Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory/Revue canadienne de théorie politique et sociale, Volume X, N. 1-2 (1986).

MARCEL RIOUX CRITIQUING QUEBEC'S DISCOURSE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Raymond A. Morrow

I
Social Theory and Social Criticism: Two Traditions

Social theory constitutes a form of specialized discourse seemingly far removed from the mediascape of radio talk shows, the question-begging interviews of television, the banalities of newspaper columns, the ripostes of parliamentary image-making, or the half-articulate confrontations of tavern political debate.[1] Yet all of these more accessible activities presuppose theoretical imagination, however unconsciously; social theory is in turn grounded in everyday life and experiences of particular communities and groups, however undeveloped may be their capacity for self-reflection. Normally, these two realms remain largely isolated from one another, aside from the slow process whereby officially approved interpretations trickle down through educational systems and the mass media or the outlaw ideologies of social movements erupt into institutional life from below or on the margins of society. In modern societies in particular, elaborated social theory has had a strategic, if largely invisible place: only there does the cultivation of the analysis and evaluation of social reality assume an institutionalized and rigorous form; only there does the construction of "careful and critical discourse" receive its due.[2]

The maturity of a group or collectivity is expressed in its traditions of social theory, whether at the academic or more popular, social movement level. However absolute the forms of deprivation within a given community, these latent needs cannot be translated into effective collective action or will-formation until they receive adequate symbolic formulation, thus

rationally re-describing brute experience in terms of narrative accounts of social determination and visions of potential transcendance. By European standards — and even those of the United States, the development of social theory in Canada has been a slow, halting process closely related to the costs of growing up under the shadow of first the British and then the American empires. As the British sociologist Tom Bottomore "sympathetically" noted in the late 1960's, though the social critic in Canada had a certain advantage over his or her American counterpart because of the existence of two vital social movements (the social democracy of the New Democratic Party and Quebec nationalism), these had been offset by the disadvantages of the "lack of a critical tradition, the absence of any outstanding earlier schools of social thought"; furthermore, there were no established intellectual centres and the "journals of opinion are few, and they are, with some exceptions, insipid and dull."[3] Of the two linguistic streams into which social and political discussion was divided, however, "the French is more lively in its social criticism and thus comes nearer to creating an original school of social thought. This is explicable by the more rapid and exciting changes which have been taking place in French-Canadian society; and to a lesser extent, perhaps, by the influence of French intellectuals, themselves more deeply committed to distinctive ideologies than are intellectuals in Britain or the United States."[4]

In the nearly two decades since Bottomore wrote, the partial recovery of the past of Canadian and Quebec social theory, along with the maturation of the university system and the emergence of new currents of social movement, have largely falsified his somewhat premature diagnosis. English language social theory and criticism has flourished in a manner which has narrowed the distance between these two traditions, even if this has rarely been accompanied by collaboration or mutual exploration. Yet a number of brief discussions have attempted to compare these two traditions. What is more striking about such efforts, however, is their incapacity to move beyond a superficial understanding of how and why the francophone tradition *is* different. If we take, for example, the fairly well studied case of the discipline of sociology, it becomes apparent that the "otherness" of the francophone tradition cannot be easily penetrated by the categories of the mainstream anglophone sociologist. As a consequence, assessments remain at a very general and formal level, limited by the need to analyze francophone work in terms of many of the very assumptions and concepts which the latter challenges. As the anglophone sociologist Harry Hiller has put it, summarizing this comparative literature: "The strong need for a sense of history and collective self-understanding within Quebec provide a specific *raison d'être* for francophone sociology that differentiated it sharply from ... anglophone sociology."[5] But what then are the implications and

consequences of this historical difference? Hiller's otherwise illuminating response reflects the chronic difficulty of moving beyond vague generalities, noting that "concern for the perpetuation of Québec society continued to encourage a more macro-sociological perspective in francophone sociology which resulted in less emphasis being placed on the individual. Such an approach was also much more historical and interdisciplinary and at considerable odds in basic perspective with the dominant American model of presentist, quantitative, and micro-sociology."[6]

Though not strictly speaking false, this type of formulation does not get us very far in understanding what the defining traits of Quebec sociology really are. For example, what is more strategic than the concern with macrosociology *per se* is that Quebec is considered as a dependent "nation" and a potential nation-state. Further, the more important issue is not that it places less emphasis on the individual, so much as concerned with the collective circumstances which inhibit or encourage particular forms of individual development. And it is more historical not simply because of some nostalgic concern about the past, but as part of a desire — both defensive and reformist — to shape the process of future developments. All of these crucial qualifications are glossed over by forms of comparison which focus on explanatory variables or the cliches of micro- vs macro-analysis. In contrast to most anglophone sociology, the point of departure of most francophone research is an anti-positivist, anti-naturalistic epistemology of the human sciences which in turn legitimates a normatively, i.e. value-oriented form of social research which gives priority to the goals of individual and collective emancipation from the constraints of existing social relations. Furthermore, in the context of a dependent society this also inevitably gives the sociology of knowledge, ideology, culture and science a strategic place.

The Case of Rioux

Rather than pursue such general comparisons, the task of the present essay is to use the case of Quebec sociologist, ethnographer and social critic Marcel Rioux as a means for a more in-depth exploration of some of the differentiating characteristics of francophone social research, especially in relation to the theme of the Quebec discourse on science, technology and modernization. To be sure, his work cannot be identified with sociological or anthropological research in Quebec as a whole. On his left flank, for example, is a tradition of more recent work of more specifically neo-Marxist inspiration which tends to consider his version of "critical sociology" idealistic, having lost its grounding in class analysis by overemphasizing culture and national specificity. On his mainstream right, on the other hand, is

much work which resembles social science done in the rest of Canada, even if most of it is more or less identified with and directed toward the policy goals of the national project envisioned by the Parti Québécois. But Rioux's work and example has been indirectly influential for the past three decades and is broadly representative of the spirit dominating Quebec sociology.[7] It must be stressed as well that there is no comparable figure in the senior generation of anglophone social scientists, either with respect to the content of his work *or* his public presence as one of the leading intellectuals supporting the independence movement from the mid-1960's onward.

Even if one is primarily concerned with social theory rather than biography, the two cannot be fully separated in coming to terms with Rioux's work. Many of its characteristics — especially its diversity of forms, relatively unsystematic character, and continuously shifting if unified concerns — can only be meaningfully interpreted and assessed in relation to his career trajectory and shifting relationship to academic and political life in Quebec.[8]

Born in 1919 in a village near Trois-Pistoles in the Gaspé peninsula, Rioux's early career follows the typical pattern of upward mobility found in the intellectual generation which founded the Quiet Revolution. His rural background, however, gave him a much more intimate relationship with traditional Quebec than most of the offspring of the urban middle and working classes. Equally significant was his early break with aspects of these conservative traditions — almost alone in his intellectual generation he considered himself both an atheist and socialist — coupled with a powerful attachment to the communities and popular culture in which these traditions were embedded. This break was always muted, however, by a temperamentally based avoidance of unnecessary conflict. As he puts it, "I do not have the temperament of my ideology nor the ideology of my temperament."[9] One of the consequences has been a creative tension between political engagement and intellectual distance which has saved him from the dogmatism of some of his younger allies and preserved his links with the international social theoretical community.

The maturation of Rioux's work and self-understanding has largely paralleled and grown out of the simultaneous maturation of Quebec. One of the dominant motifs of his biography is thus incessant change, a series of discontinuities linked to geographic displacements and points of transition in Quebec politics. The first two discontinuities date back to the thirties with an early separation from his family to go away to school and his rejection of the Church. A third phase was marked by his spiritual exile within Quebec as a radical intellectual within a backward society — the Duplessis era. It was during this period, which coincided initially with his university studies from 1939 through 1948 — interrupted by work in

Ottawa for the government during the war — that he established a very successful career as an ethnographer of rural Quebec. After a brief stint studying philosophy with the Dominicans in Ottawa, and then commerce in Montréal, he finished up an undergraduate degree in philosophy. But the crucial influence during this period of the second World War was contact in Ottawa with the well-known anthropologist Marius Barbeau. After the war Rioux then spent two years in Paris, assimilating the French traditions of sociology and anthropology directly and developing a number of important contacts, including a friendship with Pierre Trudeau which lasted through the mid-1960's. Indeed, it was Trudeau who early chided Rioux for his lack of political engagement, inscribing in Rioux's copy of the *Asbestos Strike* a plea that his friend might finally be transformed into a political animal.[10] And despite his political differences, Rioux did increasingly collaborate with *Cité Libre* toward the end of the 1950's. A fourth break came, however, at the beginning of the 1960's with the election of the Liberals in Quebec and his own appointment to a position in sociology at the Université de Montréal (after years of clerical opposition). This stage eventually culminated in his move toward an independentist position following a brief flirtation with the NDP and a labour-based socialist movement. A fifth break came with his attempt to come to terms with Marx and the Marxist tradition, a confrontation which took the form of a deepening critique of historical materialism and the outline of his own critical sociology in the late 1970's.

It would be beyond the scope of this article to trace the various stages of Rioux's intellectual career and provide a critical review of the writings of each period.[11] But it is important to stress that one of the distinctive characteristics of his corpus — and one which differentiates him from the more specialized and strictly professional orientation of his anglophone contemporaries — is the range of types of publication, an expression of both his wide-ranging interests, as well as his political engagements and participation in a smaller, less highly differentiated academic milieu. In Quebec the university is much less isolated from public life and the media; the roles of scholar and social critic are thus much easier to develop in tandem. This diversity is evident in the at least five different genre of publications which have characterized Rioux's intellectual itinerary:

- the ethnographic studies which reflected his early anthropological training, work in the National Museum of Canada in Ottawa from 1947 to 1958 and numerous lengthy field trips in rural Quebec;[12]
- the political essays of popular and journalistic character which, beginning in the early 1950's, signalled his gradual politicization and engagement in Quebec politics which continues to the present;[13]
- the historical-cultural syntheses of the development of Quebec society

which have provided widely-read and influential interpretations of Quebec dependence and contributed directly to the legitimation of the independence movement;[14]

- consultative work on various public commissions and committees, but most importantly his chairmanship of a provincial report on the teaching of the arts and a later unofficial tribunal protesting against cultural policy under the Bourassa regime;[15]
- and finally, the essays on social and cultural theory proper which emerged in the later part of the 1970's in response to his own reception and critique of neo-Marxist theory and the elaboration of his own conception of critical sociology and its relation to the transformation of Quebec.[16]

The task of the present discussion will be to draw selectively on Rioux's diverse writings to outline his unique contribution to the Canadian discourse on science and technology. It should be noted at the outset, however, that the themes of science and technology have not been a central, specialist concern of Rioux (unlike some of his former students or others influenced by him). Rather his primary concern has been the development of a critical sociology within which the questions of cultural creation and rupture play central role. But within this framework, there is a very definite conception of the way in which science and technology should be controlled for human purposes in relation to specific collective projects.

In order to draw out the implications of his analysis, the following discussion will first attempt to isolate the negative thrust of his argument, i.e. to situate it in relation to the "modernization" debate within Quebec politics and social theory. Here it will be necessary to see how his emerging conception of critical sociology leads him to a critique of the liberal and social democratic models of economic and cultural development which culminates in an increasingly critical relation to Marx and the Marxist tradition. Second, it will be necessary to sketch some of the elements of his alternative analysis of the relationship between science, technology and cultural development in postindustrial societies, especially Quebec. In this connection the concepts of "emancipatory practices" and "autogestion" (self-management) will be considered in relation to overcoming the "deterritorialization" of technology and culture.

II. The Critique of the Quebec Discourse on Science and Technology

The Modernization Debate

The discourse within modern Quebec on science and technology forms initially around the problematic of culture and its relation to modernization and thus must be situated in the context of the history of ideologies in

Quebec.[17] The most obvious way is to refer to Rioux's own typology, a schema which has, with various qualifications and refinements, guided subsequent left-nationalist scholarship. The first stage of "conservation" manifested an antagonistic, if not always outright reactionary, response of a traditional religiously dominated culture menaced by destruction.[18] Though largely an elite phenomenon, this rejection of modernity through the 19th- and far into the 20th-century did, however, express a popular desire to preserve the ethos of francophone culture. The related scientific and technical backwardness crippled the church-controlled francophone higher educational system through the 1950's. In any case the dominant defensive reaction did create a touchstone for all future intellectual developments and sets Quebec aside from the rest of Canada. Most importantly, the previous dominance of the ideology of conservation created a discursive context in which science and technology could never be separated from their cultural implications or the politics of state intervention. However much later generations might revolt against the mentality of a 19th century clergy intent upon protecting its parish from the moral corruptions of urbanization, proletarianization and Anglo-American civilization, they could not fully rid themselves of a critical attitude toward some of the exaggerated claims of liberalism, secularization and individualism.

Given this past, francophone Quebec's ambivalent attitude toward science and technology is expressed in contradictory ways. The dominant effect has been a dependent mentality reflected in a lack of self-confidence before the accomplishments of science in Europe and the United States. As well there are often signs of anxiety in attempting to imitate such models under conditions where this is linked to abandonment of the cultural specificity of Quebec. But there remains a pervasive aspiration for 'world class' technical achievements, especially where they do not involve direct subservience to outsiders. Perhaps the most vital symbol of such possibilities — and one which remains a central component of the restoration of the political fortunes of Robert Bourassa — has been the James Bay hydroelectric project.

This ambivalence of the progressive, modernizing groups toward classic laissez-faire liberalism *à l'americaine* is evident in the intellectual generation which created the second stage of ideological development referred to as the Quiet Revolution. Rooted in the 1930's, the ideology of contestation and *rattrapage* ("catching up") finally gained power with the victory of the Liberals in the 1960 provincial election. But from the outset internal differences emerged around how to respond to the contradictory relationship between modernization and cultural development. On the one hand, modernization could be achieved by simply opening up Quebec to the

outside world, allowing the free penetration of international and pan-Canadian market forces in economic and cultural life. Yet this necessarily risked the gradual erosion of Quebec language and culture and the restricted mobility of those whose mother tongue was French. On the other hand, the obvious alternative was that modernization could be guided by a strong, centralized provincial state oriented toward bringing about modernization on Quebec's terms, i.e. without paying the price of assimilation. Yet this latter strategy inevitably culminated in a confrontation with the system of Canadian federalism and brought to the fore internal splits within the Liberal Party which continue between the federal and Quebec parties to this day. But the most frustrated moved in another direction — toward the various groups which eventually formed the Parti Québécois.

The third phase of ideological development — that of participation and development — emerged in the 1960's with the deepening split within the generation which had created the Quiet Revolution. Most decisively, the wing which opted for some version of social democratic nationalism captured the most dynamic members of the younger generation coming of age in the late 60's and early 1970's, and culminating in the victory of the PQ in 1976. In the process the liberal strategy of *rattrapage* was attacked for both initiating a process of dependent development vis-à-vis external powers *and* failing to address the problems of participation required for a politics of redistribution and decentralization. Above all, it was argued, the goal of modernization could neither be fully realized under the conditions of confederation nor without the ultimate loss of Quebec's national identity.

It is in this latter context that Rioux and others (e.g. Fernand Dumont) addressed the problematic of science and technology. Three basic assumptions have tended to guide research and policy formulation despite differences of detail and emphasis: first, that the evident inferiority of francophone Quebec in science and technology were closely related to Quebec's dependent relationship within Canadian federation; second, that this situation could only be overcome by a national science and technology policy — *un virage technologique* — constructed by a politically autonomous Quebec state;[19] and third, that such a policy of research and development should be coordinated with forms of participation and self-management necessary to ensure that the resulting economic development be compatible with social and cultural needs. Obviously, advocacy of this line of argument ran headlong against some of the most fundamental assumptions and strategies which have long dominated Canadian economic and science policy. Moreover, the third argument eventually became the source of significant divisions within the nationalist left and the PQ itself.[20]

The Critique of Liberalism and Social Democracy

The onset of the 1960's marked a crucial turning point in Rioux's career and intellectual development. The two decisive events were the victory of the Liberal Party in Quebec and his own appointment to the department of sociology at the Université de Montréal. The first signalled the end of his tactical alliance with the reformist *Cité libre* group; it also marked the first step of cooling personal relations with Trudeau, culminating in his public declaration of support for the Quebec independance movement in 1964. At first Rioux had tried to develop his socialist political sympathies in relation to the CCF and later the NDP. But by 1963 the Quebec wing of the NDP split over questions of both economic policy and the status of Quebec, at which point he lost faith in the pan-Canadian socialist movement and left the party with a dissident francophone group. His university appointment, on the other hand, provided an institutional setting for defending and developing his political stance through the elaboration of a theoretical foundation for responding to and passing beyond the two most important challenges on the political horizon: the federalist liberalism which soon came to power under Trudeau and the form of social democracy advocated by the NDP.[21]

Despite a strong sympathy for the social policies of the NDP and its interventionist stance with respect to the economy, Rioux was convinced — on the basis of the experience of the early sixties — that the NDP could not come to terms with the special status of Quebec. Accordingly, from the perspective of the emerging nationalist forces in Quebec, the federalism of the NDP, and its conception of a centrally coordinated strategy of industrial development, was indistinguishable from that of the Liberal Party. This fact ensured the demise of the NDP as a political force within Quebec and called into question the underlying theoretical assumptions of its analysis of advanced capitalism. In effect the fundamental differences between the forces represented by what eventually coalesced in the PQ and the federalist position of the three national parties revolved around two fundamental issues: first, the priority of the values to be protected and encouraged by the state and, second, the analytical assumptions regarding the conditions under which such values might be preserved or enhanced. As a consequence value-judgments and empirical questions were mingled in a manner typical of charged ideological confrontations. The essential normative principle of the federalist position was the primacy of Canadian unity and the analytical assumption that the language and culture of Quebec, as well as its economic development, could be best preserved within Canadian confederation. Opponents of this position, on the other hand, rejected both the primacy of Canadian unity (or at least in the given form in the case of those who

advocated a dual nation concept) *and* the assumption that it was possible to separate cultural policy from economic and political autonomy. Hence it was argued that whatever residual value that a relation with Canada might have could be preserved on the basis of "sovereignty-association"; moreover, only on the basis of political and economic autonomy could Quebec potentially create a qualitatively different kind of society — a theme of central importance for Rioux and those on the left wing of the nationalist movement.

From the early 1960's onward Rioux's intellectual and research projects were unified by the desire to develop the social scientific and theoretical foundations of the left-nationalism of the independence movement. Indeed, it could be argued that the specificity of francophone social theory and research in Quebec derives most fundamentally from a preference for theoretical paradigms which support or illuminate the proposition that the cultural cannot be separated from the economic and political arrangements of society in the manner suggested by federalist policies. This schism thus quickly led the discussion of these issues in a very different direction than either Trudeau's liberalism or the social democracy of the NDP: a return to Marx. And it is worth recalling the Rioux is credited with teaching the first course on Marx in Quebec in 1961.

One of the primary sources of the influence of neo-Marxist discussions in Quebec from the early 1960's onward — aside from similar developments in France — was that this tradition provided an analytical framework which stressed the inter-penetration of the cultural, economic and political, despite considerable disagreement about the exact nature of those relations. This, coupled with the desire to construct a more egalitarian and just society, is the basis of Rioux's long flirtation with the Marxist tradition and his willingness — when pressed — to profess a form of "cultural Marxism." But as we shall see in a moment, this relationship to the Marxist tradition became an increasingly ambivalent one which eventually pushed Rioux's thinking in directions that often ran against the mainstream of Marxist thinking.

The central theoretical basis of Rioux's position, and which underlies his re-interpretations of Quebec development in the *Question of Quebec* and *Les Québécois*, is the concept of "dependency." Though this concept might be said to have its broader origins in the Marxian understanding of power relations and their economic bases, the theory of cultural dependency was developed in relation to total societies or regions rather than class relations and economic structure exclusively. Not surprisingly, the most influential early formulations of this approach, such as those of Franz Fanon, had their origins in Third World, post-colonial societies confronted with a collective project of national reconstruction. The task which Rioux and others were confronted with, however, was that of adapting such concepts to a relatively

advanced "society" such as Quebec which was at the same time also juridically and economically a region within a liberal democratic federal state. Accordingly, the "national liberation" rhetoric of the 1960's gave way in the following decade to a more sober assessment of the nature of and prospects for overcoming the economic and cultural dependency of Quebec.

For Rioux this entailed weaving together in a somewhat eclectic fashion a number of sociological arguments which attempted to legitimate the national aspirations of francophone Quebec. At this point — from the mid-sixties through the early seventies — there was little evidence of concern with how the resulting position was incompatible with some of the basic assumptions of Marxist theory. Rather, he took as his point of departure the various dissident forces emerging in Quebec, attempting to give them a theoretical interpretation. Four major themes unified his various analyses. First, the thesis of an "ethnic-class" argued that under particular historical circumstances, such s that of francophone Quebec, a history of domination and exploitation could allow an ethnic minority to act much like a class — a point following from dependency theory.[22] Second, in his typology of the succession of ideologies already referred to, he suggested that the movement from ideologies of conservation through contestation and *rattrapage*, and finally the transcendence embodied in the emerging principles of participation and development pointed to the unique dynamic potential of Quebec which set it apart from the rest of North America. Indeed, he even went so far as to invoke the thesis of the relative advantage of backwardness. In the transition from an industrial to a postindustrial society, Quebec potentially had certain advantages deriving from not having been fully transformed by the industrial revolution. On the one hand, backwardness and a history of conquest created forms of conflict which could precipitate political change; and on the other, the preservation of certain types of pre-industrial values and modes of cooperation created the basis for quicker adaptation to the requirements of the emerging post-industrial society. A third theme was the valorization of youth in this process of transition and the way in which the youth of Quebec were especially dynamic.[23] A fourth theme which emerged — and one which will be treated in more detail in the final section — is that of cultural development and the primacy of cultural "ruptures" at points of fundamental social transition. For Rioux, the challenge of transforming Quebec was more than a question of appropriating the forces of production, of handing over the organization of technology and economic activity from one elite to another. By itself that could not insure the survival of Quebec culture, let alone bring forth a new form of society because the crisis of advanced industrial societies is not simply economic, but more fundamentally cultural: "The conquests of technique of which we are justifiably proud

could have been realized only at the price of a systematic dissociation between the spontaneous and symbolic knowledge which gives meaning to the world for man."[24]

Confrontation With the Marxist Tradition

By the early 1970's the movement of Rioux's own thinking coupled with the maturation of neo-Marxist discussions within Quebec, created a situation in which the tensions within his own position required a re-examination of his relation to Marx. Initially, his criticisms of "Marxism" could be written off as failings of his latter day interpreters rather than those of Marx himself. But the experience of Quebec, along with his awareness of internal critiques of Marx associated with the notion of "critical theory", led Rioux toward a more systematic reconsideration of the relation between his own "critical sociology" and the Marxist tradition in a volume titled *Essai de sociologie critique*.[25] This text was also of strategic importance given that an extensive and increasingly sophisticated literature had emerged in Quebec attacking precisely the form of left-nationalism represented by Rioux, even if he was rarely referred to by name. From a more traditional neo-Marxist position nationalism could at best be a strategic device employed by the working class in its international struggle. From this perspective, nationalism inevitably entailed a compromise with the indigenous "national" bourgeoisie and undermined the efforts of a specifically working class based process of mobilization.[26]

In the present context it is possible only to allude to the arguments of the resulting dense but rich theoretical exploration found in Rioux's *Essai de sociologie critique*. The point of departure is a qualified identification with the form of a critical theory of society defended in the epistemological writings of the Western German theorist Jürgen Habermas. In thus taking a position against a scientistic interpretation of Marxism — especially the form of structuralism represented by Louis Althusser — Rioux was confronted with elaborating the implications of the concept of praxis. This required a critical sociology which would go beyond the contemplative stance of critical theory and hence could deal with the cultural and social psychological bases of those "emancipatory practices" which alone could both anticipate and carry through fundamental social change in the context of advanced societies. At the same time, in criticizing the theory of postindustrial society represented by the conservative American sociologist Daniel Bell, Rioux also sought to come to terms with the implications of the emergence of a new form of capitalist society, especially in relation to the case of Quebec. In order to convey a full sense of the implications of this type

of discussion, it is necessary to turn to what is in effect the positive thrust of Rioux's critical sociology as an alternative to either liberalism or social democracy, on the one hand, or neo-Marxism on the other.

III. *Autogestion* and Emancipatory Practices

The Tasks of a Critical Sociology

The intentions and objectives of Rioux's critical sociology cannot be adequately grasped or assessed unless it is realized that its primary objective is not "explanatory", i.e. concerned primarily with extending the analysis of the various determinants of given and past forms of society. Following the epistemology of Habermas, he argues that three knowledge interests guide social research: the empirical-analytical explanation of the causes of social phenomena, the hermeneutic interpretation of the meanings which define different cultures and modes of existence, and the critical-emancipatory concern with overcoming the given forms of domination. Not that Rioux is indifferent to either historical determinations or cultural interpretation, but these shape the background rather than the foreground of his most recent work. His concern is rather with "praxis," with those forms of action, thought and expression which alone create the possibility of qualitative change within the existing form of society. In this respect his work can be situated in the trajectory of contemporary European critical theory and related Anglo-American developments; but his location in Quebec and close relationship to a dynamic social movement has given his version of critical sociology a unique form.[27]

Postindustrial Society and De-Territorialized Technology

At least three basic types of postindustrial society theory can be identified and need to be differentiated. The most simplistic and well-known variety, propagated by the prophets of automation, technological progress and the information revolution, suggests an optimistic scenario of continuous, unproblematic advance. The futurology of people like Herman Kahn and for the most part Alvin Toffler could be located here. A second, much more pessimistic version has been elaborated by Daniel Bell who stresses the cultural contradictions stemming from the absence of a unifying moral and cultural tradition to contain the disjunction between technological rationalization and unbridled pursuit of individual gratification. A third variety can be identified in the work of people such as Alain Touraine, Rioux and others who bypass this optimistic-pessimistic polarization. The emergence of a period of transition is seen as an opportunity, but its outcome will depend upon an unpredictable conjuncture of forces and the capacity of societies to

mobilize new forms of consciousness. But at a minimum this context calls into question the crucial assumption upon which the Marxist theory of revolution was based, i.e. the world-historical mission of the proletariat as the class to abolish all classes. At the same time, however, it also creates new possibilities for change, new sites for action which may have already emerged but have not necessarily found a theoretical interpretation. As against the first two types of postindustrial society theory, moreover, the continuity with the past forms of capitalism is not forgotten.

For Rioux this continuity is best understood through the concept of alienation. The distinctive feature of capitalism, he argues, is not domination and exploitation per se because they have always existed. Nor is this alienation to be identified exclusively with private property or the system of economic relations in the narrow sense. Indeed it is over the question of how to interpret alienation that neo-Marxism and critical theory part ways. The former is based on the political economy culminating in *Capital* and stresses the theory of surplus value and the resulting exploitation of alienated labour. Critical theory, on the other hand, views alienation as *prior to* private property in the sense that it arises with a new type of society which renders the economic process (and hence technological development) autonomous.[28] In the early phase of capitalist development, of course, this autonomy was organized by the expansion of the market system. In the more recent form of advanced capitalism, however, the state has modified and restricted to some extent the market system, but primarily in the interest of ensuring the autonomous expansion of technology constrained by unregulated capitalist development. The concept of alienation found in critical theory, in other words, becomes the basis for a critique of technology, as well as some of the novel features of postindustrial societies.

What is in question here, of course, is a variant of the thesis of instrumental rationalization found in the work of Herbert Marcuse, a link which Rioux acknowledges. From this perspective technology cannot be considered "neutral" even if science can make a better claim in this regard: "As long as scientific research is almost purely speculative, a matter of theory, it can easily pretent to neutrality and objectivity; but the moment it is applied, it becomes part of the apportioning of power and the exercise of social control."[29] Technology cannot be considered in isolation, in itself, because it always appears in the context of a particular economic and political system: "clearly one cannot have capitalist economics without capitalist technique, and vice-versa."[30] This type of analysis thus becomes the foundation of a critique of postindustrial societies in several ways. First, it provides the basis for recognizing that the "imperatives" of technology are closely linked to the needs and interests of the economic process which controls their development and application. Second, it facilitates under-

standing how cultural domination has become the highest stage of imperialism by creating a symbolic canopy for bringing all societies under the yoke of these presumed technological imperatives. Third, it helps explain why alienation persists despite the obvious gains stemming from increased affluence, the welfare state and labour legislation. Even if direct exploitation has been dramatically reduced, the standard of living improved and the welfare state has softened the impact of capitalist industrialization — facts which have undermined classic Marxist politics in advanced societies, this has not altered the basic condition of capitalist alienation in Rioux's sense. The various components of society are still coerced to adapt to the assumed imperatives of technological and economic development, irrespective of the ultimate consequences for human needs and desires or the technological alternatives and social forms which might be constructed.

This strategy of analysis also allows linking the theory of alienation with that of dependency and nationalism. Accordingly, Rioux stresses how the autonomization of technology and the economic culminates in a "de-territorialization" of technology and culture.[31] In the name of the universality of technology and the logic of comparative advantage, economic development proceeds in a manner that systematically deprives communities, regions and nations of the political means and cultural autonomy necessary to control their own fate. The most obvious form of this process is the dependent economic development of Canada and Quebec and the resulting impoverishment of research and development capacities. A more subtle version of this can be found in the expansion of the new information technology and the dominance of American cultural industries which promote "universal" knowledge and entertainment values at the expense of the logical, the particular, the traditional: activities rooted in popular culture and everyday life which cannot be directly harnessed to the process of accumulation.

The Problem of Transition

But what is to be done? From Rioux's perspective the point of departure is to recognize that the classic Marxist problematic of "transition" should not be defined simply in terms of changing the mode of production, of instituting one set of property relations for another. Within the classic Marxist schema the concepts of transition and possible consciousness referred to a strategy for the seizure of political power which would in turn lead to the formation of a new mode of production. In this essentially Leninist framework, the task of theory was to guide a party avant-garde which possessed the maximum possible consciousness, hence adequate to the task of guiding the work of history. Furthermore, this conception is built on the assumption of the neutrality of technology which, it is assumed, can be directly borrowed and re-organized through the apparatus of the new

dictatorship of the proletariat. The consequences of this position, the resulting bureaucratic collectivism, are all too familiar. Though Western neo-Marxists are sensitive to the problems of bureaucratization, they have not succeeded in providing any theoretical response to bypassing these problems, aside from less than fully credible assurances that they could be overcome through a more democratic working class party organization.

Rioux's response to the problematic of transition is fundamentally different: "Historically, Marx's critical perspective was aimed first at the appropriation of nature and the development of productive forces. We are increasingly aware today that the other aspect — man's appropriation of his own nature — must be promoted."[32] Given that the goal in this context must be that of a self-managing society (*une sociéte autogestionnaire*) if socialism is to have any justifiable meaning, this cannot be achieved by simply gaining political power and imposing change from above. To the extent that any qualitative transformation is possible and shifts in political power be translated into meaningful reforms, they must be embedded in pre-existing changes, in "emancipatory practices" which pave the way for new forms of social relations and ways of organizing production and distribution. To facilitate this process suggests for Rioux the importance of a research strategy oriented toward identifying and assessing such practices — the forms of innovative praxis which are harbingers of fundamental "ruptures" in advanced capitalist societies. And of course the independence movement in Quebec is one of the most important expressions of such rupture and has its analogue in the academic milieu in the journal *Possibles* founded by Rioux and others in 1976.[33]

IV. Utopia Against All Odds?

Perhaps the most striking and distinctive feature of Rioux's intellectual project in relation to the discourse on science and technology in English Canada is his refusal to cower before the imperatives of "reality", of the given, however much he may be aware of the existing sources of power and domination.[34] Accordingly, while implicitly accepting the general argument of the critique of technology and American empire developed by George Grant, for example, for Rioux this does not culminate in the whimper of a "lament for a nation" but the passionate rage of daring to continue dreaming of one. However one may assess such utopian defiance, it must be conceded that it represents one of the few dynamic forces in contemporary Canadian politics, has shaped a distinctive tradition of social theory and research, and has inspired — and will continue to inspire — many of the most talented and creative members of Quebec society, many of whom are of non-francophone origin.

But how should we go about assessing and criticizing a form of inquiry

like Rioux's critical sociology? Criticism from the perspective of the world view of an empiricist or positivist conception of sociology as a science would be beside the point and bypass his problematic altogether. The simplest response — from an external perspective — would to simply charge his social theory with romanticism, idealism, utopianism. On this point liberals, social democrats, neo-Marxists and Red Tory's might agree, even if they would formulate their response somewhat differently and with more or less sympathy. From within the perspective of critical theory itself, on the other hand, the problematic developed by Rioux could be readily accepted as the basis for rational discussion, but criticism would be directed at inconsistencies and gaps in argumentation, point to confirming or disconfirming empirical evidence, etc. Let us consider first what this latter kind of sympathetic critical analysis might take up and then conclude with the question of a general characterization of Rioux's critical social theory in relation to its utopianism and place within the Canadian tradition.

More or less consciously, Rioux is confronted with at least three fundamental ambiguities in relating his critical sociology to the Quebec independence movement: first, the difficulty of assessing or deciphering his relation to the PQ given the absence of any explicit theory of the state, parties and class; second, whether and under what conditions Quebec, as a peripheral community, could ever be a 'weak link' in the North American context; and third, the principles of mediation between the imperatives of economic modernization and those of self-management. Such issues may appear to be merely 'academic' in the mid-1980's; but social theories cannot be in any simple way falsified by short-run turns of historical events and there may be more to be learned from side-tracked social movements than meets the skeptical eye.

As Rioux has often noted, his greatest reserve with respect to the PQ is not so much its support of the indigenous Quebec bourgeoisie as its failure to take into account that the more fundamental sources of Quebec dependence — both economic and cultural — stem from south of the border.[35] For the most part English Canada is simply the middleman for this process; and dealing with IBM directly would do little to change this political economic fact. Indeed, greater political autonomy could even result in greater vulnerability and result in even more accommodating stances with respect to foreign capital. His relative silence on many other issues beyond that of the dependency thesis, on the other hand, has peculiar implications. His silence with respect to a theory of the state, class, and party — at least beyond the strained argument of the ethnic-class hypothesis — reveals a massive gap at the centre of his effort to justify and facilitate the realization of Quebec autonomy. By not addressing the question of whether there is any alternative to traditional political economy and its theory of the state, class, and

parties, he cannot respond to the charge that the failure of the PQ reconfirms a structuralist Marxist position. But clearly Rioux's critical sociology implies such an alternative theory and remains incomplete without it.

With respect to the second question, Rioux has long entertained a version of Trotsky's thesis that relative backwardness created the potential for skipping stages of development and hence outpacing initially more advanced societies. More specifically, he has tentatively defended the thesis that under the appropriate circumstances more fundamental change might occur first in the periphery as opposed to the centre. In the early 1970's he vigorously defended this possibility in relation to Quebec in an interview with a very skeptical Herbert Marcuse and as late as the early 1980's repeated it in debate with an equally skeptical Immanuel Wallerstein; but more recently he has written of Quebec rapidly running out of time.[36] But curiously this question has not been addressed in the theoretical depth that it deserves; nor has it been adequately posed in relation to the question of changes in the rest of Canada, though this theme is touched upon in *Two Nations*. At least two major issues are at stake here. First, could this thesis be reformulated envisioning something less than a revolutionary model echoing the imagery of anti-colonial movements? And second, what are the implications of the fact that Quebec shares its peripheral situation with English Canada? On what grounds can it automatically be assumed that Quebec's double dependence — on both the United States and Canada — constitutes an advantage? Double dependence also creates a double vulnerability. Can this difficulty be traced back to Marx's theory of alienation and its problematic assumption that absolute deprivation provides the subjective basis of dialectical transcendence? Whereas Rioux's theory of emancipatory practices and emphasis on desire as opposed to need questions an immiseration thesis of revolutionary change, his theory of dependency ultimately remains bound to it.

The third question goes to the heart of internal tension within Rioux's critical sociology and its relation to the PQ, a tension shared with the *autogestion* and anarchist traditions generally. In Quebec promises of economic modernization and greater affluence have been among the most important planks of the independence movement. And yet it is also no accident that this was one of the most difficult claims to make credible to the referendum voters of 1980. Neither sovereignty nor greater self-management could be linked with immediate or short-run gains in overall efficiency, competitiveness, profitability, research and development, and wages. The contribution of prospective independence to this fear, even in the form of sovereignty-association, is evident enough: real threats of economic blackmail by English Canada and foreign capital, the flight of technical personnel and head offices, problems of transition, etc. The

technocratic wing of the PQ, to be sure, had plausible responses to all of these transitional problems, but was reluctant to openly admit short-term sacrifices were required for long-term material gains. As is obvious, however, this was scarcely a proposition which could gain majority support in electoral politics.

The underlying dilemma is that participatory national planning of the type envisioned by the PQ requires a form of democratic public which does not yet exist — anywhere. Even more intractable are the issues posed by the enhancement of self-management of the type advocated by the *autogestion* wing of the PQ. In fact, to some extent it even works at cross-purposes with the form of modernization which might follow from a successful national *virage technologique*. Even if one follows Rioux in rejecting the claim of Max Weber and others regarding the absolute constraints of instrumental rationality, it is rather a more difficult task to construct the political processes and cultural pre-requisites which could practically facilitate the reconciliation of instrumental and substantial rationalization, of technology and human purposes. Certainly, the concept of emancipatory practices and the research task of studying them ethnographically is an important step forward; yet this needs to be complemented by a more rigorous conceptualization of how these practices can be coupled with modernization in the context of international economic interdependence. Closely related to this is the failure to connect the principle of a self-managing society with a theory of the state. One of the paradoxical effects of self-management is the fragmenting of interests of the various groups given autonomy; this was the case, for example, of the 'self-managing' public unions confronting the PQ government. Does the state represent the only mediating principle for reconciling particular interests with those of society as a whole? And if so, can this result in anything more than the reproduction of the given form of society?[37]

Finally, locating Rioux within the spectrum of ideological and social theoretical labels is ostensibly an easy task at first glance — terms like 'utopian', 'romantic', and 'anarchist' quickly come to mind. But these terms are deceptive to the extent that their European origins distract us from the specific manifestations in the New World and their relation to the Canadian and Quebec imaginations. Above all it is important to stress the way in which Rioux's critical social theory — itself an expression of the movement it would legitimate — runs against the literary and cultural traditions which have dominated both English Canada and Quebec. Gaile McGregor has brilliantly characterized the latter in her *Wacousta Syndrome* by contrasting the 'western frontier' of the American imagination and the 'northern frontier' of the Canadian:

> A western frontier, depending on one's perspective, is *the limit of knowledge* or the *limit of control* ... that may not only be transcended but actually redefined — moved, advanced, or even eradicated — by human effort ... A northern frontier, in contrast, denotes the *limits of endurance*. It is, in brief, an intangible but ineradicable line between the 'self' and the 'other', between what is and is not humanly possible.[38]

Rioux's unique anarchism like his cultural Marxism is rooted in a rebellion against that sense of powerlessness rooted in living on the 'northern' frontier and the impossibility of embracing the technocratic optimism of either 'conquering' the west or 'smashing' the bourgeois state. The existential dimensions of Rioux's anarchist tendencies are more apparent perhaps in his personal life than his writings, but can be traced back to his immersion in the literature of French existentialism in the 1950's. And it reappears again in his most recent study, *Le Besoin et le désire*, which explicitly begins with the injunction that existential questions must be raised in social science; hence he rejects compartmentalizing humans as creatures of need at one point and desire another and concludes that 'autogestion is before everything else and above all a cultural revolution.'[39] And it is precisely such forms of cultural rupture which he claims to have found in Quebec and which alone can create the foundations for the technological and economic choices necessary for a qualitatively different kind of society. If the 'northern' frontier is not assimilated into the 'western' à la Bourassa, what *is* the alternative? More than any other social theorist in Canada, Marcel Rioux has dared to explore the logic of possibilities, to decode theoretically the potential of emancipatory practices which reveal emergent forms of resistance within the Canadian tradition.

Sociology
University of Alberta

Notes

1. This is a revised version of a paper presented at the "Canadian Theory Workshop", Peter Robinson College, Trent University, Peterborough, Ont. (June 1983). I would like to thank Danny Drache and Greg Nielsen for helpful comments on the original draft.

2. The theme of the rational and scientific side of what is often referred to as ideology as been developed most persuasively by the late American sociologist Alvin Gouldner in his *Dialectic of Ideology and Technology* (New York: Seabury, 1976). Though all social theory certainly has ideological dimensions, it is constructed in the context of commitments to a scientific research programme; its potential transformation into an action-oriented party platform or movement involves the construction of a mobilizing ideology in the more restrictive and often pejorative

sense. For that reason it is misleading to confuse a normatively grounded social theory with ideology in the narrow sense.

3. Tom Bottomore, *Critics of Society*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1969), pp. 121-2.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 122.
5. Harry H. Hiller, *Society and Change*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), p. 28.
6. *Ibid.*
7. As he expressed his relation to younger generations recently: "The thing which helps me to live is perhaps the fact that I am very ill at ease with people of my age ... My friends at the present time are all between 35 and 45 years old"; cited in Jules Duchastel, *Marcel Rioux: entre l'utopie et la raison*, (Montréal: Nouvelle Optique, 1981), p. 184.
8. The following biographical discussion is drawn primarily from Duchastel, *Marcel Rioux*.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 196-7.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 83; the original reads as follows: "A mon ami Marcel Rioux, anthropophage distingué, et camarade sans pareil, dans l'espoir que cette lecture le métamorphosera enfin en ZOONPOLITIA (N.D.R. en homme Politique). Pierre E.T., juin 1956".
11. Cf. however the forthcoming work by Raymond Morrow and Greg Nielsen, *Marcel Rioux*.
12. Two major monographs resulted from this research: *Description de la culture de l'Ile Verte* (Musée National du Canada, Ottawa, 1954) and *Belle-Anse* (Musée National du Canada, 1957); of the many papers published in this context, the following two might be singled out because of their ready accessibility: Marcel Rioux and Yves Martin, eds. *French-Canadian Society* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1964): "Remarks on the Socio-Cultural Development of French Canada", pp. 162-78 and "Kinship Recognition and Urbanization in French Canada", pp. 372-85.
13. These include newspaper articles, book introductions, lectures and contributions to various journals — *Cité libre* in the 1950's, several leftist and cultural reviews in the 1960's and most recently the nationalist *autogestion* journal of which he was a co-founder in 1976 (*Possibles*); also included here would be the tract lambasting the federal liberal position on the constitution: *Pour prendre publiquement congé de quelques salauds* (Montréal: l'Hexagone, 1981).
14. *Quebec in Question*, trans. J. Boake [Toronto: Lorimer, 1978 (originally published in French in 1969)] and *Les Québécois* (Paris: Seuil, 1974).
15. M. Rioux, Chairman, *Rapport de la Commission d'enquête des arts au Québec*, 3 vol. (Québec: Editeur officiel du Québec, 1969) and "Le Rapport du Tribunal de la Culture" in *Liberté*, no. 101, 1975, pp. 4-85.
16. Above all, see *Essaie de sociologie critique* (Montréal: Hurtubise HMH, 1978) and the volume written in collaboration with Susan Crean, *Deux pays pour vivre* (Montréal; Editions Albert Saint-Martin, 1980), now available in an updated and revised version (for an anglophone audience) by Crean, *Two Nations* (Toronto: Lorimer, 1983).
17. For a good treatment of the modernization theme, cf. Kenneth McRoberts and Dale Postgate, *Quebec: Social Change and Political Crisis*, rev. ed. (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1980).
18. Cf. Rioux, "Sur l'evolution des idéologies au Québec," *Revue de l'institut de sociologie*, vol. 1, 1968, pp. 95-124, reprinted in translation in J. Paul Grayson, ed. *Class, State, Ideology and Change* (Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980), pp. 205-20.
19. On the theme of dependency, cf. Marcel Fournier and Louis Maheu, "Nationalismes et nationalisation du champ scientifique québécois," *Sociologie et Sociétés*, vol. 7, nos. 2, 1975, pp. 119-31; on the history of science and technology in Quebec more generally, cf. Francine Descarries-Bélanger, Marcel Fournier and Louis Maheu, "Le frère Marie-Victorin et les 'petites sciences'", *Recherches Sociographiques*, vol. 20, no. 1, 1979, pp. 7-39 and Raymond Duchesne, *La Science et le pouvoir au Québec 1920-1965* (Québec: Editeur officiel du Québec, 1978).

20. On the post-1960 expansion of technocratic elites and their confrontation with demands for participation and self-management, cf. Jean-Jacques Simard, *La longue marche des technocrates* (Montréal: Editions Albert Saint-Martin, 1979) and Gilbert Renaud, *A l'ombre du rationalisme* (Montréal: Editions Albert Saint-Martin, 1984).

21. For the most influential formulations of liberalism and social democracy in this period, cf. respectively Pierre E. Trudeau, *Federalism and the French Canadians* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1977) and Michael Oliver, ed. *Social Purpose for Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961).

22. Cf. Jacques Dofny and Marcel Rioux, "Les classes sociales au Canada français," *Revue française de sociologie*, vol. 3, 1962, pp. 290-300 (reprinted in translation in Rioux and Martin, eds. *French-Canadian Society*, pp. 307-18).

23. Rioux, *Jeunesse et société contemporaine.* Leçon inaugurale (1965), Université de Montréal (Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1965).

24. *Rapport de la Commission d'enquête des arts au Québec*, vol. 1, p. 36. This thesis regarding the erosion of the primary culture of everyday life by the secondary culture of technical rationality was first introduced, as Rioux acknowledges, by Fernand Dumont in his *Le Lieu de l'homme* (Montréal; Hurtubise HMH, 1969). It should also be noted that in the most recent work of West German social theorist Jürgen Habermas this general theme has been explored in a much more intensive way under the rubric of the "colonization of the life world"; cf. *The Theory of Communicative Action*, vol. 2: *Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*, trans. T. McCarthy (Boston: Beacon Press, forthcoming).

25. Initially he had formulated his position in terms of confronting Weber and Marx, hence an "aseptic" and a "critical" sociology; cf. "Remarques sur la sociologie critique et la sociologie aseptique", *Sociologie et Sociétés*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1968, pp. 53-67.

26. On the theme of neo-Marxism vs. nationalism generally, cf. Nicole Laurin-Frenette, *Production de l'Etat et formes de la nation* (Montréal: Nouvelle Optique, 1978), Jacques Mascotto and Pierre-Yves Soucy, *Démocratie et nation* (Montréal: Editions Albert Saint-Martin, 1980) and Raymond Morrow, "*Deux pays pour vivre*: Critical Sociology and the New Canadian Political Economy," *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory*, vol. 6, no. 1-2, 1982, pp. 61-105.

27. Rioux's own formulation captures the distinctiveness of his position: "To the extent that critical theory was elaborated by nineteenth-century philosophers like Kant, Hegel, Feuerbach, and Marx, by philosophers of the Frankfurt School like Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, and Habermas, and in France by Sartre, Lefebvre, Goldmann, and Castoriadis, its influence has been significant. That is to say, some have held the belief that either the socio-historical factor could theorized from beginning to end (Hegel and Marx) or, like Kant, that it could not become a scientific subject — the noumenon versus the phenomenon. In either case, those who opted for one or other position, took little trouble to look into the social practices to discover what people were becoming. On the one hand, reason could foretell future events; on the other hand, social history was a practical field, a field of free-will. In either case such research seemed superfluous." ("Remarks on Emancipatory Practices and Industrial Societies in Crisis," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1984, p. 18.)

28. *Essai de sociologie critique*, p. 101.

29. *Two Nations*, pp. 104-5.

30. *Ibid.*, p. 107.

31. Cf. Rioux, "La culture 'déterritorialisée'", *Le Devoir*, 12 March 1982, p. 17 and *Two Nations*, p. 148. The term is borrowed from the French social theorist Pierre Rosanvallon.

32. "Remarks on Emancipatory Practices and Industrial Societies in Crisis," p. 4. Cf. also "Les possibles dans une période de transition," *Possibles*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1976, pp. 3-8.

33. *Possibles* attempts to serve as a kind of mediating link between the academic milieu and the

actual agents of change and praxis. Accordingly, the contents range from documents, to reflections from within various groups, through analyses of social experiments and events. Poetry and drawings also have a place in this enterprise. Furthermore, a collaborative research programme has been developed under this auspices, cf. Jean-Pierre Dupuis, *et al. Les Pratiques émancipatoires en milieu populaire* (Québec: Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture, 1982).

34. Contrast Rioux with the reflections on technology of Harold Innis, Marshall McLuhan and George Grant as provocatively formulated by Arthur Kroker in his *Technology and the Canadian Mind* (Montréal: New World Perspectives, 1984). Because of the constructive political thrust of the theory of *autogestion*, Rioux may remain enmeshed in the polarization between "technological humanism" and "technological dependency" but does succeed in pointing toward the transcendent principle of liberation.

35. Rioux, "Une porte de plus en plus étroite," *Possibles*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1983, pp. 19-22.

36. Rioux, "Politique et culture," *Conjuncture politique au Québec*, no. 2, Fall 1982, pp. 91-95.

37. For a suggestive formulation of these issues, cf. Renaud, *A l'ombre du rationalisme*.

38. G. McGregor, *The Wacousta Syndrome* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), p. 59.

39. M. Rioux, *Le Besoin et le désir* (Montreal: L'Hexagone, 1984), p. 118.