the different conceptions of political organization. And it was precisely around the question of the form of organization from which the practice of inquiry should begin that the first break among the workerists took place, between, on one side, Raniero Panzieri and the militants and researchers who pursued the experiment of *Quaderni rossi* (1964–66), and, on the other, Mario Tronti and the group that founded *Classe operaia* (1964–66).

For the first group, “the socialist use of workers’ inquiry” had to first of all provide unions with access to sociological knowledge (cf. Panzieri 1964). On the other side, what interested Tronti’s group was precisely the autonomous organization of *workers’ non-collaboration*. In the first case, we do not see a true reconfiguration of the modalities of knowledge production: supplied with theoretical tools developed by industrial sociology, experts in the social sciences put their skills at the disposal of the union. The originality of the procedure conducted by Panzieri and *Quaderni rossi* rests on the political ends toward which it directs sociological knowledge; it is a journal for the diagnostics of the objective and subjective transformations of neocapitalism. By contrast, *Classe operaia* is a truly interventionist journal; as its subtitle claims, it is a *monthly journal of workers in struggle*, that is, an organ that dictates a political line in full autonomy, even against parties and unions. Thus, we can already see, in the differences between the two journals’ formats, that the two groups’ political intentions are by no means the same.

This heterogeneity of political perspectives, linked to two contradictory ways of understanding and practicing militant inquiry, is embodied in diverging tactics, forms of organization, and objectives. For example, Panzieri’s typical demand for workers’ control, based on a socialist reappropriation of the use of machinery, finds its basis in political inquiry. Indeed, the mastery of the productive cycle’s operation, rather than being limited to a mere update of the ideal of self-management, can be seen as “a preparation for situations of ‘dual power’ in connection with a total political conquest” (Panzieri 1961: 71). Workers’ control over production thus constitutes a specific form of struggle and not a substitute for the conquest of political power;

it is the stage of maximal pressure on capitalist power. Inquiry, then, is a factor in the *acceleration of the temporalities of struggle and the strengthening of its organizational forms*, founded on the refusal to derive “the analysis of the level of the working class from an analysis of the level of capital” (Panzieri 1964: 73). Indeed, the former is autonomous with respect to the latter, and it is this margin of autonomy that can and must be radicalized and intensified, first by inquiries, and then by workers’ institutions. In this sense, political inquiry is a tool for the avoidance of all mystical visions of the workers’ movement and its degree of consciousness, strength, and organization. Particularly when it is conducted “heatedly,” that is, in conditions of political turmoil, political inquiry does not only aim to make contact with workers in struggle and to set up a process of in-depth political self-formation. Above all, it serves to provide the knowledge resources necessary to consolidate the organization of institutions for the workers’ movement and, consequently, to fortify workers’ autonomy with respect to capital. In this point of view, there is still a strong link between sociological observation and political action.

By contrast, the co-research put in place by the militants and researchers of *Classe operaia*, and Romano Alquati in particular, does not consist as much in establishing a sturdy link between social research and political action as in merging them together. Therefore, militant inquiry is here no longer a preliminary step for organization (as it is for the young Engels and Marx), nor is it the moment in which organization is perfected (as in the case of Panzieri or Marx’s late work).⁵ Extending the discussion internal to *Socialisme ou Barbarie*, Alquati identifies inquiry with organization in action. His “methodological collectivism” aims for the coproduction of “cognitive and transformative power” (Alquati 1994: 135, 18). This entails a *reciprocal action* between the technical organization of research, which is vertically structured according to its participants’ qualities and experiences, and the political organization of the group, which is shaped following the principles of equality and horizontality (Alquati 1993: 63, 65, 119). The movement beyond this division—composed of multiple skills and forms of expertise—is then founded on a relation to temporality and to spaces of research that differs significantly from that of political inquiry alone.

On one side, Alquatian co-research is a long-term movement composed of several cycles of annual political inquiries: its “interminable, permanent, and infinite processuality” extends over a period of approximately fifteen years. After having identified a “barycentric node,” the process of co-research is deployed through preliminary, exploratory sub-inquiries that are both formative and self-forming. Each cycle of annual co-inquiries seeks

to verify a set of initial hypotheses, which, once confirmed or redefined, become the presuppositions of a new cycle, and so on, in a kind of “non-extinguished, constitutive, and inventive projectuality,” which remains by definition unfinished (Alquati 1993: 38). On the other side, Alquati co-research aims to establish a constant militant presence in sites of struggle, and to install groups of co-researchers in such spaces to facilitate the co-production of political dynamics. From this point on, it is a question of analyzing the stage at hand while anticipating its tendency, and of harnessing the behaviors of insubordination and resistance within it, in time to bend them in an openly antagonistic direction. And it is precisely this implantation that allows for an identification of the lines of force articulated in the present, for an active participation in their mobilization, and for the channeling of these forces, providing them with a confrontational form.

Contrary to political inquiry, co-research is therefore not a short-term practice that is (semi-)external to struggles. It is inscribed in the long term of the sites and trajectories of mobilization to which it is immanent. Therefore, it leads to the progressive decline of the dichotomy between the researcher and the subject of inquiry. Co-research consists, in fact, in a coproduction of knowledge with and for the subjects of struggle, without, however, approaching the utopia of Maoist democratism, for which every participant would be immediately capable of fulfilling every role. The “dynamic recomposition” to which co-research aspires, in a performative mode, thus provides an original response to the problem raised by Marx in the *Theses on Feuerbach*, and taken up by Lenin: who educates the educators? Beginning from the double epistemologico-political presupposition that (1) the struggle against oppression is oppression’s condition of intelligibility, and that (2) the knowledge of the logic of this oppression’s history is the condition of an effective fight, co-research enables continual back-and-forth communications between its participants. It is indeed in the “everyday context of the knowledge and experience of the effective conditions of class movements (subjective as well as objective)” that the dynamic unity between theory and practice capable of producing effects of political subjectivation is established (Alquati 1993: 176).

Closing Considerations

We have argued that militant inquiry is a practice productive of knowledges and organizational forms capable of countering the harmful effects of capitalism on the *entirety of our lives*. As we have progressed from early Engels to Alquati, it has become clear that wages and the factory alone do not account

for the proletarian experience of the social world, such that we must broaden the spectrum of spaces and subjectivities in and with which to implement the dynamics of militant inquiries. Beginning in the 1960s, several currents of heterodox Marxism identified the growing absorption of the sphere of reproduction by that of production, thus exploding the institutions of the traditional working-class movement as well as the political perspectives they embodied. These epochal transformations—emblematic of the “1968 moment”—made possible a plurality of new subjectivities (women, youth, racialized subjects, etc.) and new strategic centers (the home, the school, working-class neighborhoods, etc.). Militant inquiry has always been able to combine theory with praxis and critical knowledge with the organization of struggles. Yet it is now more urgent than ever that it take part in the production of reciprocal actions not only between the researcher and the subject of inquiry, but also between the multiple subjectivities that are submitted to economic exploitation and political domination: *hic Rhodus, hic salta!*⁶

Notes

- 1 See Haider and Mohandesi 2013 for an overview of the topic.
- 2 Our emphasis. Commenting on this passage, Mario Tronti (2016: 169) writes that “here we have the guiding thread of Marx’s whole body of work.”
- 3 An English translation of “L’expérience prolétarienne” is available in *Viewpoint Magazine* at viewpointmag.com/2013/09/26/proletarian-experience/.
- 4 See Romano and Stone 1972 for an English edition.
- 5 On his critiques of Panzieri, see Alquati 1994: 168, 189, 205–6.
- 6 For more in-depth developments on this point, see Lassere and Monferrand 2018.

References

- Alquati, Romano. 1993. *Per fare conricerca (Doing Co-research)*. Padova: Calusca edizioni.
- Alquati, Romano. 1994. *Camminando per realizzare un sogno comune (Walking to Realize a Common Dream)*. Torino: Velleità alternative.
- Castoriadis, Cornelius. 1958. “Prolétariat et organization” (“The Proletariat and Organization”). *Socialisme ou Barbarie*, no. 28: 41–72.
- Engels, Friedrich. 2009. *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. Edited by Victor Kierman. New York: Penguin.
- Haider, Asad, and Salar Mohandesi. 2013. “Worker’s Inquiry: A Genealogy.” *Viewpoint Magazine*, September 27. viewpointmag.com/2013/09/27/workers-inquiry-a-genealogy/.
- Lassere, Davide Gallo, and Frédéric Monferrand. 2018. “Autonomia e soggettività: l’inchiesta ieri e oggi.” *Primo Maggio*, no. 30: 70–79.
- Lefort, Claude. 1952. “L’expérience prolétarienne” (“Proletarian Experience”). *Socialisme ou Barbarie*, no. 11: 1–19.
- Lefort, Claude. 1958. “Organisation et parti” (“Organization and Party”). *Socialisme ou Barbarie*, no. 26: 132–34.

- Marx, Karl. 1866. "The International Workingmen's Association, 1866: Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council: The Different Questions." *Der Vorbote*, nos. 10–11 (October and November 1866), *International Courier*, nos. 6–7 (February 20) and nos. 8–10 (March 13, 1867). www.marxists.org/history/international/iwma/documents/1866/instructions.htm.
- Marx, Karl. 1976. *Capital*, Volume I. Translated by Ben Fowkes. New York: Penguin.
- Marx, Karl. 1978. "Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844." In *The Marx and Engels Reader*, 2nd ed., edited by Robert C. Tucker. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Marx, Karl. 1989. "Workers' Questionnaire." In *Collected Works of Marx and Engels*, Volume 24: 1874–1883, 328–34. New York: International Publishers.
- Negri, Antonio. 2005. "Proletarians and the State." In *Books for Burning*. London: Verso.
- Panzieri, Raniero. 1961. "Sull'uso capitalistico delle machine" ("On the Capitalist Use of Machinery"). *Quaderni rossi*, no. 1: 53–72.
- Panzieri, Raniero. 1964. "Uso socialista dell'inchiesta operaia" ("Socialist Use of Workers' Inquiry"). *Quaderni rossi*, no. 5: 67–76.
- Romano, Paul. 1949 "L'ouvrier américain" ("The American Worker"). *Socialisme ou Barbarie*, nos. 1–6.
- Romano, Paul, and Ria Stone. 1972. *The American Worker*. Detroit: Bewick Editions.
- Tronti, Mario. 2016. *Ouvriers et capital (Workers and Capital)*. Geneva: Entremonde.