

An Introduction to Italian Workerism

by Steve Wright

INTRODUCTION

The arrest of leading theorists of *Autonomia Operaia* (Workers' Autonomy) on charges linking them to the Red Brigades and other Terrorist groups, has dominated political debate in Italy.¹ In this paper I wish to chart the development of this perspective outside of the Italian Communist Party, from its origins 20 years ago on the fringes of the Italian labour movement.² I would argue that this current is unusual in two respects: (1) from the very beginning it has taken the categories and methodology of Marx's Capital and Grundrisse seriously, and has used and developed categories that have really only begun to gain currency in "Anglo-Saxon" marxism in the recent past, categories such as labour process/valorization process, absolute surplus value, relative surplus value, organic composition of capital, formal and real domination of capital; (2) it has filtered this theory through the working class of here and now. Their understanding of the critique of political economy begun by Marx is an explicitly political interpretation of class antagonism, rather than the seemingly vacuous "laws of motion". Too often, the critique of political economy has collapsed into political economy tout court, becoming imprisoned in capital's own categories, with disastrous consequences. So instead of the insight that it is capital that tends to extend its domination from the factory to the whole of society, reducing all social time to economic time, we have ... economic reductionism.

The nature of class, the implications of technological change, and the role of the state are central to the workerists' project. These are not questions of academic interest, but ones which many of us have been racking our brains over, and with increasing urgency as the uninviting eighties loom. It's also true that "the most hasty answers have usually been given by those with the rustiest weapons" (Sergio Bologna), and we're still left with the same thorny problems - can we prize a dynamic, living notion of class away from cut-and-dried textbook notions of stratification. As blue-collar workers become a smaller and smaller component of the total workforce; does our faith in the development of the productive forces lead only to the nuclear state and its blackmail; and how can we talk of a "new" society, fundamentally different from this one, in the face of the museum of horrors that passes for socialism? I don't pretend to be able to answer all these questions myself, nor do I think this explicit 'workerist' perspective has done so definitively, but I think that it offers more than its share of insights as to possible points of departure. In particular, their analysis of the mass worker, the unskilled assembly line worker so prevalent in the factories of mid-twentieth century capitalism, a worker frequently of foreign extraction and alien to the traditions of the local labour movement, may be considered a useful hypothesis for exploring the impact of post-1945 immigration on the structure of the Australian working class. However, it is not possible to reduce the workerist perspective to the championing of the mass worker thesis, and to dismiss their work by attempting to disprove their analysis on this question.³ As we shall see, there is more to this school than the presentation of the one category which for better or worse has been identified with them.

HISTORY OF "WORKERISM"

As this form of marxism is composed of working hypotheses that have been constantly revised and refined, I have found it impossible to present it in any manner other than an historical one. The body of what follows is therefore divided into 3 parts, covering (1) 1961-1967, (2) 1967-1973, (3) 1973-now. It is structured this way because each organizational break that occurs is bound up with a new set of perspectives. Finally, this paper pretends to be no more than an exposition of a complex tradition which I hope I have done justice to; I've left little room for critique as I hope this piece will open up a debate on the relationship between theory and practice in general, and the record of workerist theory and the organizations it has engendered in particular.

We can begin by sketching out the changes taking place in Italy in the first decade and a half after the Second World War. In the economic sphere, we find a relatively quiet industrial front as large-scale industry is introduced into the North, and cheap labour gravitates from the South towards it. In the political sphere, the official working class movement led by the Communist Party began in the sixties to enter the sphere of government and management of society, the realm monopolized by the Christian Democrats since 1945.⁴

The violent FIAT struggles of 1961 shook this complacent picture somewhat, and provided the impetus for a group of intellectuals dissatisfied with communist orthodoxy. In order to analyse this development a group gathered around Raniero Panzieri, a functionary in the Socialist Party (PSI) and an advocate of workers' control, began through the pages of Quaderni Rossi (Red Botebooks):

an interpretation of society from the point of view of the factory, and an interpretation of the factory from the point of view of the working class.

"Let's examine these in reverse order, starting with the "working class point of view". These intellectuals returned to Marx's basic discovery of the "two-fold character" of labour under capitalism, as both exchange value and use value, and to what he calls in the Grundrisse:

the correct relation between necessary and surplus labour, on which everything, in the last analysis, rests.⁵

This relationship they understood not as one between economic categories, but rather between two antagonistic but intertwined classes, each with its own interests, perspectives, and strategies. As Massimo Cacciari, one of the original participants in Quaderni Rossi, wrote recently:

Everything that was not reducible to this level was seen ... as functioning as ideology, as a distortion of the class "interest" that proceeded from the immediate relationship between capital and labour.⁶

Informed by such a starting point, the workerists developed a critique of the factory, and the manner in which, planning, technology, and science are appropriated by it. In asking the question - what is capitalist command?, they attempted to explode the prevalent antithesis of capitalism and planning, the identification of socialism with planning, and a naturalistic (value-free) interpretation of the development of the productive forces.

In an article entitled "Surplus Value and Planning", Panzieri took as his starting point the individual factory in the competitive capitalism of the 19th century, one of many islands in a sea of anarchy, and following Marx showed the manner in which planning is imposed on the capitalist. The latter "inherits", as part of the exchange with labour, the cooperation of workers with each other as a productive force, but still needs to plan the organization of work to extract the maximum possible surplus labour from them. Initially, this takes the form of extending the hours of work, producing absolute surplus value. But pressure is soon brought on the factory by the state and social protest to reduce the hours of work, leaving as the only possible means of extracting surplus labour an intensification, an altering of the labour process itself, through either (i) speed up (ii) reducing the ratio of staff to machinery or (iii) technological innovation. And here the capitalist's despotism appears as rational, as a "technical necessity". Panzieri argues that

the capitalist use of the machine is not just a distortion or defamation of an objective development of a technology that in itself is rational, but itself determines the direction of technological development.⁷

From this he drew 2 conclusions. Firstly, he argued, the working class cannot simply take over technology, free it from capitalist market relations, but must "build a radically new rationality that is opposed to the rationality of capitalism", a different concrete form of technology. Secondly, capital tends to extend its planning of the factory to the whole of society, at first, in an attempt to reduce necessary labour by cheapening the costs of the reproduction of labour power. When revolutionaries (such as Lenin) have failed to see this, and treated the planning developed under capitalism as a "socially neutral" productive force, it is not surprising to see, as in the socialist bloc, capitalist production relations creeping back in.⁸

This brings us to the question of society viewed from the factory, leading to the social factory. As Mario Tronti defined it:

"At the highest level of capitalist development, the social relation becomes a moment of the production relation; the whole of society becomes an articulation of production; in other words, the whole of society exists as a function of the factory and the factory extends its exclusive domination over the whole of society. It is on this basis that the machine of the political State tends ever-increasingly to become one with the figure of the collective capitalist, becoming increasingly a property of the capitalist mode of production, and thus a function of the capitalist. The process whereby capitalist society is recomposed into a unitary entity, a process which is imposed by the specific developments of its form of production, can no longer tolerate the existence of a political terrain that is even formally independent of the network of social relations".⁹

Through its state, capital, the total social relation, becomes more and more concerned with its own total circuit, on reducing the time of that circuit, and in the problem of the reproduction of labour-power, which it also attempts to plan. So, rather than an Althusserian model of a social formation composed of a number of modes of production, one of which is predominant, the workerists present a picture of a very special, dynamic mode of production - the capitalist one - which is initially formally dominant over the others, but then tends to subsume them to it (e.g. the domestic reproduction of labour-power), and finally engulf them entirely. And instead of individual capitals, it is total aggregate capital, social

capital (which includes both classes), which takes over. If I can quote the Grundrisse again:

Capital is the existence of social labour - the combination of labour as subject as well as object - but this existence is itself existing independently opposite its real movements - hence itself a particular existence apart from them.¹⁰

The political implications are clear - overthrowing capital's rule doesn't mean removing a strata of people, so much as exploding a social relation, a mode of existence "in which the labouring praxis is contraposed to itself as if it were something absolutely extraneous".¹¹

In 1964 Tronti returns to the analysis of the capital/labour relation, but now situated in the social factory, and via a new journal, Class Operaia (Working Class), with many of the younger and more impatient members of the original circle. He takes the doppelcharakter of the "peculiar commodity" labour-power to the limit - "Labour is the measure of value" he argues, "because the working class is the condition for capital". Marx had it backwards in the Afterword to the Second German edition of Capital Volume I: the capitalist provides labour, the "opportunity" (read compulsion) to labour, to the working class; the working class provides capital, because the latter remains dead, immobile and objectified until living labour sets it in motion. So by definition the working class is "integrated" into capital from the very beginning; but rather than this being proof simply of "embourgeoisification", this fundamental fact makes possible the destruction of capitalism. Both sides of the relation define each other, except that the working class can do without capital, but capital cannot do without the working class. For here we don't have two innocent factors of production, but a social relation which splits production into dead and living labour. Again from the Grundrisse:

Of course, socialists sometimes say, we need capital but not the capitalist. Then capital appears as a pure thing, not as a relation of production which, reflected in itself, is precisely the capitalist ... capital is indeed separable from an individual capitalist, but not from the capitalist who, as such, confronts the worker.¹²

If this is a scandalous suggestion, then here is another. The way to destroy capitalism, then, is for the working class to separate itself from the class relation - deny itself as productive force and acclaim itself as political power. In fact, Tronti argues, capital's behaviour from the beginning confirms this, because it has always tried to escape from labour through technological innovation, even as it extended the socialization of production. So on the one hand it separates the worker from the labour process, through deskilling, while its extension of wage-labour outside the factory appears as the absorption of the working class by "the people" or "the new petty-bourgeoisie". Finally, Tronti identifies the working class' current quietism, its passivity, its dis-interest in politics, not simply as the infusion of bourgeois culture and lifestyle, but as a form of refusal of the capital-relation, a form of "organization without organization", which he contrasts with capital's necessity to institutionalize itself as State:

The capitalists have not yet invented - and in fact will obviously never be able to invent - a non-institutionalised political power. That type of political power is specifically working class power. The difference between the two classes at the level of political power is precisely this. The capitalist class does not exist

independently of the formal political institutions, through which, at different times but in permanent ways, they exercise their political domination: for this very reason, smashing the bourgeois State does mean destroying the power of the capitalists, and by the same token, one could only hope to destroy that power by smashing the State machine. On the other hand, quite the opposite is true of the working class: it exists independently of the institutionalised levels of its organization. This is why destroying the workers' political party does not mean - and has not meant - dissolving, dismembering, or destroying the class organism of the workers.¹³

Then he turns to examine the distance the working class has put between itself and the labour movement.

The truth is that the massive withdrawal by the working class, its refusal to consider itself an active participant in capitalist society, is already an opting out of the game, a flouting of the social interest,¹⁴

the problem being that passivity itself is a purely negative thing, around which capital could organize itself. The task, then: to encourage the development of working class autonomy from capital, and so the workerists begin a symptomatic reading of their own. And the name of the text? - The Working Class Since Marx.

In 1967, Tronti closes Classe Operaia, announces "the irredemable end of the experiences of the non-institutionalized groups", and takes one wing of the workerists off towards the PCI which, they say, must not be left in the hands of the current leadership.¹⁵ This tactic of entrism, as we know, is quite a favourite one in parts of the left, although the groups that practice it seem usually to either bore right through an organization only to end up on the other side, or else disappear so deeply that they're never heard of again. The others in the groups, among them Toni Negri, Sergio Bologna, Feruccio Gambino and Luciano Ferraro-Bravo, begin both political organization and historical research to confirm and deepen their earlier hypotheses.¹⁶

They attempt to specify the nature of the working class at different moments of capitalism's development by analysing class composition, that is, the organization of workers by capital. They begin by examining (i) the divisions within the working class, along wage lines, along lines of sex, race and age, between different sectors, around different organic compositions of capital [the proportion within a given plant or industry between constant (i.e. both fixed and circulating) capital and variable capital (labour-power)], and the relation between the working class and its official organs - unions and parties (ii) the struggles by which the working class attempts to overcome these divisions, a process which they call the political recomposition of the working class and (iii) finally the efforts by employers and increasingly the State to keep these sectoral struggles divided, and to impose a new class decomposition via both political repression and what they call "the technological path to repression":

It would be possible [Marx writes] to write quite a history of the inventions made since 1830 for the sole purpose of providing capital with weapons against working class revolt.¹⁷

Instead of talking of hegemony and class consciousness as the heirs of Gramsci in the PCI do, they talk of organization and struggle. In fact, Negri will later say of class consciousness that it is:

a material fact which is composed historically, via a series of struggles that signal real and qualitative advances.¹⁸

We should note that they are also trying to give political meaning to the fact that the accumulation of capital is a cyclical process from which, at determinate moments, the working class threatens to break free.¹⁹

The workerists draw important conclusions from this about the problem of "the necessary form of working class organization", and move beyond the sterile debate that has gone on since 1917 - is it the political party, or the workers' council, or the trade union, which is the privileged instrument of social changes? Instead, they argue, that if "the circulation of struggles follows the structure of class composition", then "organization has to be gauged in its historical specificity - different class compositions call for different tasks from revolutionary organizations. While the Bolshevik Party model might have been necessary before the Great Depression to link together the highly skilled "labour aristocrat" with the mass of unskilled, the dissolution of skilled labour by the assembly line has rendered Leninism in this sense (and also the factory councils of Gramsci and Pannekoek) obsolete.²⁰

Turning their sights back to the 1960's, the workerists define the new class composition becoming prevalent in the West since the Second World War as the mass worker, which in Italy takes the form of the assembly line workers grouped in the large Northern factories, and attempt to concretize the process, charted earlier through logic from factory to social factory. They argue that the models of factory organization as developed by F.W. Taylor and Henry Ford have separated the worker from his/her product, by fragmenting the labour process into minute stages. Since this separates the workforce from its own work, its own labour-power, it forces a new planning of the factory along a pyramid of wages, understood as a hierarchy of power. Let me explain. Now, instead of the individual worker producing a single commodity, you have a group of workers producing it collectively, that is, the socialization of productive labour - it doesn't make much sense to say this worker's function is productive, that one's isn't. All that matters for "the capitalist" in measuring costs of labour against total costs and hence profits is the total wage bill, and therefore within the latter it is possible to impose wage divisions purely along lines of political hierarchy, with no necessary relation between individual remuneration and the amount of surplus value produced. Within the factory, then, the law of value becomes directly command, subordination to the pace of the line, the imposition of abstract labour as work. Hence the only subversive struggle is one that is directed against work itself.

Meanwhile, in society, and beginning with the United States, an institutional framework is laid out in the New Deal and theorized by John Maynard Keynes where, in order to come to terms with the tendency towards overproduction of both capital and consumption goods inherent in specifically capitalist production based on the extraction of relative surplus value, and hence mass production, the figure of the worker can be made to coincide with the figure of the consumer, and the wage as "effective demand" becomes an independent variable in economic development. This is possible, the workerists claim, if the State adds to its traditional role as guarantor of the exchange of equivalents via its monopoly of the money-form, a new task as Planner. Just as in the factory, this means an attempt to tie wages to productivity, allowing an increase in the first if matched or exceeded by an increase in the second, and in the political sphere it means the institutionalization of the official labour movement.²¹

When the student struggles and Italian "Hot Autumn" break out at the end of

the 1960's, the workerists find themselves prepared. The "Hot Autumn" in particular seems to confirm their hypotheses, as the negotiation for 50-odd industry contracts turn into the struggle, outside the control of the unions, for more money, less work, and begin to challenge the capitalist organization of work itself, calling for the abolition of wage gradings. One might call this (and only partly tongue in cheek) an instance of Engelsian dialectics, of the transformation of quantity into quality. The workerists identify the new form of political organisation as the mass vanguard, the group of workers in the forefront of particular struggles, a vanguard internal to the struggle as opposed to the traditional external one (Leninist detonator). Negri writes that:

there is already a form of organization given in the concept of mass vanguard; it is wild, but a structured wildness.²²

The workerists attempt to regroup these factory organizations within the groups Potere Operaio (Workers' Power) and Lotta Continua (Continuous Struggle). These groups are initially quite successful, especially Lotta Continua, which grows to about 50,000 members, and they distinguish themselves from the rest of the left by their attempts to destroy capitalist accumulation through wage demands impossible to meet ("Give us 10, we'll ask for 100, give us 100 we'll ask for 1,000"); by promoting and organizing activities which don't reproduce capital (sabotage, go-slows, rolling strikes, absenteeism); and by extending their roots into the community, calling for a social wage, free schooling, transport and other public services, and "wages for housework", so as to cheapen for the working class, and make more extensive for capital, the reproduction of labour-power. Such struggles highlight the previously mentioned antagonistic but intertwined perspectives of the two parties in the exchange of labour power for wages. What is central for the working class is consumption, use values - it sees this exchange (C-M-C) as commodity (labour power) - money - commodity (goods for consumption). What is central for the capitalist, however, is money's self-expansion as value (M-C-M); money - of occasions, the breaking of this chain M-C-M-C-M, there exists the formal possibility of crisis.²³

This brings us to the last section, the economic crisis of the 1970's. Reflecting on the struggles in the community, the workerists argue that it is impossible to understand the working class unless one takes into account the role of those outside the immediate process of production, of the factory - women, unemployed, students, peasants - who now belong to the class even if their unwaged status belies this to most Marxists. After all, the wage in itself is not such a good indicator of class since, just as it serves to hide surplus labour extracted from the worker, it also hides the unpaid labour of women in the home, students ("figures of abstract labour") training to be workers, and the unemployed whose work is to search for jobs. The workerists talk now of the working class in the immediate process of production, and the proletariat in the circuit of total reproduction, of the reproduction of labour-power, together forming the social worker. Some even talk of the whole society producing surplus value. The growth of struggles such as the "self-reduction" movement, where workers refuse to pay increases in rent, electricity and transport, and sometimes even refusing to pay at all, illustrates what they call proletarian self-valorization. If the struggle against work in the factory centres on the wage, then in the social sphere it becomes directly appropriation - organized looting, for instance, which breaks the chain of capitalist commodity production and asserts use values over exchange.²⁴

To meet these challenges, they claim, a new State-form is coming into being. As capitalist society moves from the reformism of the 1960's to the restructuring of the 1970's, the State-as-planner (stato-piano) becomes the State-as-factory

Command-over-Living Labour (stato-impresa). As Negri puts it:

Under reformism, the State-as-Planner sets about altering class composition, acting from within a continuing faith in development: the mechanism of exploitation is seen as linear. The restructuration by the State-as-Enterprise on the other hand, entirely discounts the effects related to the falling rate of profit (a consequence of the reduction of necessary labour and the extension, intensification and massification of the refusal of work). So, in the second instance, capital faces the inescapable necessity of undertaking a process of planned action designed to strike directly at the composition of the working class. But this is built not simply on control of the cycle, but gives first priority to de-composing the cycle and reconfiguring it in a form suitable for the urgent requirements of command. In other words, the primary characteristic objective of restructuration is to achieve a new set of class divisions via dis-articulation of the cycle of capital.²⁵

[He adds in another paper, written a few months later in early 1974:]

Hierarchical compartmentalisation - both international and domestic - is to be reconstructed based wholly on the control of social fluidity: the actual technological advances within the crisis will consist in the rationalisation and automation of control. We should bear in mind that the earlier major technological advance (the introduction of the assembly line) brought with it far more than simply a modification of the direct cycle of production (Taylorism) - it also brought an advance in the regulation of the social cycle (Fordism): today, with the drive towards automated rationalisation, these aspects are accentuated still further.²⁶

The Stato-impresa means first of all the generalization, at the social level, of the purely political hierarchy of the factory based on income. Just as in the factory, where the law of value becomes directly command, so at the level of society capital becomes command:

When the State, faced with the crisis in the functioning of the law of value, attempts to reimpose that law by force, mediating in its own relation to capital in relation to the commodity form, it registers upon itself, in effect, the crisis of all homologous functions. Force does not substitute for value, but provides a surrogate for its form... All the elements of the whole are unified in a technical sense; they only hang together in their mutual untranslatability; only in the form of a forced relationship.²⁷

Capital loses its rationality ("the development of the productive forces" so loved by traditional Marxism), its theory becomes technique of control. This form of the State is matched by a new method of accumulation interest-bearing capital, which attempts to expand itself outside the mediation of the working class. Marx, writing of interest-bearing capital as the most "developed" form of the social relation, calls it "form devoid of content", a senile mimicking of its infancy as merchant capital.²⁸

Confronted with this restructuration, Potere Operaio underwent a crisis which none of the Italian far left organizations have subsequently escaped. Its line of preparing for imminent armed confrontation with the State, "militarizing the

struggle", has proved to be incorrect as mass factory struggles receded after 1973, and while some militants left to build the "armed party" with the Red Brigades and other terrorist groups,²⁹ the majority dissolved themselves into the already existing network of collectives in the workplace and community known as Autonomia Operaia. Here they involved themselves in (and sometimes led) struggles in sectors neglected by the far left - for instance, in hospitals, where they have a strong presence.³⁰

It's no coincidence that the structure of Autonomia has paralleled that of the women's movement, even if relations between the two have been very strained at times. In fact, during 1977, when Autonomia Operaia emerged as the dominant force on the far left (estimates of autonomist numbers vary between 10,000 and 100,000: it is probably about 30,000), it functioned as one faction within the wider movement, composed of students, feminists, casual and part-time workers, unemployed and youth, the emerging "second society", counterposed to the "first society" of waged labour. As Sergio Bologna, himself not a member of Autonomia but choosing to continue the workerist tradition outside (but still parallel) to it, noted three years ago:

the decisive event which began to transform the conditions of the movement from 1970-81... (was) the birth of the feminist movement. This immediately posed a question of hegemony of the whole social fabric, hence was analogous in its dimensions and its claims to the hegemony of the mass worker. The specific, autonomous interests of women, organised by women, not only directly challenge family relations of, production; they also, by taking an autonomous political form as an independent feminist movement, involved a radical separation from the mediations of the "party system", from Trade Union representation, but also above all from the revolutionary Left groups themselves. With women's self-rediscovery and claim to control their bodies, their own needs and desires, their subjectivity, we see the beginnings of a new critique of alienated militancy - one of the key themes of the movement in the second phase - but also, and more fundamentally, the starting point for the general thematic of needs within the movement.³¹

It's been said of the autonomists that their form of struggle has simply been to mirror that of the state, to reduce mass politics to the technique of war. While the majority (including all those arrested) have criticized the Red Brigades and other terrorist groups for their elitism towards mass struggle, their "inveterate Bolshevism" and Stalinism, their militaristic logic, there have still been certain elements within the loosely organized Autonomia Operaia and the broader movement, who have thought "at least these groups are doing something". Unfortunately, as Negri and others have pointed out, the Terrorists' chief success seems to have been on the one hand, to consolidate the State and push the PCI into the aims of the Christian Democrats (legislation was passed earlier this year, with Communist Party support, that permits, among other things, the detention of terrorist "suspects" for up to 12 years before being put on trial), and on the other, to severely curtail the political space won by the far left in the last decade and throw it into confusion. Despite the release of a number of "suspects" recently, and the dropping of some of the most serious charges against Negri and those arrested with him, Autonomia is taking a battering, and a number of trials have begun against various local collectives (e.g. in Padua and Bergamo). As Jack Fuller wrote recently, it's time we had an unambiguous history of the autonomist movement, and its successes and failures.

Finally, what of the workerists who entered the PCI? In the last decade Tronti has been busily turning his work of the sixties on its head - as the working class approaches state power, he argues, it is necessary for it to appropriate a theory of politics which Marxism, as the critique of political economy cannot supply. Instead of the subsumption of the state to capital, he writes of the "autonomy of the political". Instead of smashing the state, the working class through its party (the PCI) must take over its management, and along the way the possibility may arise that the party must assert its autonomy vis-a-vis the class.³² Another former workerist, Asor Rosa, has taken this potential antagonism, and the class collaboration that it implies, further:

The working class and capital (not only taken its pure form as in books) can find a long phase in which they have a common interest in (economic) development and in this they can see as standing against them both privileged parasitic strata and non-privileged parasitic strata, the latter never getting beyond the arid and desperate perception of their own needs ... the way out of the capitalist system is through its extreme (most profound) realisation and not through the stunted way forward of an ideological refusal to face up to the laws that determine its development.³³

The workerist tendency within Italian Marxism is, we can see, a rich and complex one. An assessment of it by those of us in the English-speaking left is long overdue. With the increasing availability of translated texts, such as Red Notes Working Class Autonomy and the Crisis (London 1979), the imminent arrival of Karl-Heinz Roth's The "Other" Workers' Movement (CSE Books, forthcoming), John Merrington's collection Money and Proletarians (Allison and Busby, forthcoming), and the work of the American workerists (Zerowork 1 and 2, and Harry Cleaver's Reading "Capital" Politically), such a critical assessment - more intensive and wide-ranging than this purely introductory essay - will be possible, indeed necessary.

FOOTNOTES

1. In early April 1979 warrants were issued for the arrest of Toni Negri, Oveste Scalzone, Franco Piperno and other "leaders" of Autonomia. The magistrates responsible alleged that Autonomia was the legal front for the Red Brigades, and accused the arrested of being the brains behind the Brigades and in particular, of being responsible for the kidnapping and subsequent death of Aldo Moro. Red Notes (1979) contains a dossier on the proceedings up to mid-1979; other sources for English speakers include The Leveller, People's News Service, Nation Review (February 1980) and the New York Times.
2. See for instance, M. Chalmers' review of E. Lucas, Arbeiterradikalismus in Social History 4/2 (May 1979).
3. Marx (1973), p.446.
4. Cited in Altuater and Kallscheuer (1979), p.121. Concerning the nature of the two class perspectives inherent in the wage-relation, see Cleaver (1979), Chapter 3.
5. Cited in Fetscher (1980), p.46. Both Fetscher's article and that of Postone (1978) are interesting in as much as they take up many of the themes found in the workerists' critique of traditional marxism, particularly on the question

of "labour" in post-capitalist society.

6. Ranzieri (1976) pp.21-22. On the question of the need for a different concrete form of technology, see Miklos Haraszati, A Worker in A Workers' State.
7. Cited in Bologna (1974). The texts by Tronti in the bibliography have been collected in Operai e Capitale (Workers and Capital), published in Turin in 1965 and 1971, as have two essays in Red Notes (eds.) (1979), "Lenin in England" and "The Strategy of Refusal".
8. Marx (1973), p.471.
9. Rovatti (1972), p.102.
10. Marx (1973), p.303. See also pp.257-258.
11. Tronti, "The Strategy of Refusal", in Red Notes (1979), p.11.
12. Tronti (1972a), p.23.
13. For a discussion of the development of Tronti's work, see Rossini (1980).
14. A number of papers from this period, such as Gambino (1976) and Bologna (1972), have been collected in Bologna and Negri (eds.), Operai e Stato (Milan 1972). A review of this work is available in Ramirez (1972), and a summary in Baldi (1972).
15. Marx (1976), p.563. On class composition, see Zerowork 1 (1975), pp.1-6, the appendices to Gambino (1976), and Bologna (1972) passim.
16. Cited in Red Notes (1979), p.38.
17. See Negri, "Marx on the Cycle and the Crisis", in Merrington (forthcoming).
18. Baldi (1972), p.7.
19. Baldi (1972), pp.14-21; Tronti (1972b), passim.
20. Cited in Morris (1978), p.62.
21. See Radical America's special issue, and Marx (1976), p.209; (1973), pp.149, 150, 198.
22. See Red Notes (1978) and 1979); Zerowork 1 (1975) and 2 (1977); Morris (1978); Ramirez (1975) and Bratach Dubh (1979).
23. "Reformism and Restructuration" in Red Notes (1979), p.33.
24. "Theses on the Crisis", ibid., p.43.
25. Negri, "Capitalist Domination and Working Class Sabotage", in ibid, p.99. It was from this short book, widely distributed since its publication in 1978 and hailed in some quarters as a "new" Communist Manifesto, that much of the "evidence" against Negri has been drawn.

26. The journal Primo Maggio (May First), edited by Bologna, has been engaged since its inception in 1973 in the analysis of interest-bearing capital and the money-form, particularly as they pertain to attacks ("monetary terrorism") on the working class. See the articles by Bologna in Red Notes (1978) and (1979), his essay "Money and Crisis" in Merrington (forthcoming), Marazzi (1977), Negri's "Capitalist Domination and Working Class Sabotage", Chapters 3 and 4, and de Brunhoff (1978), passim.
27. See Silj (1978), Chapter 11, and Bologna's "The Tribe of Moles" in Red Notes (1979), p.77.
28. Red Notes (1978) and (1979); Fuller (1980); Albione (1979).
29. "The Tribe of Moles", in Red Notes (1979), p.80.
30. Rossini (1980), and Altvater and Kallscheuer (1979), pp.121-124.
31. Cited in Anderson (1979), p.25.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- R. Albione, "The Crisis of the Italian Revolutionary Left", International Socialism 6 (Autumn 1979).
- E. Altvater and O. Kallscheuer, "Socialist Politics and the 'Crisis of Marxism'", in R. Miliband and J. Saville (eds.), Socialist Register 1979 (London 1979).
- P. Anderson, "The New 'New Left' in Italy", Revolutionary Socialism 3 (1979).
- G. Baldi, "Theses on Mass Worker and Social Capital", Radical America 6/1 (May-June 1972).
- S. Bologna, "Class Composition and the Theory of the Party at the Origin of the Workers-Council Movement", Telos 13 (Fall 1972).
- S. Bologna, "Il Rapporto Societa-Fabbrica Come Categoria Storica", Primo Maggio 2 (January 1974).
- Bratach Dubh, Armed Struggle in Italy (Catania 1979).
- S. de Brunhoff, The State, Capital and Economic Policy (London 1978).
- H. Cleaver, Reading Capital Politically (Austin 1979).
- I. Fetscher, "The Changing Goals of Socialism in the 20th Century", Social Research 47/1 (Spring 1980).
- J. Fuller, "The New 'Workerism' - The Politics of the Italian Autonomists", International Socialism 8 (Spring 1980).

- F. Gambino, Workers' Struggles and the Development of Ford in Britain (London 1976).
- C. Marazzi, "Money in the World Crisis: The New Basis of Capitalist Power", Zerowork 2 (Fall 1977).
- K. Marx, Capital, Volume 1 (Harmondsworth 1976).
- K. Marx, Grundrisse (Harmondsworth 1973).
- J. Merrington (ed.), Money and Proletarians (London forthcoming).
- M. Morris, "Eurocommunism Vs. Semiological Delinquency", in F. Foss and M. Morris (eds.), Language, Sexuality and Subversion (Sydney 1978).
- R. Panzieri, "Surplus Value and Planning: Notes on the Reading of Capital", in CSE (ed.), The Labour Process and Class Strategies (London 1976).
- M. Postone, "Necessity, Labor and Time: A Reinterpretation of the Marxian Critique of Capitalism", Social Research (Fall 1978).
- B. Ramirez, Review of S. Bologna and A. Negri (eds.), Operai e Stato, in Telos 13 (Fall 1972).
- B. Ramirez, "The Working Class Struggle Against the Crisis: Self-Reduction of Prices in Italy", Zerowork 1 (December 1975).
- Radical America, Red Notes (ed.), Living with an Earthquake: Italy 1977-78 (London 1978).
- Radical America, Red Notes (ed.), Working Class Autonomy and the Crisis: Italian Marxist Texts of the Theory and Practice of a Class Movement: 1964-79 (London 1979).
- R. Rossini, "Le Tront Popolare", L'Espresso (February 17yh, 1980).
- P. Rovatti, "Fetishism and Economic Categories", Telos 14 (Winter 1972).
- A. Silj, Never Again Without a Rifle: The Roots of Italian Terrorism (New York 1979).
- M. Tronti, "The Struggle Against Labour", Radical America 6/1 (May-June 1972).
- M. Tronti, "Social Capital", Telos 17 (Fall, 1973).
- M. Tronti, "Workers and Capital", Telos 14 (Winter 1972).
- Zerowork, Numbers One (December 1975) and Two (Fall 1977).

ADDRESSES

Red Notes,
Box 15,
29 St. Paul's Road,
London, N.I.,
U.K.

Zerowork,
417 East 65 Street,
New York City,
New York, 10021,
U.S.A.

Copyright of Full Text rests with the original copyright owner and, except as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, copying this copyright material is prohibited without the permission of the owner or its exclusive licensee or agent or by way of a license from Copyright Agency Limited. For information about such licences contact Copyright Agency Limited on (02) 93947600 (ph) or (02) 93947601 (fax)