Introduction: Resurgence of the People

Two Canoes

In 1995, amid Canadian debates around multiculturalism, Quebec nationalism, and Indigenous sovereignty, Haida artist Bill Reid's sculpture, *The Spirit of Haida Gwaii* (completed in 1991), inspired James Tully's vision of "constitutionalism in an age of diversity" (Tully 1995). The sculpture depicts a crew of diverse beings drawn from Haida culture and the European encounter paddling a canoe, "squabbling and vying for recognition" (Tully 1995, p. 24). Tully makes Reid's crowded canoe a "symbol of the age of cultural diversity" and a metaphor for the multicultural and pluralistic society that Tully considers to be a "genuinely post-imperial age" (Tully 1995, p. 17) following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the apparent triumph of liberal-democratic constitutionalism.

The passengers in Reid's canoe are gathered around a central figure, "holding the speaker's staff in his hand... the chief exemplar, whose identity... is uncertain" (Tully 1995, p. 18). For Tully, the chief's position is one of mediation or reconciliation, adopting Locke's view of sovereignty as a question of tolerance and the peaceful mediation of competing interests.

However, in the twenty-five years since Tully's book was written, the pacific horizons of liberal constitutionalism have become increasingly fraught. The continuation of settler-colonial violence, not least in the Murdered and Missing Indigenous Women and Girls (MMIWG) crisis in Canada, as well as anti-Black racism, intolerance towards refugees and immigrants, and the return of open white-supremacy - all in the context of sharpening social and economic crisis - all challenge Tully's deployment of Reid's sculpture as a model of liberal social progress. In a world with Donald Trump, Boris Johnson, Jair Bolsonaro and others in power, it is hard for us now to take Tully's description of the chief seriously: "listen[ing] attentively to each [passenger], hoping to guide them to reach an agreement, without imposing a metalanguage or allowing any speaker to set the terms of the discussion" (Tully 1995, p. 24).

In the face of the ongoing crisis, it is tempting to reject Tully's liberal conception of sovereignty and opt instead for a Hobbesian model of intersubjective war limited only by the power of Leviathan [1]. But this choice is a false one, as Hardt and Negri suggest at the beginning of *Empire* (Hardt and Negri 2000,

[1] Such a desire is illustrated by the "strong man" politics of Trump, Bolsonaro, Viktor Orbán, Alexander Lukashenko, and Vladimir Putin

pp. 6–8), published five years after *Strange Multiplicity* in the wake of the 1999 anti-globalization protests. There is a third constitutional option, a radically democratic one that is often dismissed out of hand because, as we will see, it relies upon an immanent, unruly creativity, a self-directed action that not is beholden to the calm wisdom of a leader, and therefore poses a challenge not only to both the Lockean and Hobbesian constitutional orders, but to the Cartesian disciplining of the body by the mind that lies at the heart of what Negri has called the "bourgeois ideology" of modern philosophy.

Another contemporary artwork, one that echoes and challenges *The Spirit of Haida Gwaii* in many ways, illustrates this third constitutional approach. Kent Monkman is a two-spirit Cree artist born in Ontario and raised in Winnipeg, Manitoba. Monkman's paintings have struck a chord with their provocative "reconfigurations" of classical European forms, motifs, and images in the service of challenging the settler-colonial artistic heritage on which today's Canada relies (Elston 2012). Echoing Tully's understanding of a "hidden constitutionalism" surviving within dominating, hegemonic institutions (like libraries), Monkman's work recognizes the continuation of Indigenous identity and politics within an artistic tradition that has tended to erase Indigeneity in favour of settler-colonial triumph and the universalizing aspirations of liberal philosophy.

Monkman's 2019 painting *Resurgence of the People* depicts, as Reid's sculpture does, a crowded canoe; only in this instance, Monkman appears to reject the conciliation and mediation of the politics of recognition in favour of a self-affirmation of the multitude in all its diversity. In Monkman's canoe, while there is still a visually central figure, the "passengers" (the term seems inappropriate here) are not gathered around pressing their case for recognition. Rather, the canoe is filled with people of colour of various ages and genders, all looking after one another, not in a struggle for recognition, but in decentred mutual support and care, creating space for a conception of politics broader than the democratic sovereignty that is Tully's focus.

The central figure of Monkman's paintain makes this alternative perspective explicit, rejecting both Hobbes' and Locke's conceptions of sovereignty and social contract. Gone is the enigmatic chief who "must act like a mother in caring for the common good if s/he is to secure respect and authority" (Tully 1995, p. 25). Respect and authority are remnants of the false choice, holdovers of the need for constitutional centralization and sovereign power. In *Resurgence of the People*, Reid's chief has been replaced by Monkman's wild and exuberant alter-ego, Miss Chief Eagle Testickle, "a time-traveling, shape shifting, supernatural being who reverses the colonial gaze to challenge received notions of history and Indigenous peoples" (Monkman 2020).

While Reid's chief accords or grants recognition to the passengers in the canoe, indicating the accommodation of diverse identities within a hierarchical sovereign constitution, Miss Chief offers her own exuberant affirmation, overflowing the limits of the canoe and suggesting an irrepressible power that does not depend either on recognition, authority, or a constitution. Similarly, the others in the canoe are not looking to Miss Chief for recognition or leadership,

but are living their lives, helping each other without concern for constitutional niceties, yet all fully aware that they are living in the same boat. While Tully quotes Reid's description of his canoe as "go[ing] on forever anchored in the same place" (Tully 1995, p. 33), thus betraying the liberal desire of an orderly, predictable, and risk-free future, Monkman's canoe is thrusting powerfully forward through choppy and uncertain seas.

There is an unbridgeable gulf between the self-determining forward motion of Monkman's canoe and the static, rockbound impotence of settler-colonialism. The resurgence of the people is their unruly momentum, produced by the determined paddling of Indigenous men and women, unconstrained by the power of a constitution. It is this momentum that turns away from the white, patriarchal capitalist state in order to make its own way in the world.

Miss Chief does not need anyone's recognition; rather, it is the white men stuck on the rock with their weapons who clamour for recognition: of their authority, their power, their capacity for violence. The new politics of identity differs from older politics of recognition precisely in this insistence on self-affirmation that transcends a universal, egalitarian notion of rights and liberties, as well as any procedural, discursive conception of democratic process. It takes seriously the incommensurable, the irreconcilable, and the non-dialectical tensions, antagonisms, and contradictions of contemporary political life. This insistence goes further than Tully's "democratic constitutionalism" in challenging hegemonic ideas of the state, of democratic participation, of liberty, and of citizenship, all of which play out in current controversies and debates within Canadian society, including Canadian librarianship.

Kent Monkman, *Resurgence of the People* (2019)

The Spirit of Haida Gwaii and *The Resurgence of the People* represent not only

two alternative ways of seeing the present, on the one hand bound by rules and procedures centred on a figure of power, on the other hand decentralized and anarchic, but two distinct versions of modern history.

Altermodernity and the Multitude

The idea that there is an alternative current of modern history running alongside the dominant one is a commonplace of critical political theory. In the *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (1852), the revolutionary movement burrows like a mole, occasionally breaking through to the surface of modern society (Marx 1963, p. 121).

Likewise, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri draw on the autonomist concept of the "cycle of struggle" in *Assembly* (2017) to illustrate the dynamics of constituent power - the power of the unruly multitude - in the form of a subterranean river that occasionally breaks the surface (Hardt and Negri 2017, p. 36). Hardt and Negri see this "second history" as "altermodernity", see it as the constant unfolding of constituent power against the dominant history of the constituted power of capital and the state. They write that "the desire to free humanity from the weight of poverty and exploitation, superstition, and domination may at times be submerged and made unrecognizable by the dominant transcendental formation that legitimates and consolidates the power relations of modernity, but it continues nonetheless in European thought as an alternative, subterranean line" (Hardt and Negri 2009, p. 115) [2].

The turbulence of the 1960s renewed interest in alternatives to constituted power in both its totalitarian and liberal forms. In Canadian politics, as we shall see, communitarianism was proposed as a way to recognize and accommodate cultural difference while upholding the power of the centralized state - a compromise between the procedural or libertarian United States and the totalitarian state of the USSR or China. In his discussion of a particular kind of constituent power, dual power [3], Fredric Jameson notes that when "the inquiry of societies without power begins to turn into an inquiry into the emergence of power in early human societies", this problem "slowly links up with practical politics, in the form of an anti-institutional and anarchist preponderance on the left whose causes are clearly multiple" (Jameson 2016, p. 2). Jameson includes among these causes the "failure" of 1968, disillusionment with traditional Communist Parties and decolonization movements.

These two historiographies are inscribed within contemporary debates, not only around culture, but around identity itself. Indeed, Edward Said sees these debates as a battle "between advocates of a unitary identity and those who see

[2] Antonio Negri traces the alternative history of modern political theory from the perspective of constituent power in *Insurgencies*(1999).

[3] Jameson traces the history of dual power from the coexistence of liberal and soviet government structures in Russia in 1917 through the social programs of Hamas and the Black Panthers, and proposes a structure of non-state mutual aid which does not challenge but coexists with the actual structure of state institutions

the whole as a complex but not reductively unified one. This opposition implies two different perspectives, two historiographies, one linear and subsuming, the other contrapuntal and often nomadic" (Said 1993, p. xxv).

In this thesis I will explore the place of Intellectual Freedom (IF) as a concept which seeks to reinforce a single, unified identity under the guise of pluralism. In this way, IF in Canadian librarianship mirrors the development of recognition as a political theory. Both IF and recognition are attempts to soften the hardest edges of liberalism, to counter both its rejection of social relations and its tendency towards homogeneity, the reduction of politics and social services to rational procedure. Canadian politics provides a useful context for this investigation because in many ways Canada occupies a similarly liminal position: between colonizer and colonized, between centre and periphery, between laissez-faire and the welfare state. I will argue that the real history of Canadian politics informs the political theory of recognition, which attempts to chart a middle course between absolute sovereignty and constituent power. Similarly, IF in Canada tries to balance between American-style free-speech absolutism on the one hand and the balanced conception of "free expression" enshrined in the Canadian constitution.

In many ways, the differences between the American and Canadian situations can be understood as differences in the relative weight of individualism and social relations. Constituent power is therefore a useful lens through which to view debates around unified identity and difference because it tries to avoid either a purely voluntarist or a purely determinist social model, positing a non-dualist relationship between the one and many. As a result, constituent power and the multitude can offer an alternative perspective on Intellectual Freedom which is not bound to the social and political commitments of liberalism.

In his 1979 work, *The Possibility of Naturalism*, philosopher of science Roy Bhaskar offered a typology of individual-society relations. Bhaskar initially distinguished between a pure individual voluntarism derived from Weber and a deterministic social theory derived from Burkheim (Bhaskar 1998, p. 32). Bhaskar adds two further types of social theory to these two. First, Bhaskar describes a "dialectic" model, in which individual and society determine each other in a succession of states (society produces the individual, individuals produce society, and so on) (Bhaskar 1998, pp. 32–36). Second, he offers the social model that underpins his own critical realist philosophy, which he calls a "transformational model", in which

> people do not create society. For it always pre-exists them and is a necessary condition for their activity. Rather, society must be regarded as an ensemble of structures, practices and conventions which individuals reproduce or transform, but which would not exist unless they did so." (Bhaskar 1998, p. 36)

This model has been further developed by subsequent social theorists like Margaret Archer, who argues that the duality between structure and agency

ought to be understood in critical realist terms as a relationship of emergence. "Ontologically, 'structure' and 'agency' are seen as distinct strata of reality, as the bearers of quite different properties and powers. Their irreducibility to one another entails examining the interplay between them" (Archer 2003, p. 2).

The move from a dialectical to a transformational or emergent theory of structure and agency mirrors a move from Hegel to Spinoza in the thought of autonomist Marxists which we will explore in a subsequent chapter. Briefly, the encounter with Spinoza by French and Italian theorists in the 1960s led to the incorporation of the concept of the "multitude" in Marxist political thought. In the same way that Spinoza's immanent conception of nature overcomes the dualism between mind and body, self and other, the multitude (bearer of an uncontainable constituent power) overcomes the duality of structure and agency by seeing society as a condition of the many as many, that is as irreducible to a class, a people, a nation, or a state.

Individuals emerge from the structure of the multitude. This is the main point of Marxist theorists like Antonio Negri, Maurizio Lazzarato, Francesco Berardi, and Paolo Virno. The main question of this thesis is what consequences this perspective has on Intellectual Freedom, a concept which relies on a purely individualist and voluntarist social and political theory.

The constituted power of the state and the ruling class construct Intellectual Freedom as timeless and transcendental. This static, rigid, unchanging framing of IF then itself becomes part of the constituted, hegemonic, order and an unquestionable pre-requisite for the unfolding of life in capitalist society. Within librarianship, Intellectual Freedom emerges as the "rule to regulate other rules" [4], a status which has has real policy implications situated for debates over trans rights, Indigenous sovereignty, police brutality, education, and democratic participation. This thesis thus argues that because of its entanglements with constituted power, IF - and librarianship itself - must be critiqued from the perspective of constituent power.

The isomorphism between constituted power and its static, unchanging logic and concepts is well-understood within Marxism (which opposes a dialectical logic of interconnection to the dominant Aristotelian logic of atomistic identity)[5]. This thesis takes a new approach in attempting to connect constituted power with a particular concept in order to show not only how that concept functions ideologically, but how it mirrors the aspirations to timelessness and stability of the constituted order itself [6].

[4]Marxist literary theorist Terry Eagleton describes as metaphysical "the belief that there are immutable essences and self-evident foundations; that we can break reality down to certain irreducible components; that the existence of the world can be indubitably demonstrated; that all of our practices need to be rationally justified; that there might be a rule that would regulate all other rules" (Eagleton 2016, p. 149). I see Intellectual Freedom as just such a "metaphysical" element in librarianship.

[5]There is an enormous body of literature on this topic. Two good introductions are (Norman and Sayers 1980) and (Ollman 2003).

[6]There are two other important critiques of Intellectual Freedom connected to the one I want to make here. The first is along the lines of the left-wing critique of human rights more generally (see Moyn 2018, Shoikhedbrod 2019, Menke 2020). The second is around debates over free-speech/free-

If these claims seem at this juncture extravagant or far-fetched, this is only because we have a lot of ground to cover in order to show how all these processes function. The initial burden is to illustrate the idea that IF is up in the struggle between constituted and constituent power.

Politics and Librarianship

Canadian librarianship differs from librarianship in the United States by an adoption of the conciliatory, mediating vision of state authority represented by *The Spirit of Haida Gwaii*. The constitutional history of the US, constantly guarding against tyranny, and with checks and balances against state overreach, differs from the "responsible government" of Canada, which sees the state as a paternal guide rather than a Hobbesian necessary evil [7] As a result, while the pure individualism of Rawlsian liberal egalitarianism tends to be dominant in the US, a communitarian liberalism formalized by Tully and Charles Taylor is dominant in Canada, each emphasizing one or other element of Rawls' principles of justice. Communitarianism informs Canadian librarianship generally, but as we will see it affects Intellectual Freedom in particular ways as well.

Intellectual Freedom tends to be explained/justified in two ways. First, as a philosophical concept drawing on the liberal tradition of Mill, Rawls, and Habermas. Second as a juridical concept grounded in human rights. Debates within librarianship take similar forms to debates within political theory itself: debates over individuals and society, universal equality vs. differences, etc. More precisely, the debates in librarianship which arose in the late 1960s between "Intellectual Freedom" on the one hand and "Social Responsibility" on the other mirror debates between individual and communitarian liberalism, and the ambiguity of Rawls' theory of justice. This raises the question of the ways in which real historical and political developments produced both changes in (liberal and radical) political theory *and* informed debates within librarianship over intellectual freedom. Put in the form of a question, my aim here is to ask what social, political, and economic processes produced both the politics of recognition and the current controversies over Intellectual Freedom in Canada.

This approach challenges the prevailing conception of intellectual freedom which sees it as either an unchallengeable (liberal) given or an eternal and unchanging juridical right. By historicizing and materializing intellectual freedom *alongside* the politics of recognition, I hope to show that both political theory and concepts like intellectual freedom are themselves historical, social, and political constructions and that *therefore alternative perspectives are possible*.

expression more generally (for example, in the purported "free speech crisis" on university campuses, "cancel culture", and deplatforming. For an overview of debates around deplatforming and intellectual freedom in libraries, see Popowich 2020. I do not address those critiques in detail in this thesis

[7] For an account of the difference between the American "separation of powers" drawn from Locke and Montesquieu, and the British colonial concept of "responsible government", see Malcolmson et al. 2016.

Critiques of Intellectual Freedom, like critiques of liberalism, cannot be a priori dismissed on the basis of their "illiberalism" but should be taken seriously for they new perspectives they open up for librarianship and for political theory more broadly.

This thesis will address these issues, first in a contrapuntal reading of Canadian politics, Intellectual Freedom, and post-Rawlsian political theory. It will then proceed to dig deeper into the ambiguity between Rawls' two principles of justice, and its consequences for Intellectual Freedom. Next it will look at Taylor and Tully's political philosophy and the ways they determine Intellectual Freedom, before turning to an alternative derived from autonomist Marxism, in particular the work of Paolo Virno.

Recent years have seen a resurgence of "the people" after decades of neoliberal focus on individualism. Right-wing and white-supremacist populism, Brexit, refugee crisis, Indigenous activism, anti-Black police brutality, and the BlackLivesMatter movement all illustrate the issues associated with collective national, ethnic, or racial identities in the current historical moment. Another strand of the contemporary problems of "identity politics" [8] is that of transgender rights and "gender critical feminism". It may seem odd to situate the library and librarianship [9] at the heart of these controversies, but this thesis seeks to connect librarianship's liberal egalitarianism with just these questions of race, gender, and notions of "the people".

The resurgence must be understood in terms of the energies released by the "cycle of struggle" of the 1960s [10]. After a long period of repression of individual desires in the name of postwar reconstruction, at the end of the 1960s revolutionary activism on a number of social and economic fronts provoked a serious crisis in postwar capitalism. This crisis had deep consequences for politics and economics (the beginning of the neoliberal transition), political theory (Rawls' revitalisation of liberalism but also the development of extra-parliamentary and anti-Soviet communisms), and Intellectual Freedom in librarianship. This period of crisis and response produced political problems which are still with us today.

In Canada, 2019 and 2020 have witnessed a continuation of Indigenous resistance in the form of both land-defense blockades to protest oil pipeline development (Gandbhir 2020) and to take advantage of treaty rights in the formation of a Nova Scotia Indigenous lobster fishery (Palmater 2020). Both forms of activism were met by settler-colonial violence by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (Canada's federal police force) (Palmater 2019) and by settlers themselves. Settler-colonial violence, including questions regarding structural racism in the RCMP and the ongoing Murdered and Missing Indige-

[8] It is important to locate the origin of the term "identity politics" to the collective statement of the Black radical feminist Combahee River Collective in 1974. (K.-Y. Taylor 2017, p. 8).

[9] Throughout this thesis I use "librarianship" to refer to the combination of the practice of library work and the academic discipline of Library and Information Studies (LIS).

[10] The concept of "cycles of struggle" between labour and capital is common in far-left political theory, such as the operaismo of Mario Tronti, the communisation theory of the Endnotes collective, or the post-workerist autonomism of Tronti, Negri, Virno, and others. See Dyer-Witheford 1999.

nous Women and Girls (MMIWG) crisis, indicate the breadth of the problem settler-Indigenous relationships and Indigenous sovereignty pose to the Canadian federation.

Similarly, Quebec nationalism, which has simmered since the defeat of the French by the English on the Plains of Abraham in 1759, remains an unresolved element in Canadian politics. Quebec law to ban the wearing of religious symbols by public servants - focusing on the symbols of religious minorities - has raised yet again the vexed question of minority rights and Quebec's distinct status within the Canadian federation (Turgeon et al. 2019). The ongoing issues of Indigenous sovereignty and Quebec nationalism, among many others, demonstrate that Canadian politics has not found a solution to the questions of identity and difference within a liberal-democratic nation state.

In this thesis I want to offer a reading of contemporary political theory that explains why these problems continue, and to propose an alternative from the perspective of Paolo Virno's autonomist Marxist form of radical democracy [11]. To focus the critique of political theory, I will concentrate on the concept of Intellectual Freedom as it is deployed in policy decisions in Canadian libraries.

In the US, freedom of speech is enshrined in the First Amendment of the Constitution, dating from 1791. While some limited forms of speech have come to be excluded from the First Amendment (child pornography, for example), the default position on free speech in the US is an absolute one. This derives from an understanding of individual freedom in social contract terms as *original*, that is, pertaining or attached to individual subjects in a state of nature prior to their entry into social relations. The First Amendment is there to ensure universal and equal protection of the right to free speech, satisfying Rawls' principle of equality.

In Canada, on the other hand, freedom of expression is enshrined in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms adopted alongside the new Canadian constitution in 1982. The Charter understands freedom as something fostered and supported by society, as an *outcome* rather than an origin, following Kant's definition of enlightenment as an individual's "emergence from self-incurred immaturity [which is] the ability to use one's own understanding without the guidance of another" (Kant 1991). The role of the state is not, therefore, the protection of a primordial, pre-existing liberty, but rather making possible, fostering, and supporting such liberty [12]. The emphasis here is on Rawls' second principle of justice, the difference principle, and it explains, for example the explicit prohibition of hate speech in Canadian constitutional law.

This ambiguity between universal equality and what the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms describes as the "reasonable limits" on equality "justified in a free and democratic society (Constitution Act, 1982, §1) creates

[11] Radical democracy is often equated with Chantal Mouffe's "agonistic" approach, but autonomist Marxism has been accepted as an alternative to Mouffe. See Dahlberg and Siapera 2007, p. 8, Dyer-Witheford 2007. However, political theorist Jakeet Singh has recently called for a decentring of both liberal and Marxist perspectives on radical democracy (Singh 2018).

[12] This view of the state and society lies at the heart of Charles Taylor's critique of libertarianism, see C. Taylor 1985.

room to maneuver within a constitutional system, and gives rise to many political differences. While the ambiguity appears to provide a necessary balance from the perspective of liberal political theory, I will argue that the ambiguity in fact reflects serious underlying contradictions in liberal-democratic society which liberal theory is inadequate to address. These contradictions exploded in the 1960s, forcing a crisis on both liberal and radical political theory. Radical political theory, as we will see, rose to this challenge through a new openingendedness. However, rather than resolving social contradictions the ambiguity between the two principles of justice have allowed the neoliberal political project to opportunistically emphasize one or other of the principles to support the maintenance of the constituted power of the liberal state itself. The case of Intellectual Freedom in Canadian libraries offers concrete examples of this opportunism in action.

Political theory, Canadian politics, Intellectual Freedom: none of these can be looked at in isolation if we want to gain a new perspective on them. The methodological question then arises: how can look at all three interrelated elements at the same time. Before turning to Virno's political theory, I want to discuss these methodological implications.

Methodology: Contrapuntal Reading

Canadian politics, Intellectual Freedom, and political theory intersect and interrelate in diverse ways. Real political dynamics and events - the 1968 revolts, the October Crisis, or the Kanehsatà:ke resistance, for example - set problems for political theory to solve and thereby *produce* political theory as such. Political theory is constrained by historical necessity: even at its most imaginative it responds to political events that have actually taken place.

But this is not how liberalism presents itself. It seeks to offer up a universalizing, transhistorical view of human conduct and political formations. In his discussion of the hostility of the liberal tradition to dialectical thought, Jameson notes that "the antispeculative bias of that tradition, its emphasis on the individual fact or item at the expense of the network of relationships in which that item may be embedded, continue to encourage submission to what is by preventing its followers from making connections, and in particular from drawing the otherwise unavoidable conclusions on the political level" (Jameson 1972, p. x).

In a similar vein, Raymond Geuss relates an anecdote in which Rawls' mistakes the date for the Treaty of Westphalia, placing it in 1548 instead of 1648. When corrected, Rawls changes the title of his paper, but nothing else. Geuss concludes that "from the point of view of the original position, the difference between sixteenth and the seventeenth century is completely insignificant, actually invisible" (Geuss 2005, p. 39).

Canadian politics - for example, the repatriation of the constitution or the rise of recognition as a political strategy in the late 1960s - are seen in isolation from the "resurgence of the people". Liberal political theory inspired by

Rawls prioritizes the abstract and eternal "original position". Librarians see Intellectual Freedom as autonomous from larger social and political questions, an abstract and absolute ethic of autarkic individual choice.

Following Said's model, I want to argue that these three phenomena, far from being understandable in isolation, "irradiate and interfere with apparently stable and impermeable categories", in particular the liberal conception of individual identity. Said's method of analysis offers a means by which internal relationships - dialectical or otherwise - can be illustrated, by the "sounding" of any given note against the contrapuntal unfolding of the rest.

In this way, the "contrapuntal reading" proposed by Edward Said in *Culture and Imperialism* suggests an appropriate hermeneutics for this project. Said describes contrapuntal reading as reading "with a simultaneous awareness both of the metropolitan history that is narrated and of those other histories against which (and together with which) the dominating discourse acts" (Said 1993, p. 51). For Said, references to, for example, the West Indian plantations in Jane Austen's *Mansfield Park* are not contingent, not subject solely to the author's fancy, but historically necessary, produced by the reality of British colonial power. Similarly, despite the absence of concrete historical references in much political philosophy, we must read the development of theory *against* the real historical and political facts that produce them.

Said's contrapuntal reading offers a way to ground political theory in real historical and political developments, and as such it provides a corrective to the ahistorical tendencies of political philosophy [13] It also allows us to avoid the limitations of the positivism of purely historical work. For example, in Toni Samek's hugely important book *Intellectual Freedom and Social Responsibility in American Librarianship, 1967-1974* (2001), she advances the claim that IF debates were part of a struggle for hegemony within American librarianship. The history she recounts is vital to our understanding of these debates, but the Gramscian political theory sits uneasily alongside Samek's positivist historiography [14]. Political theory divorced from historical reality is just as partial and one-sided as history kept separate from theorization.

Applying the idea of a contrapuntal reading to political theory is not unprecedented. In "Political Theory as Historical Counterpoint", Jeanne Morefield suggests that "engaging in contrapuntal readings of key moments in the canonical history of political thought - moments that have become frozen around certain particular ideas and thinkers - can shake up the sleepiness of our received canon and, in the process, broaden our sense of what is possible in the

[13] Such abstractions are the subject of Raymond Geuss' critique in the name of "real politics", but see also the requirement for a historical and not just a philosophical approach to politics expressed in Loughlin 2003, pp. 14–15.

[14] Historical writing was divided in the nineteenth century into three main schools, Romantic, Idealist, and Positivist (Parker 1983, p. 120), (White 1973, p. 145). Positivist historiography is one which lets the "facts" speak for themselves, without reference to philosophy or interpretation. Hayden White notes that debates between historiographical schools were very often debates over which approach was more "realistic" (White 1973, pp. 46–47), and since its revitalization in the 1930s positivism remains the dominant approach in library and information studies (Popowich 2019, pp. 238–240). Samek's history is firmly within this positivist camp.

now" (Morefield 2016). Reading Taylor and Tully both in the context of particular Canadian political processes and through the lens of Virno's autonomism will, I hope, contribute to a shakeup of liberal theory and Canadian political thought. In addition, such a contrapuntal reading will help clarify and problematize the question of Intellectual Freedom in librarianship.

In a similar vein, Keally McBride has argued that "providing historical information is one way of asserting the political aspects of the production and reception of a theory, and by extension it brings a political awareness of interpreting of these texts" (McBride 2016). The methodology described by Morefield and by McBride imposes on us a responsibility to ask just what were the historical and political dynamics that led to the "refoundation" of political theory in Rawls' *Theory of Justice* and to the development of Taylor and Tully's politics of recognition as a response to Rawls.

This kind of contrapuntal reading, one which recognizes the effects of already-produced material and historical reality on texts (including social texts) fits well with a generally historical-materialist approach. Contrapuntal reading allows for the reinscription of materialism and historical necessity into our understanding of political theory without resorting to any kind of crude determinism. The deployment of materialism and necessity is vital to Virno's work, as a combination of both Marxist and Spinozist (materialist) theoretical perspectives.

Similarly, I see contrapuntal analysis as conforming to the kind of Spinozan openness and immanence that attracts autonomists like Negri and Virno. Rather than being forced to choose either a synchronic or a diachronic model of understanding and explanation, Said's contrapuntal analysis allows us to do both at the same time. It also allows us to avoid the dialectical problem of closure, since the closing of a piece of counterpoint always implies the continuation of the various voices in other permutations. As musicologist Charles Rosen has remarked, "the Baroque melody" - the high point of contrapuntal music - "is extensible, almost indefinitely so" (Rosen 1998, p. 77).

Paolo Virno's Spinozan Marxism

The energies released by the 1960s cycle of struggle, as we have seen, forced a transformation upon liberal political theory. Rawls *Theory of Justice* lay at the centre of this crisis. As Samuel Moyn has written, while Rawls' work "reflected many premises of the dream of national welfare" in the post-war period, in the late 1960s Rawls' perspective "suddenly became controversial". "Rawls's thought registered the assumptions of national welfare on the brink of crisis, or memorialized hopes for their further extension when they were about to be eroded by a neoliberal revolution" (Moyn 2018, p. 147). Moyn, like Forrester (Forrester 2019, chap. 2), connects Rawls' work to civil disobedience in the face of expanding US involvement in the Vietnam war after 1967, and Moyn notes - quoting Brian Barry - that if the Vietnam War was the "external stimulus" to a re-evaluation of liberal ethical and political theory, Rawls' *Theory of Justice* was

the internal stimulus (Moyn 2018, p. 148).

A similar crisis was also forced on Marxism and other left-wing political philosophies. The death of Stalin in 1953 and the invasion of Hungary in 1956 led to a re-evaluation of communist principles, strategies, and tactics. The development of the New Left was mirrored in Italy by the emergence first of anti-revisionist left-wing groups, and then a powerful extraparliamentary left after the "hot autumn" of 1969 (Wright 2002). For Paolo Virno, Antonio Negri and others, the continuation of authoritarianism in the Soviet Union after the death of Stalin suggested an authoritarian tendency at the heart of the Hegelian-Marxist dialectic, with its teleological vision of closure and the end of history. The encounter with Spinoza in the 1960s, especially among French philosophers [15], suggested a way to reformulate communist (even Marxist) philosophy to allow for an indeterminate open-endedness while still including a (non-Hegelian) theory of historical necessity (Negri 2020).

One common criticism made by Marxism against liberalism is that liberalism considers freedom as separate (or separable) from necessity (Menke 2020, p. 4) (Shoikhedbrod 2019, p. 157). This is due primarily to the "positive" or Aristotelian logic dominant in the West in general and capitalism in particular. Dialectical logic requires that we understand freedom and necessity not as binary opposites, but as internally related, as Engels described in his *Anti-Dühring* (1883) (Engels 1969, pp. 130–142). Marxism also offers a critique of both the individualism of social contract theory (which Marx dismissed as Robinson-Crusoe-like fables (Marx 1973, p. 83)) and of the Kantian theory of Enlightenment. However, the dialectical insistence on eventual closure was inappropriate to the politics of the 1960s which, in the early years of postmodernism, emphasised openendedness and incompleteness (Negri 2020, pp. viii–ix).

The rediscovery of the philosophy of Spinoza led autonomists to conceive of politics as less a question of capturing state power or even the creation of a constitution, and more the ongoing, neverending "absolute procedure" of constitutional self-creation by the multitude [16] The only constraint on the power of the multitude was necessity, and it was necessity that provided the horizons of liberty for both individual and political association. As opposed to the liberal tradition, Virno (following Spinoza) saw freedom as only comprehensible against the horizon of necessity.

The best known proponent of the Spinozan/autonomist Marxist perspective is Antonio Negri. Negri's re-evaluation of Spinoza (Negri 1991) and his reconstruction of the alternate historiography of constituent power (Negri 1999) provide a necessary background and foundation for autonomist and post-autonomist

[15] For example, Negri cites Gueroult's two-volume *Spinoza* (1968), Matheron's *Individu et communauteéchez Spinoza* (1969), Deleuze's *Spinoza et le problème de l'expression* (1968) and *Spinoza* (1970), as well as Macherey's late *Hegel ou Spinoza* (1977). While Negri does not include him in this list, Louis' Althusser's work from the mid to late 1960s - *Reading Capital* and the work on ideological state apparatuses - refer to Spinoza in ways that directly prefigure Negri's and Virno's reading.

[16] Other forms of autonomism, such as that associated with Cornelius Castoriadis, arose in the same period from many of the same concerns. See Castoriadis 1998.

thought. In the Anglo-American world Negri's political theory are best known through the trilogy he wrote with Michael Hardt, *Empire*(2000), *Multitude*(2004), and *Commonwealth*(2006), as well as the later text, *Assembly*(2017). The "Empire" trilogy is really a synthesis of workerist and autonomist thought in the service of an analysis of neoliberal globalization and the proposal of a political project based on constituent power and the notion of the common.

Italian thinkers, on the other hand, have attempted to reconcile autonomist Marxist thought with other strands of Italian political philosophy under the rubric of "Italian Theory". The philosophy of Negri, Giorgio Agamben, Gianni Vattimo, and others has been united around a theme of biopolitics and various diagnoses of the pathologies of contemporary political life. Beginning with the publication of Virno and Hardt's 1996 anthology of radical Italian philosophy (Virno and Hardt 1996) and given new impetus by the reissue of Semiotext(e) autonomist magazine of the 1980s in the form of an anthology in 2007 (Lotringer and Marazzi 2007), Italian Theory has become popular in recent years. Attempts to unify the disparate strands of Italian political thinking, for example in Roberto Esposito's *Living Thought: Origins and Actuality of Italian Philosophy* have made the case that, like German philosophy in the early Twentieth Century, and "French Theory" of the 1960s-1980s, "Italian philosophy is now entering into an analytical and critical relationship with the dominant features of our time, to a greater degree than other traditions of thought" (Esposito 2012, p. 1) to the extent that "Italian thought is now better equipped than others to deal with the dynamics of the globalized world and of the immaterial production that characterizes the postmodern era"(Esposito 2012, p. 3)[17].

Italian Theory - and specifically Italian autonomism - is a rich and useful theoretical lens with enormous explanatory power for the current conjuncture. Negri's work above all forms the backbone of this way of understanding the world and contemporary politics. This raises the question of why, in this thesis, I should focus on Virno rather than Negri himself.

In the first place, Negri's work is already quite well-known while Virno's political thought is more obscure. Negri's work is also more wide-ranging while Virno's narrower focus is more directly applicable to this theses.Goth Negri and Virno take Spinoza and autonomist Marxism as their starting points, Virno focuses more on the production of subjectivity and the relationship between individual subjects and the multitude. Furthermore, Virno engages with analytic philosophers like Wittgenstein which makes comparisons and contrasts between his work and Canadian political philosophers like Charles Taylor and James Tully easier to develop and bring out.

Virno offers a "transindividual" alternative to both the liberal conception of atomistic individualism and the communitarian variant inscribed within the politics of recognition. Virno does not take the individual as any kind of starting point, but sees individuality as emerging from a pre-individual social ma-

[17]Other recent books that propose a unified Italian Theory are Chiesa and Toscano's edited collection *The Italian Difference*(Chiesa and Toscano 2009) and Dario Gentili's *Italian Theory: dall'operaismo alla biopolitica*(Gentili 2012).

trix, especially through language and technology[18]. It is this individual, still bearing the marks of a pre-individual society and culture, that exists within the political form known as the multitude. Because individuals do not have to reject any aspects of themselves in order to achieve a formal political equality (a process Marx described in the "Critique of the Gotha Programme" of 1875), the multitude is a political form which supports and maintains individual difference while creating the possibility (*potenza*) for collective action and forms-of-life.

Virno's politics are therefore radically democratic without being individualistic, an essentially anarcho-communist development of both Marx and Spinoza. This politics thus tries to avoid the problems presented by the Hegelian dialectic - closure, teleology, empire - while sidestepping those that arise from Rawls' two principles of justice. Virno's politics, like Negri's, asserts "the *potenza* [power as strength] of singularities against the ethics of individualism and against the totalitarianism of commodities consubstantial with bourgeois culture" (Negri 2020, p. viii). We will explore this idea in more detail in Chapter Six.

Chapter Outline

In Chapter Two, I want to lay the groundwork for a contrapuntal understanding of Canadian Politics and Political Theory by connecting the rise of neoliberalism and the split between liberalism proper and communitarianism. Communitarianism - in the form of the politics of recognition - helped justify the adoption of the politics of recognition in Canada in the late 1960s and the creation of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1982. I want to argue that Intellectual Freedom in Canada in contrast to IF in the United States is marked by the politics of freedom and communitarian understandings of individuality and rights.

In Chapter Three I will give a brief analysis of the history of Intellectual Freedom in librarianship since the 1930s and the rise of a communitarian variant in the later 1960s, Social Responsibility. These two tendencies arise out of the crisis of the late 1960s and express the two contradictory tendencies within Rawls' Theory of Justice we have looked at above. In the US, Social Responsibility it seen as diametrically opposed to Intellectual Freedom, while in Canada the Social Responsibility position is included within the more communitarian version of IF operational within Canadian libraries.

In Chapter Four I will look at two recent controversies in Canadian librarianship which have an IF component. The Toronto Public Library's room rental to a transphobic speaking group became a touchstone for Intellectual Freedom debates in Canada. On the other hand, the institution of "airport style" se-

[18]This autonomist view of individual subjectivity can be described as "transformational", using the taxonomy of individual-society relations developed by Roy Bhaskar. The transformational model sees the individual as "emergent" from pre-existing social relations and social relations as emergent from the interaction between individuals. See (Bhaskar 1998, pp. 31–37).

curity at Winnipeg Public Library, while controversial, did not connect with Intellectual Freedom debates. The reasons why one event should have been "about" Intellectual Freedom and the other not are one of the things this thesis will address.

To do that, I will explore, in Chapter Five, the politics of recognition as it appears in Canadian political theory, specifically that of Charles Taylor and James Tully. What I will argue is that Taylor and Tully propose a political theory to inscribe a communitarian vision of Canadian politics which simply reinforces the status quo rather than offering anything truly new. This, I will argue, is because of their commitment to Enlightenment individualism, only slightly moderated through the external relationships inscribed in the politics of recognition. The politics of recognition can shed light on the way IF debates play out in Canada, but it cannot, in the end, help us move beyond those debates.

In Chapter Six I want to propose an alternative to Enlightement views of individualism in the form of Paolo Virno's autonomist, transindividual theory of subjectivity. Virno's theory allows us to reformulate Intellectual Freedom in terms specific to the constituent power of the multitude. In this chapter we will explore Virno's theory in details.

In the Conclusion I will draw lessons for Intellectual Freedom from Virno's political theory and suggest avenues for future research.

References

Archer, Margaret S. (2003). *Structure, Agency and the Internal Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN: 978-0-521-53597-7. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139087315.

Bhaskar, Roy (1998). *The Possibility of Naturalism: A Philosophical Critique of the Human Sciences*. Third. Routledge.

Castoriadis, Cornelius (1998). *The Imaginary Institution of Society*. MIT Press.

Chiesa, Lorenzo and Alberto Toscano (2009). *The Italian Difference: Between Nihilism and Biopolitics*. Melbourne: Re-Press.

Dahlberg, Lincoln and Eugenia Siapera, eds. (2007). *Radical Democracy and the Internet: Interrogating Theory and Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/9780230592469.

Dyer-Witheford, Nick (1999). *Cyber-Marx: Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in High-Technology Capitalism*. University of Illinois Press.

— (2007). "Hegemony or Multitude? Two Versions of Radical Democracy for the Net". In: *Radical Democracy and the Internet: Interrogating Theory and Practice*. Ed. by Lincoln Dahlberg and Eugenia Siapera. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 191–206.

Eagleton, Terry (2016). *Materialism*. Yale University Press.

Elston, M. Melissa (2012). "Subverting Visual Discourses of Gender and Geography: Kent Monkman's Revised Iconography of the American West". In: *Journal of American Culture* 35.2, pp. 181–190.

Engels, Frederick (1969). *Anti-Dühring*. Progress Publishers.

Esposito, Roberto (2012). *Living Thought: Origins and Actuality of Italian Philosophy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Forrester, Katrina (2019). *In the Shadow of Justice: Postwar LIberalism and the Remaking of Political Philosophy*. Princeton University Press.

Gandbhir, Gauri (2020). "Canada: Wet'suwet'en Defend Land and Sovereignty". In: *Green Left Review*.

Gentili, Dario (2012). *Italian Theory: Dall'operaismo Alla Biopolitica*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Geuss, Raymond (2005). *Outside Ethics*. Princeton University Press.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri (2000). *Empire*. Duke University Press.

— (2009). *Commonwealth*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

— (2017). *Assembly*. Oxford University Press.

Jameson, Fredric (1972). *The Prison House of Language: A Critical Account of Structuralism and Russian Formalism*. Princeton University Press.

— (2016). *An American Utopia: Dual Power and the Universal Army*. New York: Verso.

Kant, Immanuel (1991). "An Answer to the Question 'What Is Enlightenment?'" In: *Kant: Political Writings*. Ed. by H.S. Reiss. Cambridge University Press.

Lotringer, Sylvere and Christian Marazzi (2007). *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics*. San Francisco: Semiotext(e).

Loughlin, Martin (2003). *The Idea of Public Law*. Oxford University Press.

Malcolmson, Patrick et al. (2016). *The Canadian Regime: An Introduction to Parliamentary Government in Canada*. Sixth. University of Toronto Press.
Marx, Karl (1963). *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. International Publishers.
— (1973). *Grundrisse*. Penguin Books.
McBride, Keally (2016). "On Relating History and Political Theory". In: *Theory & Event* 19.1.
Menke, Christoph (2020). *Critique of Rights*. Polity.
Monkman, Kent (2020). *Biography*. https://www.kentmonkman.com/biography.
Morefield, Jeanne (2016). "Political Theory as Historical Counterpoint: The Case of Schmitt and Sovereignty". In: *Theory & Event* 19.1.
Moyn, Samuel (2018). *Not Enough: Human Rights in an Unequal World*. Harvard University Press.
Negri, Antonio (1991). *The Savage Anomaly: The Power of Spinoza's Metaphysics and Politics*. University of Minnesota Press.
— (1999). *Insurgencies: Constituent Power and the Modern State*. University of Minnesota Press.
— (2020). *Spinoza: Then and Now*. Polity.
Norman, Richard and Sean Sayers (1980). *Hegel, Marx and Dialectic: A Debate*. Harvester Press.
Ollman, Bertell (2003). *Dance of the Dialectic: Steps in Marx's Method*. University of Illinois Press.
Palmater, Pam (2019). "RCMP Invasion of Wet'suwet'en Nation Territory Breaches Canada's 'Rule of Law'". In: *Canadian Dimension*.
— (2020). "Mi'kmaw Treaty Rights, Reconciliation and the 'rule of Law'". In: *Canadian Dimension*.
Parker, Christopher (1983). "English Historians and the Opposition to Positivism". In: *History and Theory* 22.2, pp. 120–145.
Popowich, Sam (2019). *Confronting the Democratic Discourse of Librarianship: A Marxist Approach*. Library Juice Press.
— (2020). "The Problem of Neutrality and Intellectual Freedom: The Case of Libraries". In: ed. by Charlotte Lydia Riley. Manchester University Press.
Rosen, Charles (1998). *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven*. New York: W.W. Norton.
Said, Edward W. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. Vintage Books.
Shoikhedbrod, Igor (2019). *Revisiting Marx's Critique of Liberalism: Rethinking Justice, Legality and Rights*. Palgrave Macmillan.
Singh, Jakeet (2018). "Decolonizing Radical Democracy". In: *Contemporary Political Theory* 18.3, pp. 331–356.
Taylor, Charles (1985). "Atomism". In: *Philosophical Papers, Volume 2: Philosophy and the Human Sciences*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 187–210.
Taylor, Keeanga-Yamahtta (2017). *How We Get Free: Black Feminism and the Combahee River Collective*. Haymarket.
Tully, James (1995). *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*. Cambridge University Press.

Turgeon, Luc et al. (2019). "A Tale of Two Liberalisms? Attitudes toward Minority Religions Symbols in Quebec and Canada". In: *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 52, pp. 247–165.
Virno, Paolo and Michael Hardt (1996). *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
White, Hayden V. (1973). *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
Wright, Steve (2002). *Storming Heaven: Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism*. Pluto Press.