

The transformation of everyday life

Interview with Kristin Ross

Kristin Ross is a leading theorist of French cultural history and politics, and Professor Emeritus of Comparative Literature at New York University. She is the author of several widely-translated books including The Emergence of Social Space: Rimbaud and the Paris Commune (1988), Fast Cars Clean Bodies: Decolonization and the Reordering of French Culture (1995), May 68 and its Afterlives (2002), and Communal Luxury: The Political Imaginary of the Paris Commune (2015). Kristin was interviewed for RP by Patrick Lyons to mark the publication of a career-spanning collection of essays, The Poetics and Politics of Everyday Life (2022) and the English translation of her latest book, The Commune-Form: The Transformation of Everyday Life (2024).

Patrick Lyons: In your introduction to *The Politics and Poetics of Everyday Life* you describe beginning your academic career in a field dominated by post-structuralism, deconstruction and a general retreat from politics. How did this affect your trajectory as a scholar and your own method of working?

Kristin Ross: My thinking about literature, history and historical processes is very much a product of the 1970s: the post-'68 moment of 'history from below'. This was an era filled with experiments in historiography, some of which I wrote about later in *May 68 and its Afterlives*. One of the major afterlives of '68 was, precisely, this host of interventions into the field of who was entitled to write history and in what way. As an undergraduate, I was lucky to attend the 'experimental' campus of the University of California at Santa Cruz, built during the late 1960s. We students grew the vegetables we ate in the cafeteria and there were no grades. And, at that time – Vietnam, the bombing of Cambodia – many of us were caught up in various forms of street militancy. Because of its innovative practices, Santa Cruz, then, drew an amazing array of faculty across the disciplines who were my teachers: the Freudo-Marxian classicist, Norman O. Brown, and, occasionally, his friend and rival Herbert Marcuse; the theorist of schizophrenia, Gregory Bateson; the urban theorist Reyner Banham. Jonathan Beecher, who wrote intellectual biographies of Fourier and Considérant, taught French history. The most interesting faculty by far, in other words, were, if not Marxist, at least in some sense materialists fully conversant in Marxist theory. And each of these scholars had no trouble at all venturing far afield of their given disciplinary constraints, creating between them and making available a kind of 'interdisciplinary unconscious' to students and colleagues. Especially now, when we compare what they created to the shackles of today's academic conventions – little more than a breeding ground for specialisation and opportunism – this was an extraordinarily lively group. Brown, in particular, impressed upon

me the importance of keeping the question of desire at the forefront of any Marxist analysis, and introduced me to the thinkers – Walter Benjamin, Ernst Bloch, William Morris, and an array of poets like Blake, Sappho and Charles Olson – to help light up that path.

Graduate school, though, was a different story. My own case could be viewed as an example of both the fragility and strength of political transmission, especially during counter-revolutionary times, of which the late 1970s were certainly the dawning. Deconstruction had reached a quasi-liturgical status, at least at Yale where I was, and though it shrouded itself in layers of gravitas, it was hard for me to take such a hyper-intellectualised textual formalism very seriously. Political action was reduced to the romantic ‘politics’ of textuality and was limited to the thrill produced by the free play of the signifier; political struggle took the form of the battle between competing jargons; and political revolution transpired in the ruptures internal to the semiotics of a text. Fortunately, Fredric Jameson joined the faculty and helped me reestablish continuities with my earlier training. I found a way to start working against the grain of the theoretical hegemony, beginning with my first book on Rimbaud and social space.

PL: The essays in parts one and two of *The Politics and Poetics of Everyday Life* demonstrate an ongoing theoretical dialogue with Henri Lefebvre and Jacques Rancière respectively. In what way did the work of Jacques Rancière, whose *Le maître ignorant* (1987) you translated, influence your thinking? And how would you describe the contribution of Henri Lefebvre to your writing?

KR: As I was writing the book on Rimbaud, *The Emergence of Social Space: Rimbaud and the Paris Commune*, a fellow-traveller in the archives of the Paris Commune, Adrian Rifkin, introduced me to the early work of Jacques Rancière and the *Révoltes Logiques* collective. Rifkin had translated some of the early essays from *Révoltes Logiques* and submitted them to *History Workshop* where they were rejected on the grounds that they were insulting to the working class! Apparently, what had excited Adrian and myself about the particular kind of cultural history the collective at *Révoltes Logiques* was undertaking – their dismantling of Marxist literal-mindedness and sociological determinism, their unravelling of all the stereotypical representations that congeal in the writing of even the most progressive social scientists or political activists when it comes to workers – was exactly what made it anathema to the folks at *History Workshop*. In *Révoltes Logiques*, base and superstructure never quite lined up in any obvious way, edifying narratives about good workers were few and far between, and the terrain of class relations was shot through with fantasy, denial and misrecognitions. I decided to translate *Le Maître ignorant* – what for me remains Rancière’s most interesting and innovative book.

As for my method, Rimbaud’s famous response to his mother’s question, ‘But what does it mean?’, that he wished to be understood ‘literally and in all possible ways’, did become a method of sorts for me. In my books on the political memory of major upheavals like the Paris Commune or May ‘68, I was trying to document a moment in an oppositional culture that cannot be detected as long as one approaches cultural production uniquely from the perspective of the relentless ‘it couldn’t have been otherwise’ logic of the commodity. The Paris Commune and 1968 were moments of the social appropriation of space and the transformation of everyday life it implies. They were moments when the state recedes, its political temporality broken or interrupted, during which we can begin to detect the existence of forms of the organisation of material life that escape from the logic of profits. During these

moments, discussions of collective interests occur outside of the realm of experts. But it's only by reconstructing the particular phenomenology of the event, gathering the voices of actors of the past and lingering with them for a good bit of time that one can arrive at an event's more centrifugal and far-reaching effects. It is only by respecting an event's singularity – what the people who made the Commune, for example, did and said, what they thought and said about what they were doing, the words they used, borrowed, imported, disputed, abandoned and all the many significations they gave to those words and the desires that informed them – that the event or struggle enters into the figurability of our day-to-day concerns and imagination and presents itself to us as a possible future.

I think a literary formation is helpful for this kind of attentiveness to language in that it places an emphasis on the scene of subjectivisation, on the importance of beginning with subjectivity, say, over beginning with concepts. There's a Benvenistian element to all of this that I share, I think, with Rancière – the idea that subjectivity is created literally when one says 'I', the profound equality enabled by the fact that we all share the pronoun 'I', the fact that everyone who speaks that pronoun appropriates to him or herself when they say it an entire language. I owe this kind of attention or listening to the *énoncé* to Rancière's conviction that workers' voices from the past are entitled to the same degree of attention we pay to the voices of those who make up theories about them later on. Provided, that is, that their setting, their conditions be de-naturalised, so to speak – so that people of the past, and particularly workers, may appear to us now as subjects, and not as mere data. To free them from the task of being nothing but the representation of their conditions, I sometimes have to stage unexpected encounters, paratactical rearrangements that open up their present, or reconstruct the phenomenology of the event using oblique transversals – and then listen to the dynamics that result from those encounters.

So, on the one hand there is the attempt on my part to document past capacities set in motion. This means mobilising several 'scales' of analysis at once, both the lived and the conceived, the biographical and the textual. On the other, though, I think no new politics can be constructed or reconstructed unless one disengages actively and polemically from the legends and thefts that surround the representation of such moments – the idea that May '68 was something benign for the state, for example. It's often necessary to remove all sorts of clutter from the stage, just as the Communards themselves did when they blew up what William Morris called 'that base piece of Napoleonic upholstery', the Vendôme Column, in order to transform their city – however briefly – into a space of pure potentiality.¹

The goal here for me has always been to destabilise our sense of unchanging conditions or what Barthes called the 'petit-bourgeois distribution of roles and places': that whole massive appearance of permanence that restricts not only the emergence of individual and collective subjectivities and political energies but even the mobility of ideas and the spontaneity and provocation of artistic invention.²

My books are always interventions into particular situations. *Fast Cars, Clean Bodies*, for example, was written at the high point of celebratory modernisation ideology. American social scientists had successfully promulgated the idea of value-free social science and the inevitability of the American model, and all sorts of scholars who claimed the objective 'neutrality' of the social scientist, historians like Richard Kuisel and many of the French frequenters of the Fondation Saint-Simon, were in fact busy doing the bidding of American capitalist interests. One of the ways they did so was to completely separate two post-war narratives about France: the story of the end of the empire and the residues of colonialism,

on the one hand, and the story of shopping and modern appliances, on the other. Thinking the two narratives together, as I tried to do in my book, was an attempt not only to break through the consensus surrounding American neo-liberal inevitability, but to take seriously the enactment of a kind of ‘colonisation of everyday life’ in France in those years, to think that phrase literally and in all possible ways to arrive at an economic, non-culturalist theory of racism.

The idea of a ‘colonisation of everyday life’ is, of course, Henri Lefebvre’s. The interdisciplinary reach of his thought – a reach that allowed him to conceive of the ‘quotidian’ in the first place and to elevate it to the status of a critical theory – was once much less unusual in France than it is now.³ His idea that any history must be written beginning with, and in view of, the present (the ‘progressive-regressive method’); the iconoclasm of his anti-structuralist stance in the era of high-Althusserianism (one of the few dimensions he shares with Rancière); his insistence on taking seriously women’s magazines, horoscopes and youth culture at a moment when Second International macro-histories were still the fashion; his abiding relationship with literature; his fascination with moments when cities and urban space are transformed into theaters of strategic operations – all these aspects of his multidimensional thought have been rich resources for me. As with any theorist the question is always: what does his or her work allow one to do? In my case, when I returned to the Paris Commune to write *Communal Luxury*, I had in mind not Lefebvre’s own book about the Commune but rather his ‘dialectique du vécu et du conçu’. The conceptual, when it is in constant relation to the lived, does not resemble a finely philosophical abstract elaboration but is rather constructive, built in view of the lived, after it, in response to it, towards a political goal. For Lefebvre, revolutionary thought and action, while different, are obliged to return to each other periodically and regularly for renewal. His own life exemplified the idea. For me it opened up the structure of my book and pointed me towards thinking through the theoretical breakthroughs unleashed by the experience of the Commune as they were occurring and immediately afterwards, as though in a laboratory.

In the end you might say I borrowed from Rancière a way of thinking about emancipation and the resistance to work, an attentiveness to the desires that arise on the borders of the artisanal world, and the centrality of the division between intellectual and manual labour. From Lefebvre I owe the projection of that division onto the uneven levels that are city and countryside, including the level of everyday life. From the first, then, I owe the right to thought; from the second, the right to the city. And more lately – the right to the countryside.

PL: The middle section of the volume moves away from philosophy and theory *per se* to study a series of cultural texts – Zola’s *The Ladies Paradise*, Genet’s screenplay for Tony Richardson’s *Mademoiselle*, the films of Jacques Tati, Matisse’s *Odaliques*, and detective fiction on both sides of the Atlantic. Anglophone readers of French literature will likely be more familiar with Zola and Genet than with *polar* writers like Didier Daeninckx or Jean-François Villar. Yet as you frame things in ‘Parisian Noir’, the post-68 French detective novel inherits the political thrust of May, transposed into narratives which reveal crimes committed and suppressed by the French state. How do these crime novels, in your reading, function as political works?

KR: My work for some time has taken up the problem of the contingencies of political memory – the sometimes circuitous and unscheduled ways that incidents or moments from the collective past succeed in entering forcefully, sometimes jarringly, into our present consciousness. How do past emancipatory processes attain figurability for us today? When I was working on my

book about the way May '68 in France has been remembered, forgotten, trivialised, celebrated and banalised in France,⁴ I could not avoid confronting the whole, very French phenomenon of 'the commemoration' – '68 as pictured in the media ten years, twenty years after, and so forth. I remember the first time I came across the phrase 'commemoration industry' was in a text from 1978 written by detective writer, militant and surrealist, Jean-François Vilar.⁵ He was complaining about the hijacking of the political memory of '68 already getting underway by the 'official', or rather the then-making-themselves-official memory custodians of the sixties – namely, those former student 'leaders' eager to capitalise on and publicly repudiate, in one breath, their militant past as they began to climb the career ladder to success in the media and culture industries. Of course, Vilar, and people like him, were not invited to the commemoration. Like all state-sponsored commemorations, this one would do nothing more than summon forth the past in order to consecrate the present and the status quo. Instead, as I discovered once I had immersed myself in the *noir* fiction produced in the 1970s and 80s by Vilar and his fellow travelers – Didier Daeninckx, Thierry Jonquet, Francis Zamponi, Gérard Delteil, Frédéric Fajardie and others – they were busy producing a whole repository of alternative political memory about not only the events of '68, but the Algerian War, the extermination of European Jews, and other significant events from recent history. And they were doing it using a genre that took as its principal task the representation of ordinary people and their entanglements with their (mostly urban) surroundings. Writers who took up detective fiction, in other words, were fully conscious of the struggle over the collective memory of the 1960s and 70s, and they were intent on producing a different kind of history of the postwar years – one that was neither commemorative, abject, nor nostalgic like the extravaganza shows televised in 1978 about May '68, and, particularly, in 1988 when the commemoration industry was doing double duty trying to hijack the memory of the French Revolution during the latter's Bicentennial celebration. A more belletristic novel form, it seems, could not be made to suit the purposes of writers like Vilar and Daeninckx – instead, the readily available, mass-market, 'pulp' medium of crime fiction, with its affinity with the streets and what goes on there, worked better for recovering the 'structure of feeling' that accompanied the transformation of everyday life, the conviviality and sense of possibility so many people recalled about those times: the experience of creating together a culture not as an institution but as a way of life.⁶

In the confusing and sometimes disheartening years of the decomposition of the movement, as groups, friendships, and political opportunities and vistas dissolved, and new agendas hovered only vaguely on the horizon, it is not too surprising that detective-writing should prove to be a refuge of sorts for militants unwilling, so to speak, to 'settle', to get back in the harness and return to the daily grind. Polar writing, often for series editors who were themselves former comrades, and often with an overt political thematic, was a way of maintaining a solidarity with the aspirations of the recent political past, a way of continuing a form of subversive work and sociability that had been opened up and made possible by the events of '68.

The choice of the detective genre was overdetermined as well by the way in which it could be adapted to the kind of inductive reasoning and critique of specialisation that were both hallmarks of '68 practice, conducted in any number of exercises in 'writing history from below' such as the workers' *enquête* (enquiry). Militants in search of workers' experience unfiltered through the mouthpieces of union leaders or militants themselves – the unmediated voice of the worker – performed *enquêtes* or investigations in workers' *foyers*,⁷ in an attempt to gain

knowledge of workers' experience inductively – from the particular, that is, as opposed to drawing deductive consequences from an abstract general principle, an a priori theory or a social profile. Documentary film and alternative journalism were also characterised by an inductive mode of reasoning that could easily be transposed onto a noir format. The post-68 years saw a considerable overlap as well between the *métiers* (professions) and the figures of journalist, photographer and detective (writer): Daeninckx, for example, was an investigative reporter for years (in the process gaining, as he put it, a taste for the terrain) before turning to detective fiction; Vilar's main character, an ex-68'er turned street photographer, drifts ineluctably into crime investigation.



Using a technique best summed up as ‘the imbrication of eras’,⁸ French noir shows the disquiet, decomposition and devolution of the present social world to be intimately linked to the unresolved or actively covered-up residues of past political action, usually on the part of the state. Forgotten incidents from France’s colonial past, for example, thread their way into the present and re-emerge as recurrent fascist comportments. A random street murder cannot be explained without ultimately revealing a state crime perpetrated decades past, buried under layers of artful bureaucratic obfuscation.

In the essays in *The Politics and Poetics of Everyday Life* that deal with detective fiction, I see the figure of the detective in the French case functioning as a kind of historical consciousness

at the moment of a sweeping eradication of historical depth. The counter-revolution that set in in the late 1970s not only tried to re-write the '68 years as the birth of narcissistic individualism and neo-liberal consumerism. It also presided over massive urban renewal projects, especially in Paris, transformations on a scale comparable to the Haussmanian upheavals of a century earlier. Such widespread demolition and reconstruction resulted in the production of a prevailing consumer blandness in the city centre, a centre newly rid of its poorer inhabitants, destined to finish their days in the shoddy, hastily constructed high-rises now ringing the periphery of the city. The revolutionary memory embedded in the urban texture of a city like Paris was considerably eradicated in the process. The specificity of the French case, however, cannot be made without a significant detour through the urban imaginary and social geography of that other great noir city, namely the Los Angeles of Raymond Chandler and Ross Macdonald, Fredric Jameson and Mike Davis.

PL: Your previous books have focused largely on urban spaces and struggle – modernising France, May '68, the Commune – why the turn to the rural in the concluding essays in the volume? Can you describe how you came into contact with the ZADistes (Zone to Defend activists) at Notre-Dame-des-Landes, what your time with them was like, and how it has informed your most recent (and ongoing) work?

KR: In France at least, in recent years, zones of experimentation and pragmatic intervention into actually living differently – living, that is, in semi-secession from state and market – have flourished far more readily in the countryside than in the big cities, those centres of capitalist exchange and state decision-making. This is not too surprising, given the overlap between contemporary experimentations with what I call the commune-form and the overwhelming ecological imperative to defend the living against capitalist expropriation and destruction. Some of these rural communities are in areas that the market forgot or couldn't monetise sufficiently, while others, like Notre-Dame-des-Landes during the airport struggle, or, in the United States, the occupations in Cop City in the forests outside of Atlanta or Standing Rock in the Dakotas, are in areas fiercely contested by the state.⁹ In the countryside, it is easier to reinvent forms of life in regions that have conserved, at least in part, residual pre-capitalist usages and practices. At the same time, the choices available to young people in the cities – no work, badly paid work, precarious work, meaningless work, or work that actively and directly facilitates the capitalist destruction of the lived environment – don't exactly inspire great enthusiasm. When I went to Notre-Dame-des-Landes for the first time in 2016, I saw the way that being off the radar, so to speak, even for just a while, two or three years, enabled the building of alternative, semi-autonomous communities. Remember that in the case of Notre-Dame-des-Landes, the state took a long nap during its project to build the airport – it forgot about its own intention for a number of years, and during those years a kind of wonderful political intelligence and solidarity developed between the very different individuals and groups on the site bent on sharing together, in a by no means conflict-free way, a movement and a territory.

PL: Your study of the 'Commune-Form' grounds the third section of *The Politics and Poetics of Everyday Life*. This is a flexible form with the potential to gather together disparate autonomous experiments across time and space, but your insistence upon historical specificity prevents it from floating off into abstraction. What do you see as the political potential of the commune-form, and how does it continue to shape your current work?

KR: I wrote *Communal Luxury* because the Movement of the Squares in 2011 had reawakened an almost worldwide communal unconscious and in so doing had brought the Paris Commune once again prominently and forcefully into the figurability of the present. At NDDL the following year, some of the occupiers had read the book and initiated discussions with me about the continuities and discontinuities between the urban nineteenth-century Communards and what they themselves were then living. These discussions made me think more generally about the commune-form – not, as you say, as an abstraction or a concept, but rather as a constantly changing and improvisational formation or set of processes that is nevertheless recognisable. The examples I use in the book are primarily, but not entirely, French and modern, but I am in no way claiming the form to be particularly French or that it is a new, novel invention. After all, the same term, ‘commune’ has been used to denote bourgeois town formations in the European Middle Ages, the most radically democratic aspects of the French Revolution, agrarian peasant communities throughout the world, the desires for a society built on association and cooperation that flourished in workers’ clubs in Paris at the end of the Second Empire, and the alternative communities founded by mostly young people in exodus from establishment ways of life, particularly after ‘68. It is in fact a quite archaic form, reworked according to the specific needs, histories and emancipatory desires of those engaged in living it and the region they are defending and transforming. The form is inseparable from its different incarnations, from the individuals and non-human life-forms participating in each situation, all of whom confront the conditions and avail themselves of the resources of the present moment. A struggle that is at the same time a way of life, the commune-form implies taking creative responsibility for the management of everyday life in common – what Marxists call social reproduction – in an immediate and pragmatic way. As such, it’s a struggle that already contains elements of a life beyond capitalist society.

So, if the early essays in the book tend to highlight the alienated dimensions of an everyday given over to the violence of economic logic, in the later essays it is the capacity of the everyday to harbour and unleash forms of social creativity that moves to the forefront. Lefebvre thought that changing society was meaningless without the production of an appropriated space – what I call the commune-form. Individuals and groups cannot constitute themselves as political subjects unless they appropriate a space – both social and physical – for themselves. Not in the sense of a possession, but rather as a social creation. Certainly the ZAD (Zone of Defence) at Notre-Dame-des-Landes was such a creation.

PL: In an interview with *Mediapart* from May 2023, you discuss your experiences with the *Soulèvements de la terre* movement in France.¹⁰ Can you say a bit about the group and your involvement?

KR: Something like a distinctively combative rural life is emerging in France – opposed to agribusiness, to the stockpiling and privatisation of resources, and engaged in defending and resuscitating a kind of agriculture associated with small farms and *paysans*. In recent years, I’ve been involved with the movement issuing from the ZAD at NDDL known as *Soulèvements de la terre*, whose defense of agricultural land against developers, unnecessary infrastructural constructions, polluters, agribusiness, the FNSEA and other destructive agricultural organisations, has the strongest political potential of anything I’ve seen in the cities or the countryside. The movement is still very much in its youthful stage. But it has elicited a terrifying degree of violence on the part of the state – some of which I’ve observed personally – a state that seems bent on nothing less than exterminating the movement and any traces

of it. In a book I published recently in France that pursues some of my reflections on the commune-form, I argue that *Soulèvements de la terre*, which bases its actions on concrete living situations, regional particularities and the specific needs of the humans and other life forms living there, is the commune-mode for our time. The movement's ability to create and maintain solidarity across extreme diversity, as well as its ability to draw the gaze of city-dwellers onto the crimes being committed in the countryside, is in my opinion why it has given rise to the high degree of panic among the elites we were witness to in March 2023, in Sainte Soline and its afterlives.



PL: The figure of the peasant – and the subsistence farmer in particular – is central to the story you recount in *La Forme-commune*, rather than the urban student or worker. This requires you to confront all manner of stereotypes projected onto the peasantry, often from the left. Can you say a bit about the pejorative figuration you're working against and why it's important to confront it today?

KR: In the wake of the demonstration at Sainte Soline, where the government launched over 4000 military grenades in a few hours at its own citizens, injuring hundreds and putting two people into a coma, it's quite clear that there is a war between two different worlds transpiring in the French countryside.¹¹ On the one side, we have intensive, productivist agro-business, which deems itself justified in privatising and stockpiling a resource held in common like water (for the use of only 7% of the farmers in the region – those that grow water-intensive crops like corn destined to feed industrially-raised livestock.) And, on the other, a kind of agriculture associated with small holdings and *paysans*. It's important to understand that in my discussion of *paysans* I am not talking about *paysans* empirically, in the sense of the numerically ever-dwindling sociological entity – a population whose

members can be counted – but rather about the *paysan* as a *figure*. In the same way that the *forme-commune* cannot be given a hard and fast definition because of the history of its ever-evolving specific manifestations throughout the world, so the name *paysan* has been given over time to large landowners, small subsistence farmers, and landless agricultural labourers alike. And even to non-city dwellers in general! For my purposes, though, the figure of the *paysan* is associated with a rootedness in the land, the cyclic nature of agricultural labour and activities, a way of reasoning that is basically social rather than economic, and, most importantly, with a subsistence economy that is not entirely subordinated to market relations. It is the situation of the *paysan* – physically, of course, but also temporally – that interests me. *Paysans* are regularly castigated for being out of step with modernity – they are seen as forces of tradition, even conservatism. But that conservatism is double-edged, and is frequently a mark of the stubbornness and resilience it takes to defend, at all costs, a way of life that is constantly under threat by the forces of capitalist modernisation. The anachronistic dimension of the *paysan*, as Erag Ramizi and others have pointed out, is what constitutes the force of the figure – out of step with their own time, *paysans* are not only figurations of a past but also, potentially, of a possible future. All this acts to make the *paysan* – again like the *forme-commune* – a kind of valuable repository of archaic, pre-capitalist ways of living that are well worth reviving and attending to as we begin to build a post-productivist world.

Patrick Lyons is Assistant Professor of French and Francophone Studies in the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures at Case Western Reserve University. He is currently completing a book manuscript on the literary history of North African immigrant labour in twentieth century France.

Notes

1. William Morris, *Political Writings: Contributions to 'Justice' and 'Commonweal', 1883-1890*, ed. Nicholas Salmon (Bristol: Thoemmes Press, 1994).
2. Roland Barthes, *Mythologies* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1972).
3. Henri Lefebvre, *The Critique of Everyday Life: The One Volume Edition* (London: Verso, 2014).
4. Kristin Ross, *May '68 and its Afterlives* (Chicago: 2002).
5. Jean-François Vilar, 'Le temps des fossoyeurs', *Rouge*, May 11, 1978.
6. Raymond Williams, 'Structures of Feeling', in *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford University Press, 1977), 128–135.
7. State and business-run dormitories.
8. Elfriede Müller and Alexander Ruoff, *Le Polar français: crime et histoire* (Paris: La Fabrique, 2002), 47.
9. On Notre-Dame-des-Landes and the ZAD, see Jade Lindgaard, ed., *Éloge des mauvaises herbes: ce que nous devons à la ZAD* (Paris: Les liens qui libèrent, 2018); and Mauvaise Troupe, *The ZAD and NoTAV: Territorial Struggles and the Making of a New Political Intelligence*, trans. Kristin Ross (London and New York: Verso, 2018).
10. Kristin Ross, 'Les Soulèvements de la Terre have succeeded in reorienting the gaze of city dwellers towards the countryside', Verso Blog, 23 May 2023, <https://www.versobooks.com/en-gb/blogs/news/les-soulevements-de-la-terre-have-succeeded-in-reorienting-the-gaze-of-city-dwellers-towards-the-countryside>. On Soulèvements de la Terre, see Les Soulèvements de la Terre, *Premières secousses* (Paris: La Fabrique, 2024).
11. See Kristin Ross, 'The War of the Worlds in France', *New York Review of Books* (August 23, 2023).