

# Towards Global Multitude and Assembly: An Analysis of the Works of Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt

Atsushi Shibasaki <sup>\*</sup>

You say you'll change the Constitution  
Well, you know  
We all want to change your head  
You tell me it's the institution  
Well, you know  
You better free your mind instead  
- John Lennon -

**Key words:** Antonio Negri, Empire, Multitude, Common, Assembly, Global Relations

## Summary

This paper reveals only the very introductory part of an ongoing research on the thought, theory, and philosophy of Antonio Negri (1934-). The original script was read at the working lunch seminar held at the Institute of Global European Studies (Europainstitut), University of Basel, on 24 April 2018. Before the publication, slight and minimum revisions and corrections were done. In addition, because of its nature as being originally a manuscript for a lecture, all slides are attached in order to help the readers to understand the argument.

The author has long been tackling with this research project from the perspectives of theory and philosophy of international relations, or rather international cultural relations, since the publication of the book *Empire* (2000), co-authored by Negri and Michael Hardt (1960-). Until now, two papers had been published by the author, respectively in 2006, and 2011. The former mainly dealt with *Empire* and *Multitude* (2005), and the latter measured the development of their argument from *Empire, Multitude* to *Commonwealth* (2009). Since the author's publications, they published new books and many articles. Right after the publication of their latest work *Assembly* (2017), the author decided to prepare the third paper that would describe the whole development of their theory or philosophy, and elucidate the comprehensive essence of their thought. By the publication of the third paper, the author would attempt to make this cat-and-mouse academic chase end.

On February 2018, the author luckily had a chance to hold an interview with Mr. Negri in Paris. I visited him together with Prof. Teresa Pullano, an excellent Italian scholar of social theory and philosophy of the Institute of European Global Studies, University of Basel, who kindly offered to pray the role of translator. The author had sent a long letter to him beforehand, in order for Mr. Negri to understand who the author is, how he sees their works, and what he would like to talk with. Since the talk was unexpectedly fruitful, Mr. Negri, Prof. Pullano and the author are now working on its publication, both in English and in Japanese. This paper selectively picks up some contents of our correspondence. Following this context, this paper introduces the author's research history about Negri and Hardt, which might be some helpful introductory guide

---

<sup>\*</sup> Ph.D. (International Relations)

Professor, Komazawa University, Japan/Guest Professor, Institute for Global Studies, University of Basel

for the readers, who have not been familiar with past papers by the author in Japanese, to understand his approach, which seems to be previously unknown in English academic world.

This paper has seven parts. Part 1 is a brief research history of the author and explains how the research on Negri could be located in the history. This part shows that the author's research interest towards Negri stems from the contemplation about the aporia of two "ir"s, namely International Relations (as a discipline) and international relations (as a reality) to analyze and represent today's globalizing world. Part 2 is a brief introduction of Antonio Negri and Michel Hardt and their works.

Part 3 depicts the basic theoretical and philosophical framework of their argument. Especially it deals with the core definitions and meanings of their main keywords such as Empire, Multitude, Common, Assembly and so forth. Part 4 tackles to distil the essence of their main argument, and pose some critiques towards them. There are five points as follows; first, a sweepingness of their dialectical way of argument. Second is the possibility and difficulty of becoming multitude with a reference to Dostoevsky or Milton Meyer. Third, the relationship between their theory and practice, between western philosophy and non-western practice. Forth is, related to the third point, the possibility of creating an original theory or philosophy from the experiences and practices by non-western people, especially by examining some cases from modern Japan. Last point is the configuration of emotion or passion in their theory and the relevance of their ideas to the real world.

Part 5 is an excerpt from our dialogue in February, but as the full-fledged interview is now under preparation for the publication, it only touches some clues the author took from the talk. In part 6, this paper sorts out the basic points of departure for future study, namely an problem about the dialectical argument, about a difference between western and non-western cultures, relations between emotion and reason, location of themselves in their own theoretical framework, and the balance between being a scholar and being an activist. In Part 7, the author comprehensively summarizes the whole argument, and proposes future research agendas that could advance the study on Negri and Hardt.

### **Zusammenfassung**

Der vorliegende Aufsatz versteht sich als Hinführung zu laufenden Forschungen zu den Ideen, der Theorie und der Philosophie von Antonio Negri (\*1934). Der diesem Aufsatz zugrunde liegende Vortrag wurde am 24. April 2018 im Rahmen eines Working Lunches am Europainstitut der Universität Basel präsentiert. Vor der Publikation wurden kleinere Korrekturen und Modifikationen vorgenommen. Zudem sind die Folien der den Vortrag begleitenden Präsentation zum besseren Verständnis dem Aufsatz angefügt.

Der Autor hat dieses Forschungsprojekt schon seit längerem im Blick gehabt. Seit der Veröffentlichung von "Empire" (erschienen im Jahr 2000), gemeinsam verfasst von Antonio Negri und Michael Hardt (\*1961) hat sich der Autor dem Forschungsprojekt vor allem aus der Perspektive der Theorie und Philosophie der internationalen Beziehungen und der internationalen kulturellen Beziehungen angenähert. Zwei Arbeiten hat der Autor in diesem Kontext in den Jahren 2006 und 2011 veröffentlicht. In einer ersten Arbeit untersuchte er "Empire" und "Multitude" (erschienen 2004). In seiner zweiten Publikation analysierte der Autor die Entwicklung der Argumentation Negris und Hardts von "Empire" über "Multitude" bis zu "Commonwealth" (erschienen 2009). Seitdem haben Negri wieder neue Abhandlungen publiziert. Unmittelbar nach dem Erscheinen von "Assembly" im Jahr 2017 entschied sich der Autor für eine dritte Veröffentlichung über das Werk Negris, in deren Mittelpunkt die Entwicklung des Gesamtwerkes und der zentralen Ideen Negris stehen soll. Durch diesen Beitrag, so hofft der Autor, wird der akademische Zirkelschluss durchbrochen werden.

Im Februar 2018 hatte der Autor die Gelegenheit, Herrn Negri in Paris zu interviewen. Ohne die wertvolle Hilfe von Prof. Teresa Pullano, einer ausgezeichneten Politik- und Sozialwissenschaftlerin des Europainstitutes, die sich dankenswerterweise bereit erklärte, sich als Dolmetscherin zur Verfügung, wäre das Interview

in seiner vorliegenden Form nicht zustande gekommen. Zur Vorbereitung auf das Interview hatte der Autor Herrn Negri einen längeren Brief und einen Fragebogen zukommen lassen, um seinem Gesprächspartner einen Eindruck davon zu geben, wie der Autor über sein Werk denkt und was er mit seinem Gesprächspartner zu besprechen gedenkt. Da das Gespräch sich als noch ertragreicher darstellte, als man vermuten durfte, arbeiten der Antonio Negri, Professor Pullano und der Autor an einer englischen und japanischen Publikation des Gespräches. Der Aufsatz gibt daher einen kurzen Einblick in den Inhalt des Gespräches. Zugleich führt der Aufsatz in die Entwicklung der wissenschaftlichen Beschäftigung des Autors mit Negri und Hardt ein und erlaubt es den Leserinnen und Lesern, sich mit früheren, auf Japanisch erschienenen Aufsätzen des Autors, vertraut zu machen.

Der vorliegende Aufsatz gliedert sich in acht Teile. Der erste Teil führt in die Genese der Forschung des Autors ein und ordnet die Beschäftigung mit dem Werk Negris in diese Vorgeschichte ein. Dieser Teil legt dar, dass das Interesse am Werk Negris sich vor allem aus der Aporie der zwei "IBs", nämlich IB sowohl als Disziplin als auch als Realität, um die sich globalisierende Welt zu analysieren und zu interpretieren, speist. Der zweite Teil stellt eine kurze Einführung in das Werk von Negri und Hardt dar.

Im dritten Teil werden grundlegende theoretische und philosophische Elemente ihres Werkes analysiert. Dabei werden theoretische Grundbausteine ebenso adressiert wie Schlüsselbegriffe wie "Empire", "Multitude", "Common", "Assembly" etc. definiert. Der vierte Teil identifiziert die Kernaussagen ihres Werkes und äussert ein wenig Kritik an ihrem Werk. Diese wiederum lässt sich grob in fünf Punkte gliedern: Der erste Kritikpunkt betrifft die Pauschalisierungen, die der angewendeten Dialektik inhärent sind. Der zweite Kritikpunkt bearbeitete die Möglichkeit und Schwierigkeit der Multitude zu werden, vergleichend die Werke von Dostojewski und Milton Meyer. Der dritte Kritikpunkt zielt auf die Repräsentation des Verhältnisses zwischen Theorie und Praxis im Allgemeinen, besonders aber im Hinblick auf das Verhältnis von westlicher Philosophie und nicht-westlicher Praxis, ab. Der vierte Kritikpunkt, der direkt mit dem dritten zu tun hat, bezieht sich auf die Möglichkeit, eine neuartige Theorie und letztlich auch Philosophie auf Basis der Erfahrungen und Praktiken der nicht-westlichen Völker, insbesondere durch einige Einzelfalluntersuchungen aus dem neuzeitlichen Japan, zu entwickeln. Der letzte Kritikpunkt hat die Behandlung von Passion und Emotion in ihrer Theorie und die Relevanz für die wirkliche Welt zum Gegenstand.

Der fünfte Teil bietet einige Auszüge des Interviews von Februar, dessen vollständige Publikation noch in Vorbereitung ist. Der sechste Teil des Artikels weist auf mögliche Wege für zukünftige Forschungen hin: die Logik der Dialektik, die Differenz zwischen westlich und nicht-westlich, die Beziehungen zwischen Emotion und Ratio, ihre Position in der Theorie und die Balance zwischen der Position als Wissenschaftler und als Aktivist. Im siebten Teil wird eine Zusammenfassung des Aufsatzes geboten und es werden weitere Perspektiven für die Erforschung des Werkes von Negri und Hardt aufgezeigt.

## Sommaire

Cet article fait part des conclusions préliminaires d'une recherche continue sur les idées, la théorie et la philosophie d'Antonio Negri (\*1934). L'intervention sur laquelle cet article est basée fut faite lors d'un déjeuner de travail à l'Institute for European Global Studies à l'Université de Bâle le 24 avril 2018. Avant la publication de cette intervention, des minimales corrections et révisions furent faites. De plus, car il s'agit d'un manuscrit d'une présentation orale, les diapositives sont attachées à cet article pour faciliter la compréhension de la discussion.

L'auteur du présent article s'est approché de ce projet de recherche de la perspective de la théorie et de la philosophie des relations interantoniales / des relations culturelles internationales la première fois suite à la publication du livre *Empire* (2000), corédigé par Negri et Michael Hardt (1960). Deux articles furent publiés par l'auteur en 2006 et 2011. Le premier analysait *Empire and Multitude* (2005), le dernier retraçait le déve-

loppement du débat d'Empire, Multitude à Commonwalt. En suite, Hardt et Negri publiait un vaste nombre de nouveaux livres et articles. Justement après la publication de leur dernier livre, *Assembly* (2017), l'auteur décida de rédiger une troisième étude sur Negri. Cette étude, présentée dans l'article, offrera une analyse du développement de leur théorie et philosophie et il vise à dévoiler l'essence de leurs Idées pour sortir du cercle vicieux académique existant.

En février 2018, l'auteur eut l'occasion d'interviewer Antonio Negri. Cet interview eut lieu avec l'assistance de Professeur Teresa Pullano, une excellente experte des idées politiques et du fait social, elle aussi membre de l'Institute for European Global Studies à Bâle. Ce fut Madame Pullano qui joua le rôle d'interprète. L'auteur avait préparé l'entretien en envoyant une lettre et un questionnaire auparavant à l'interviewé pour s'introduire en matière de sa biographie professionnelle, mais aussi en matière des positions de l'auteur vis-à-vis les oeuvres de Monsieur Negri. Comme résultat de cet entretien très riche et stimulant, Antonio Negri, Teresa Pullano et l'auteur décidèrent, au moment même de l'interview, de préparer une publication de cet interview en anglais et japonais.

Cet article comprend certains éléments de la lettre et du questionnaire. En conséquence, cet article reflète l'histoire des recherches de l'auteursur Negri et Hardt. Il peut donc aussi servir d'un guide préliminaire pour les lecteurs qui ne connaissent pas les deux études précédentes en japonais de l'auteur, pour se familiariser avec et pour comprendre l'approche adoptée par l'auteur - une approche probablement méconnue dans le monde scientifique anglo-saxon.

L'article est organisé en sept parties: La première partie offre une brève histoire des recherches de l'auteur et une localisation de Negri dans cette histoire. Il montrera que l'intérêt de recherche sur Negri provient de sa contemplation de l'aporia de deux "ir", à savoir Relations Internationales comme discipline, et relations internationales comme une réalité pour analyser et représenter le présent monde qui est en train de se mondialiser. La deuxième partie introduira Antonio Negri, Michael Hardt et leurs travaux.

La troisième partie adresse la base théorique et philosophie de leur oeuvre. En particulier, les définitions et mots clés seront définis, comme Empire, Multitude, Common, Assembly, etc. La quatrième partie tentera d'extraire une "essence" de la discussion de leurs oeuvres et donnera la possibilité d'articuler quelques mots de critique en leurs égards. Il y a notamment cinq points de critique: Premièrement, la tendance d'une schématisation extrême dans leurs moyens dialectiques pour argumenter. Deuxièmement, la possibilité et la difficulté de devenir à multitude, avec la consultation de Dostoïevski ou Milton Meyer. Troisièmement, une critique visant le décalage entre leurs théories et les pratiques dans le monde entier, particulièrement les relations entre les théories occidentales et les pratiques non-occidentales. Le quatrième point, ayant un rapport direct avec le troisième, adresse la possibilité de construire une théorie ou philosophie originale, d'après les expériences de, et les pratiques des gens non occidentales par citer quelques cas historiques dans le Japon moderne. Et, finalement, leur configuration d'émotion et passion dans leur théorie est le lien avec le monde réel.

La cinquième partie est un extrait bref de notre dialogue de février. A cause de la publication avisée de la version intégrale de cet interview, elle ne touche que des clefs prises de l'interview. La sixième partie analyse les points de départ pour des recherches futures, à savoir le problème dans la méthode dialectique et sa discussion, la différence entre des cultures occidentales et non-occidentales, les relations entre les émotions et les passions, la place des deux dans la description du monde mondialisant et, dernièrement, la balance entre la position comme chercheur et celle d'activiste. Dans la septième partie, l'auteur propose un résumé de sa discussion avec Antonio Negri et il montre des pistes de recherches sur Negri et Hardt pour des recherches futures.

## Sommario

Questo articolo rivela solo la introduttiva parte di un ricerche in corso su l'idea, la teoria, e la filosofia d'Antonio Negri (1934-). Il testo originale ero presento a il pranzo di lavoro seminario tenendosi alla Istituto Europeo, L'Università Basilea, le 24 aprile 2018. Prima della pubblicazione, ho fatto qualche revisioni e correzioni. Anche, a causa della sua natura come originariamente un manoscritto per una conferenza, tutte diapositive stato attaccato al fine di contribuire a capire la sua discussione più facilmente.

Il autore ha affrontato questa ricerca dalla prospettiva della teoria e filosofia delle relazioni internazionali, e relazioni internazionali culturali, dalla pubblicazione di *Empire* (2000), coprodotto da Negri e Michael Hardt (1960). Fino a ora, i due articoli stato pubblicati dal autore, nell'ano 2006, 2011 rispettivamente. Il primo tratta soprattutto l'analisi di *Empire* e il loro seguente libro *Multitude* (2004), il secondo misura il sviluppo di loro pensiero da *Empire, Multitude a Commonwealth* (2009), il loro terzo libro. Da quel tempo, hanno pubblicato nuovi libri e articoli continuamente. Immediatamente dopo la pubblicazione di *Assembly* (2017), il autore ho deciso di preparare il terzo saggio che descrive il completo storico progresso della loro teoria e filosofia, e delucida la essena della loro idea. Della pubblicazione di questo saggio, il autore tenterebbe di fare mettere fine a questo gatto-e-topo inseguimento accademico.

Febbraio 2018, il autore fortunatamente ho avuto una opportunità per avere un colloquio con Signor Negri a Paris. L'ho visto con Prof. Teresa Pullano, una eccellente studiosa del pensiero politico e sociale del Istituto Europeo, Università Basilea, che cordiale si ha offerto a fare da interprete per me. Il autore aveva invitato una lunga lettera e questionario per Negri in anticipo, al fine di lo comprendere chi è il autore, come il autore pensa loro lavori, che il autore vorrei discutere con lui. Poiché il dialogo ero inaspettatamente fruttuoso, Signor Negri, Prof. Pullano e il autore adesso mettersi al lavoro del pubblicare, entrambi a l'inglese e al giapponese. Questo lavoro include alcuni contenuti della lettera e questionario. Questo lavoro è basato su così contesto, e mostra il storico di ricerca su Negri e Hardt del autore, che potrebbe essere la preliminare guida per i lettori, che non conoscono bene i precedenti articoli del autore al giapponese, per capire il modo d'affrontare Negri, che sembra che era sconosciuto al mondo di accademico a l'inglese.

Questo articolo consiste di sette parte. La parte 1 è una storica di ricerca di autore, e spiega come la studio di Negri sta stabilito a la storica. Questa parte monstra, che il interesse di ricerca dal autore su Negri deriva dalla contemplazione sull'aporia di due "ir", per Relazioni Internazionale (come una disciplina) e relazioni internazionale (come una realtà), per analizzare e ripresentare del globalizzando mondo. La parte 2 è un breve presentazione di Negri, Hardt e loro lavori.

La parte 3 descriva la base teorica e filosofia della loro discussione. Specialmente si occupa di le definizioni centrale e i sensi dei le loro parole chiave, come *Empire, Multitude, Common, Assembly* ed altri. La parte 4 affronta a estrarre la essenza di la loro discussione principale, e solleva qualche critiche verso loro. Sono i cinque punti; Primo è la tendenza di semplificazione a le loro logica dialettica. Secondo è la possibilità e la difficoltà di diventare la Multitude, consultando Dostoevskij o Milton Meyer. Terzo, le relazioni fra la teoria e la pratica, soprattutto fra le filosofie occidentale e le pratiche non occidentale. Quarto, che è in relazione con la terza, è la possibilità di creare una teoria o filosofie originale dalle esperienze e pratiche di la gente non occidentale, citando i esempi da Giappone moderna. Infine è sulla configurazione della emozione e passione alla loro teoria, e la coerenza degli loro idee con il mondo realtà.

La parte 5 è un estratto dal nostro dialogo a febbraio, ma perché prepariamo la pubblicazione della completa versione, tocca unico qualche chiavi dalla nostra conversazione. A parte 6, questo saggio classifica le punte di partenza fondamentale per il futuro studio, cioè un problema su il metodo dialettico del loro discussione, su la differenza fra le culture occidentale e la cultura non occidentale, le relazioni fra la emozione e la ragione, la posizione di loro stessi a la loro struttura teorica, e l'equilibrio tra essendo come un studioso e come un attivista. Per finire, a la parte 7 riassume la discussione, e propone i programmi dei ricerche futuri,

che potrebbe fare progredire il studio su Negri e Hardt.

## **Introduction (SLIDE <1>)**

Guten Tag. I would like to express my gratitude for all of you who come here. I am Atsushi Shibasaki, from Komazawa University, Japan. I have been spending my sabbatical leave since last April. It is my first presentation at EIB during my stay, at last after one year. Today, I am so grateful to have this chance to share with you one of my ongoing research topics. First of all, I would like to show my deepest gratitude to Madeleine for offering this opportunity. Also, as I refer later, I would like to thank Teresa and her partner Angelo, without whom I could not initiate this research about Negri, an Italian philosopher living in Paris, in Basel. Their contribution is literally decisive.

Before going into the today's theme, I would like to explain a structure of the presentation. The Part I deal with my encounter with Mr. Negri in my academic history. I am basically a historian, with putting strong emphasis on cultural relations across borders. As I tell you later, I have started to study a history of institutional development of promoting international cultural exchange in modern Japan, by doing multi-archival research and interviews. If I were satisfied with such researches and kept doing only that, I would not even read Negri. But in the course of time I have been becoming interdisciplinary more and more, by trying to acquire new perspectives from such historical researches and gradually started to deal with various kinds of topics. So, in this section, I would like to locate the study about Negri in my whole research programs, in order to understand why I turned to Negri.

Part II and Part III are the short introduction of Negri and Hardt, and the structure, keywords of their argument. Part II provides basic information about themselves and their works. Part III clarifies the main contents of their argument, such as Empire, Multitude, Common, Declaration, and Assembly. Then I am going to compare my views and theirs. Since I am not sure how many of you are familiar with Negri (I suspect that most of you are not), I try to summarize their main points of view.

In Part IV, I am going to pose my interpretation on their argument, from the perspective of my academic interests showed in previous sections. There are at least five topics that seem important to me and I am going to explore them accordingly. I have already pointed out the basic content of this part in 2011 in Japanese, but what I suggest today is somewhat an updated version. Part V is a rough summary of the answer from Negri, which was taken from the interview in Paris in February, with a brilliant translation by Teresa. These two parts would clearly show us the similarity and difference between Negri and myself.

Part VI and Part VII are concluding sections. Part VI aims to elucidate some implication from the encounter, and clarify some academic agendas in terms of advancing the study of Global Relations. In the last section, I would like to suggest some future prospects and plans for this ongoing project.

## **I. Introduction: How I encountered with Negri (SLIDE <2> ~ <7>)**

### **1.1 My research interest**

At first I started my academic career as a historian. Then, based on the method of historical research, I gradually stepped into the field of history of ideas or history of philosophy, so-called meta-level, concerning international relations, and gradually shifted to the critics of International Relations (IR) theory, and began to seek the alternatives of IR. I tentatively call the alternative as the study of Global Relations (GR).

Remembering my undergraduate days, the faculty of the university in which I studied is called "international relations". In US and Europe, IR is regarded as a sub-discipline of political science. However, in Japan, and especially in my faculty and graduate school, professors strongly encouraged students to be interdiscipli-

nary. For example, in order to receive BA grade, I had to get grades of all three major fields, international politics, international economics, and international law, and also take classes of international history, culture, and sociology.

Needless to say, not every student sought to be, or wanted to be interdisciplinary. and I guess. Also, as well as most of recent social sciences in the universities worldwide, my university right now is also getting less and less interdisciplinary, instead of becoming narrow scoped, or divided. So, I might take those advices and encouragements from my professors at that time too seriously, but that is why I am always trying to be as interdisciplinary as possible. In that sense, I guess I might be a scholar who was not made for these times.

The core keyword in my study is ‘culture’. Of course, this is so much troublesome concept, from its definition to its interpretations and its applications. You might understand the way I treat this concept gradually, as this presentation goes, and at this stage I am not going into the concept of culture here.

I have been studying the thought on the concept of ‘international relations’. Obviously, if we define it as relations, society, or system between sovereign nation-states, there seems to need no further inquiries. However, to stop there and to investigate the origin and changing interpretations of such prima facie concept is a important departure for academic exploration. Einstein once said, “If at first the idea is not absurd, then there is no hope for it”. After several years, I found that the interpretation has been tremendously various and changing, swinging back and forth between one extremes to the others, especially on its relation to the concept of self or individual, society, state, and world as a whole.

In this respect, the discipline IR as we know it tends to hide such dramatic historical developments and instability by disseminating the story or myth of Westphalian state system, that modern IR started from the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 and its system spread to the world without changing its core until now. However, as we have been observing in recent 10 or 20 years, in the process of globalization, such nation system based on exclusive territorial sovereignty is drastically changing and such Westphalian ontology of IR is now becoming more and more obsolete. But, unfortunately, IR has not been able to devise a new description of this world as a whole. They admit that international relations does not mean only relations between great powers or sovereign states, but they cannot devise a new concept that clearly and perfectly defines the field. A few years ago, I have tried to elucidate the aporia of IR. And this also leads to the road to Negri.

In terms of culture, I regard both international relations as a phenomenon, and the IR as a discipline, as “culture”. It as phenomenon is culture, in that it was devised by human being in order to make a stable world order (you can remind the explanation of Kant about this in his *Zum ewigen Frieden* (1795)) which basically designed to human survival. Of course, there has been devastating wars and conflicts in the framework of international relations, but we still have not found an alternative world order that completely substitutes for it.

And IR as a discipline is also a culture, in the sense that it tries to find out how to manage international relations as a phenomenon, and it regards human survival as its ultimate purpose. However, IR as a discipline also falls into aporia, for IR has not found out how to overcome its theoretical difficulties, which stem from drastic changes in today’s globalizing world. This point also closely related to the appreciation of Negri, because his description and interpretation on this world seems provide useful and ample clues to those aporia.

So international relations as a description of today’s world, and IR as a prescription for today’s world are both in kind of deadlock. And my aim is to find out the way for them to get out from it by studying Negri.

## 1.2 Research History

In the next section, I would briefly explore my research history. You may listen with taking a look at this list.

### **PHASE ONE 1995-1999**

I started my academic life in the last decade of the 20th century, mid 90s. My graduations thesis (01) and MA (02, my first book) theses were basically historical researches of programs, activities, institutional developments related to promote international cultural relations in pre-war Japan. But after the MA thesis I found out the need to investigate the thoughts of the practitioners and thinkers on international relations and international culture. Many of them were heavily influenced by neo-Kantian concept of culture, which treat the sphere of culture as being basically independent form political realm. Then I started an analysis of Tanaka, who was a thinker and practitioner at the same time and offered unique thoughts about international relations and international culture, as a scholar of commercial law and world law, and as a Catholic.

### **PHASE TWO: 1999-2009**

I had shifted to study such philosophical issues and submitted a Ph.D. thesis <in 2007>. It was about Tomonaga (05, second book), who was neo-Kantian historian of western philosophy and the author on the idea of peace in the philosophy of Immanuel Kant. I proposed the concept <Self-State-International Relations> as an epistemological basis of modern world in his thought. I would explain this later, for such investigation toward the ontological principle of modern world is related to the academic works by Negri. At the same time, I applied the method to other subjects, Like soft Power, Kenneth Waltz, and Negri. And this was my first step to Negri, in 2006. Alongside, I continue a historical research of international cultural relations in Japan and also published a controversial short essay on down right and sharp-edged critic of IR, with a title “You ain’t goin’ nowhere”, which is taken from the song of Bob Dylan.

### **PHASE THREE: 2009-2015**

After being emancipated from Ph.D. thesis, I continued to widen my research areas, with updating past ones. One of new agendas was on the role of fear and emotion in international relations or IR by introducing an insight from cognitive science. And I turned to an analysis of Negri from 2009 and two years later, published the second paper on him. Most major papers were published in my third book(07).

It was during this phase that Madeleine kindly invited me to the conference in Heidelberg. She encouraged me to write an English version of the history of KBS (abridged version of my first book) and offered me a chance to publish an English version of Tomonaga (abridged version of my second book). Those English papers greatly helped me to open the door to an international academic arena.

In the meantime, I wrote a concise overview of the history of cultural diplomacy and its thought in modern Japan, from 1919 to 21<sup>st</sup> century. I have been thinking about presenting updated version of this paper in English at EIB during my stay, but instead, coincidentally, I have a chance to talk about Negri first.

### **PHASE FOUR 2015-present**

From 2015 to until now, I keep continuing various kinds of works. For the theoretical research, I have jointly published the book about the myth of Westphalia in IR (09). In that book, we have described how IR is constrained by the historiography that wrongly put enormous emphasis on the importance of modern state system and how IR itself reproduced and reinforced such myth through education, and how practitioners of international relations who has given such education also played the role of self-realizing such myth. Also I proposed in another paper that in order to get out of such aporia, study of IR would have to be a study of Global Relations (08). Related to this, I also studying the concept of time in international relations (14). The

discourse of Westphalia is about epistemology of geographical space, so the next step from the study about space, I mean Westphalia, there comes analysis about the way of dealing with time in international relations.

Another recent topic is how to describe history of the discipline of international relations, especially from a viewpoint of international cultural relations. Recently the discipline of IR has becoming more global, and traditionally IR in Japan was heavily influenced from IR in US or UK, and it happened with an act of translation. As you can imagine, to study how to write a history directly leads to find an answer about how to prospect a future.<sup>10, 11, and 13</sup> are those efforts. From this year on, I would try to establish a framework of analyzing such international interactions between disciplines and to make a research on famous Japanese scholars (some of them are practitioners, like Sadako Ogata, former UNHCR commissioner and JICA president) who experienced transboundary academic journeys. Also I am now doing a research on Bob Dylan, with its emphasis on the relation between music (or sound, more fundamentally) and emotion in world politics.

Then I am now turning to Negri, for the third time. I am going to submit updated version of this seminar and make a reworked version of conversation with Negri, and based on those works I am planning to make a contribution to a book about the politics in post-globalizing world.

In such way, now I am handling so many projects and many deadlines for submitting papers are ahead of me. Sometimes I feel like being a juggler, juggling so many kinds of props from balls to torches or rackets. One I finished and throw one prop away, someone throws new one to me immediately. But I enjoy such academic juggling at least while I am here, with a plenty of time.

## **II. Antonio Negri and his corroboration with Michael Hardt (SLIDE <8> ~ <9>)**

Part II is a short introduction to Negri and Hardt by showing biographical and bibliographical information.

### **2.1 Profile of Negri**

Mr. Negri is a scholar, philosopher and activist. From early 50s, he participated in communist party and involved in labor movements. He started to write academic theses and books from late 50s. His first book was published in 1958. Especially after becoming a professor at the University of Padua, he turned more into the movement of labcrowns, such as operaismo and autonomia, but the same time kept publishing so many articles and books.

In 1979, he was accused and arrested by the many charges of act of treason, including the suspect of relationship with left-wing terrorist groups. While he was in prison, he was elected to the Italian parliament and temporarily released, and before the government sent him to jail, he escaped to France and stayed at Paris, teaching at Paris VIII (Vincenne) and Collège international de philosophie with Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault and others. In 1997 he returned to Italy and serve his reduced sentence until 2003. Then he went back to Paris and stay there until now.

Michael Hardt was born in Maryland, USA and studied comparative literature, literary theory and philosophy. In 80s he was fascinated by Negri's books. So he went to Paris and became one of his students. He is now a professor at Duke university.

### **2.2 Collaboration with Michael Hardt (1960-), his student at Paris VIII**

Prior to 1990s, Negri already has been undoubtedly a very well known intellectual and activist not only in Italy but in entire Europe. However, in my view it was not until the end of the Millennium that he becomes a truly global intellectual figure, with a publication of *Empire* (2000). One of the reasons is that from *Empire*,

he explicitly extended the scope of his argument towards the whole world, not only within Italy and Europe. And another reason, which I regard as more decisive, was that he published those books primary in English (not too easy, but not so difficult to read), by collaborating with Michael Hardt.

This time, I do not investigate his past works prior to *Empire* (one of the reasons is the language). Instead, I try to describe the change in his writings or his intellectual shift as a response to the process of globalization from *Empire* to *Assembly*. This trial would show that his (their) works themselves is also a product of globalization. To follow the development means to know the drastic changing nature of globalization from their eyes. And what made their argument so influential than never before is also a byproduct in information and logistics revolutions supported by digital information technology. Globalization makes them write and they write to respond globalization, and to lead the duetion globalization as they wish. As sociologists like Anthony Giddens or Roland Robertson once pointed out, any academic writings could not detach from this circle of self-referential structure.

The first collaborated book was *Labor of Dionysus*. It was not a totally new, for more than half of them were translations from Negri's past writings in 60s and 70s. In that sense this book was only a warming up exercise for them, I think. However, they already introduced some of the important concepts there, like 'constitutional power', or 'immaterial labor' or 'multitude'. To tell the truth, those keywords had introduced in his single-authored book, *Le pouvoir constituant* (originally in Italian in 1992, translated into French in 1997).

Then they published three important books in the first decade of 21<sup>th</sup> century, *Empire*, *Multitude*, and *Commonwealth*. *Empire* described the whole structure of today's world. *Multitude* is about a main actor who tried to participate in the struggle against Empire. And *Commonwealth* discussed about the goal or aim of the struggle. The three books constitute a kind of trilogy for describing what is going on in this globalized world and how to change better and what to be pursued. This trilogy, especially *Empire*, the first book, were widely read globally and caused numerous appraisals, critics, and controversies. One of the reason I did my own research about Negri might be that I felt a need to respond to their books as a scholar of international relations, and by doing that I also got involved into the structure of globalized self-referential discourse on the significance of globalization.

After the trilogy, they have published two more books. *Declaration* (2012) was a very short book (pamphlet) and I suppose it is their response to the new type of democratic movements after Arab Springs (2011), like Occupy Wallstreet, M15, and so on. This book could be regarded as a supplementary fact update without any significant modification of their theoretical position that had already established.

*Assembly*, the latest book, it seems to me at least up to this moment, could be regarded as the response to the rising populism, the crises of democracy, and reinforcement of neoliberalism or statism. They concentrated to offer how multitude to take power in what ways, in the situation that has slightly changed compared to early 2000s. However, in my view, this book also has not altered the basic structure of their argument. *Assembly* is exciting to read, but in order to understand their main theoretical contention; we have to look to this trilogy first.

### III. Basic Structure and Concepts in their works

If I were asked to summarize their argument in the shortest form, I would say like this: The world is the struggle between Empire and Multitude for Common, and multitude will win through assembly. That's all. This is only a simplified configuration and you can guess very easily that this stems from typical Marxist formulation: struggle between capitalist and proletariat over surplus value and proletariat will win by communism. However, their theoretical formulation is not that simple, and the content is totally and essentially different from previous communism in many respects. And we are going to look at it more closer.

Here, I am going to explain their main arguments by following their publication from 2000 to 2017. How-

ever, their keywords would be overlappingly introduced, always with slightly different nuances. For example, in *Empire*, almost all concepts had been introduced, but they updated their interpretations sometimes subtly and sometimes entirely. I know this always happens especially in the writings of European philosophers. Anyway, here I only give you very simple way of explanation, without going into such details.

### 3.1 *Empire* (2000) (SLIDE <11> ~ <14>)

#### 3.1.1 Empire

##### a) Network of three-layered sovereignty>

Their concept of Empire is entirely different from the traditional usage of “empire”, which is a territorial entity and governs territory that includes homeland and so-called colonies. To put it very simply, Empire is a network of sovereignty. It consists of three tiers as explained. The point is that they see the sovereignty is now not occupied only by each state, but it was dispersed in the network. Of course, nominally, nation-state has its own sovereignty, but in reality, sovereignty was possessed and enforced through this structure.

#### 3.1.2 Basic features

“Biopower is a form of power that regulates social life from its interior, following it, interpreting it, absorbing it...The highest function of this power is to invest life through and through, and its primary task is to administer life”. (*Empire*, p. 24)

Here is the basic character of Empire. First, “no outsideness” refers to the global nature of Empire. As is the process of globalization, Empire takes the form of global network of ruling the world. They always look for the chance of inclusion. Second, decentered and deterritorialized, means that since this is a network, there is no center, no particular place we can call Empire, it is everywhere and no one can point out somewhere and say this is the center or core.

We need to make clear the difference between Empire and the USA. The United States has been long criticized by its imperial nature and many critics use the metaphor of Empire to denounce the deed of the USA in international arena, especially so many wars from Vietnam to Iraq. Because of this, sometimes people misunderstand that Empire of Negri is the United States. However, this is not correct. In their configuration, The USA is a prototype of Empire, especially its ambition to include all within its territory, but in today’s Empire, though USA plays an important role, but it is only part of it.

Lastly, The concept of biopower and control explains main function of Empire. By controlling all lives in Empire, from cradle to the grave and in every aspect of life, through media, education, surveillance, or any other useful means. This concept apparently comes from the works of Michel Foucault, needless to say.

#### 3.1.3 Backgrounds

Empire pretends to be the master of that world because it can destroy it. What a horrible illusion! In reality we are masters of the world because our desire and labor regenerate it continuously. The biopolitical world is an inexhaustible weaving together of generative actions, of which the collective (as meeting point of singularities) is the motor. (*Empire*, p. 388)

Then we turn to the backgrounds for Empire. There are at least four important features. The first point is

about historical context behind the book *Empire*. It was written during 1990s, so-called post-cold war era, that began from the fall of Berlin wall and the world was suffered from many regional conflicts, Gulf War, Yugo, Somalia, Rwanda, Afghanistan and among others to Kosovo. Also, this area was in the initial stage of globalization and IT revolution (information, biotechnology, and so on). However, as the Cold War ended, people could not find the exact way of describing the whole structure of the world. People discussed about the “New World Order”, the “End of History” or “Clash of Civilizations”, but almost none of these were persuasive enough to draw a comprehensive image of the world. However, the picture Negri and Hardt posed was a far more clear and attractive, although there are many problems in theirs.

Second point is about their basic understandings of human history. As I refer later, they always try to find the alternative path of history, which could be possible but in reality did not happen that way. And they suggest that we should revive such alternatives. According to them, there happened the subjectivation process in 13-16c, especially in the age of renaissance. By this process, humans had taken back their internal power to rule themselves, emancipated from the transcendentalism based on Catholicism. However, in their understanding, this subjectivity had once again been oppressed and now humans are subjected to Empire, that controls and exploits the power of subjectivity.

Thirdly, the importance of immaterial labor and biopolitical production refers to the significant transformation of today’s labor, from simple material labor, in the age of Taylorism and Fordism which has long been criticized, for example in the movie *Modern Times* by Charles Chaplin, to the new configuration of labor. This significant shift leads to the emergence of Empire and Multitude.

The fourth and last point is closely connected to the third, and it is about why Empire was formed. By their explanation, in order to control laborers that has changed into Multitude, network of people who shifted to immaterial labor and produce biopolitical production, the rulers also had to transform into a networked sovereignty. It happens because of the form of capitalism has changed, people is now re-grasping its subjectivity, but at the same time the authority is now trying to oppress and control again in the form of Empire.

### **3.2 Multitude and Common (SLIDE <15> ~ <18>)**

#### **3.2.1 *Multitude* (2003)**

Now we move to the concept of multitude. First, as previously shown, it is also a network, which was defined as “an open and expansive network in which all differences can be expressed freely and equally, a network that provides the means of encounter so that we can work and live in common”. (*Multitude*, xiv) They have their subjectivities, in the sense that they are the maker of biopolitical product by immaterial labor that is performed as a form of collaboration. And what they produce is what they call the common (which I clarify later). Also, they can be exercising constituent power against Empire. as mentioned, the concept of constituent power is another important concept for Negri.

Another significant concept is singularity, which was defined as “a social subject whose difference cannot be reduced to sameness, a difference that remains different” (*Multitude*, p.99). This is tightly related to their contention about subjectivation. By their understanding, when humans first redeemed it in pre-modern era, they were totally singular. But such diversified character had been paved with modern configuration of self, who has example, single and exclusive identity that is aligned with modern nation state and nationalism. However, humans are basically singular, between them and inner minds. That is why they stress that multitude is not people, crowds and other modern collective concept of humans, because such concept was defined by the sameness, single identity.

Lastly, global absolute democracy is their goal. In their usage, I think “revolution” means to achieve this global absolute democracy. This idea is taken from Spinoza, the of the most important philosopher for them

(especially for Negri). Multitude is an independent from representative democracy, which shakes such modern and nation state based political system from outside, by collaboration and cooperation, time to time with different purpose, with different people, with different places, but all of them are connected.

### 3.2.2 *Common* (2009)

Our point of departure is our recognition that the production of subjectivity and the production of the common can together form a spiral, symbiotic relationship. Subjectivity, in other words, is produced through cooperation and communication and, in turn, this produced subjectivity itself produces new forms of cooperation and communication, which in turn produce new subjectivity, and so forth. (*Common*, 189)

Then, we turn to the concept common. First, for them common has two meanings. The first one is not their original. But of course, they are threatened by neoliberal global economy and to protect them is one of the purposes of multitude. And the second one is the main part and we have already known what it is. One more thing to add that in their recognition, the dichotomy of public/private, based on the concept of property makes the importance or significance of such common less visible and sometimes meaningless. They try to recover common. Also, they think that there is a virtuous circle between the subjectivity of multitude and common. As this citation explains, this symbiotic mechanism is at the core of the movement of multitude. As Empire exploits this mechanism and for them now is the time to fight against such control and take it back to Multitude.

Second is about their goal, global revolution. Identity, property, sovereignty is exclusive, univocal, and refuses common, but they want to change the epistemological formation to more open, diverse, free one. However, the contrast between sovereignty and revolution is not clear at least to me.

The last point, the importance of love or joy, refers to a new (in this presentation, but they repeatedly try to argue in each book, updating and deepening its contention. Love in this concept is not personal one (like romantic love ideology in modern age). Although they don't use the word, it is like fraternity. However, this aspect of stressing the importance of emotion, including passion and joy is significant, because conventionally, social science especially political science is not good at dealing with the element of emotion.

### 3.2.3 Backgrounds

As for the background context, we can point out those historical events behind the two books. Multitude was published in the midst of the debate on Iraq war, and also reflects the ongoing War on Terror that brings the issue of surveillance towards individuals, human right abuse towards the suspected terrorists (Guantanamo, Abgrheib, etc). Also widening global inequality was another issue. Negri and Hardt descried such worsening situation as global Apartheid and in Multitude they tried to respond what to do. c) *Common* was published in 2009, right after the global financial crisis and the election of US president in 2009. Although there was a little hope for Obama, but *Common* was put in some sense as an alternative for the failed management of global economy.

Those books also reflect the new movements from below, like Sapatistas in Mexico, MST (Movimento dos trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra, Landless Workers Movement, 以下MST) in Brazil, protest in Seattle (WTO conference), etc. They were influenced by those new movements and tried to apply their theory for those cases.

### 3.3 *Declaration* (2012) and *Assembly* (2017) (SLIDE <20>)

Then I would like to touch very briefly about another two books. *Declaration* is very short book and it is only a updated overview of present situation, to show how subjectivity was dominated and repressed its strong power by Empire. They use four formulation about the issue of debt, media, security (surveillance), critic of representative democracy. And they suggested the way to overturn by depicting four crisis and try to overturn those oppressions of subjectivity.

*Assembly*, the latest book reflects the recent waves of rising populism all over the world and it tries to show how Multitude to react. The further investigation is left undone, but basically the meaning of assembly, as my understanding goes, is a condensed expression for how multitude to function in order to realize revolution, which we have previously seen. One interesting point is that they tried to connect Multitude assemblage with machinic assemblage that accentuate mutual relations between human and machine.

## IV. Interpretation, and Questions towards Negri (SLIDE <20> ~ <28>)

### 4.1 Appreciation: Overlapping interests

Now in this part, first I would like to talk about the common interests between Negri and me, and the pose questions on his argument.

About the description of the world and people as a whole, I have already explained as the aporia of IR. It seems to me, since the first time I read *Empire*, I am not quite sure if the word Empire would be most suitable for the name of present global order. However, their effort to describe a big picture of the whole world is attractive and at least they are ahead of scholars of international relations, who stuck to the Westphalian myth.

Traditionally, International Relations Theory has underestimated the utility and relevance of Marxist analysis of ir. One of the reasons that IR theorists pose is that Marxism disregard the importance state sovereignty because Marxism IR scholars regard the relation between capitalists and laborers far more important than interstate relations, because of their original theoretical settings. In the textbook of IR, we can see at least one chapter on Marxism, like Imperialism theory of Lenin, World System Theory by Wallerstein and so on. But it seems to me, now the tables has been turned because of the ongoing globalization, and this time IR, rather than Marxist IR is now becoming out of date.

The second point, description of the comprehensive epistemological basis in the modern/postmodern world, and challenge to overcome constitutional epistemological mechanism of modern world (how to tackle with sovereignty) is about more direct relation between Negri and me. I have posed a past and present (but now declining) epistemological mechanism on how to explain this world comprehensively, as SELF-STATE-INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.

In brief, this was a three-tiered structure: the individual, rooted in an independent and autonomous Self, the nation-state (society), made up of such individuals, and international relations (society), constituted of these independent and autonomous nation-states and premised on non-dissolution into a world state. We can provisionally call this “Self-State-International Relations”. It is a cross-referential mechanism that specifies the modern worldview and acts as a framework for asking the question, “What is international relations” in modern times. The modern epistemology of international relations has, whichever way we look at it, undeniably assumed a kind of world based on this mechanism, regardless of whether we accept it or criticize it. (From English translation of my paper, translated by Gainer Sekimori)

This is the basis of IR, and many scholars of ir overlooked this trilogical relations. On the other hand,

Negri tries to see the present situation and future, as the formulation of Empire and Multitude. Interestingly, both look to the importance of subjectivity. I studied how this logic was devised and disseminated, and Negri tries to elucidate how this is now collapsing and dissolving.

Challenge to seek the happiness and welfare for all, challenge to how to change the world, and putting emphasis on emotions are what we exactly shares as a common interest. For me also to pursue those challenges is exactly the reason why I do my research. However, there is also a significant difference between us and I am going to come back this point later.

## 4.2 Critics

### 4.2.1 Is it really possible or better to overturning the modern principles?

Now, I am going to pose some critics on their argument. There are five main points (of course there would so many other important issues, but I limit them to five for this moment).

The first point is about their core contention that we have to transform the world from modern one to revolutionary one. This way of argument, contrasting a present formula and future one, is definitely elegant and fascinating, but to put it differently, we could say that it is too sweeping and simple. First, the formation of <identity-property-sovereignty> is also a product of humans, and if it has been strongly functioning until now, we could assume that there might be some merits by keeping this. However, it seems to me that Negri does not support such arguments.

Second, abandoning <identity-property-sovereignty> is not easy to do and such process might invite confusion or chaotic disarray in the world. However, they only stress the need to change and they do not argue the cost and danger caused from such change. In short, we have to estimate both the merit and demerit in those two formations and also to plan carefully for the change to be soft landed if it is better to change it completely. Or we might have to think about the possibility of mixed formation of two principles.

### 4.2.2 Is future always ambiguous?

Next issue is about the concept of Multitude. We can understand that there is multitude even now and we could admit that they are growing strong and influential, but the problem is that we can see many variations of people in this world.

First, there would be multitude, who are willing and able. Second, there would be some people who wish to be a multitude but they can't for various reasons, for example because being busy, occupied with jobs, care for families and relatives or because they don't have enough skills, time, money or others or other. Third, there are some people who completely qualified to act as multitude, but don't wish to do so because of various possible reasons, personal or political, those might stand on the side of Empire. Lastly, there are some people who are not willing and able to act as such.

This is a very difficult problem, about participation. You can remember the pessimistic argument in *The Great Inspector in Brothers Karamazov* by Dostoevsky, showing how most of people easily and willingly abandon the heavy burden to think and act by themselves and subject to higher authorities without clearly understanding or judging what is right or what shall they do. Also, it is very difficult to stand up even they wish. A clear example is found in the writing of Mayer, about how difficult it was for ordinary Germans to resist against Gleichshaltung in Nazis regime.

In sum, it seems to me that they are too optimistic about such negative elements or counter strategy from Empire. Mayer introduced two latin axiom as a lesson from such experience: *Principiis obsta* (resist the beginnings) and *Finem respice* (consider the ends), but history shows that there are only a few people who

could do it.

#### 4.2.3 Western Philosophy and non-western practices

In this part, I would like to locate Negri and Hardt or their discourse itself in the context of the picture they draw. In other words, I try to clarify the significance of them as a phenomenon in this globalized world.

First point starts with a simple question: of course there are so many practices in the world that they can regard as the act of multitude, but are all practices directly or indirectly influenced by Negri? I think the answer is definitely no. As multitude is a network, the intellectual activity of Negri and Hardt is also one of them. Also, among people who participate in such multitude-like practices, some are very well read as Negri and share the intellectual tradition same as them, but I estimate most of them are not. However, many practices that can be seen as multitude's were done by those people. People in Cochabamba who fought the Water war had not read Negri and Hardt. Of course, after the publication of those books, more of those have a chance to read, but it is still questionable how Empire and other books contributed the real movements.

This leads to the second point, about western centered view of history. I do not intend to deny or accuse of Negri, but their argument follows the historical view that modern ideas was born in western world and it spread worldwide (with colonization, imperialism, wars, decononization etc). However, in my view and recent works on global history proves, modern ideas was forged in the global interaction, which was unlinear, complex process. It seems to me that Negri and Hardt might overlook such aspects.

Also, the time span of modernity is so short, if we take a far more long time span of the history of human being, but Negri sees the power of modernity too sweeping and strong, and endless.

If we combine this two alternative views on history (importance of global interaction and longer time span), we can regard modernity, especially connected only to the western historical context is so particular, and non-modern and non-western tradition on the other side we can find everywhere. If we take such position, S-C-R configuration is not that hard find in human history and if we have difficulty in finding such configuration, one of the reasons would be that we are being so short-sighted by western/modern centered historical understandings. Negri call the S-C-R world is altermodernity, but seeing from different point, it might not hard to find.

One of the examples I introduce is the case of Makoto Oda, who was both activist and writer. He was a leader of civic movement in Japan, author of many books, from novels, travelogue to theoretical issues about the activity of civil society in Japan. He was famous as an initiator of Beheiren (1965-74, Citizens' League for Peace in Vietnam) in 1960s-70s, which was a unique movement with no leader, no hierarchical organization but was so popular and powerful at that time in helping deserted US soldiers who fought in Vietnam to escape to other countries or applying shareholder activism and so on. Later in 1990s, he succeeded a sign-in movement for a legislation of a law for rescuing victims of great earthquake in 1995, by collecting 25 million of signs, which is one quarter of all population in Japan and also the biggest number in Japanese history.

Here are some quotes in one of his most systematically constructed book about his thoughts, *Yo Naoshi No Rinri To Ronri (Ethics and Logics of World Restoration)* (1972), by my translation. He has read Marx and or Lenin as liberal left, but interesting point is that he is not relying on particular thinkers and he mainly thinks by himself, from his experience and observation. I have once tried to compare you and Oda in my lecture, by reading your Declaration and this book, and students find so much resemblance in both arguments (especially like the ideas on the power of entangled people to entangle back, which resonates Negri's idea on multitude) .

I would be going to make a more detailed comparison between Negri and Oda in the coming article, but the case of Oda shows that there might be many people in the world like Oda, who took a different path but reach to the same thought and practices as Negri. If I extend my view, we could say that Negri and Hardt is

also a one of such intellectual multitude and they are not the only one.

#### 4.2.4 People

This is about their concept of multitude. Stemmed from Marxist point of view, the key definition of multitude is the people who work together. However, as we all know, there are so many powerless, weak people, from refugees, homeless, aged, people with serious diseases, and so forth. Negri and Hardt are beginning to deal with this issue, how to involve them into their framework by offering basic income and other measures, but because of the definition, it seems hard for them to completely incorporate such people. Sometimes they use another word people, or everyone, but also this does not alter their basic definition of multitude. It seems to me that they have not found out a good idea how to incorporate those people in their theory.

Makoto Oda once pointed out “Most books on revolution doesn’t include the fact that people get old and people get sick. (That proves those books does not think about lively man in their argument).” And it might be applicable to Negri.

#### 4.2.5 Emotion: Love and hate

Last point is about how to deal with elements of emotion. In normal sciences, emotion is totally left, or rhetorically mentioned, or reduce to one of variables. Those are not fruitful and do not reflect the essence of emotion into their analysis. However, Negri and Hardt put emotional elements at the center of their theory. This is so challenging, and as I have also tried to do it with a help of theoretical reference to a cognitive scientist.

The question I would like to pose Negri is how they see the negative effect of emotion, especially control of emotion by the side of Empire. I definitely agree that passion is important or political love, joy is the key. But this only sees the bright side and they do not provide how to prevent the control of emotions by empire, using fear or hate. We can think of so many examples from George Orwell or propadanga on racism, terrorism, and others.

Another overlooked aspect, in my view is that Negri and Hardt put their importance only on the releasing positive emotions, but they don’t argue about how to restrain. This is related to the previous point about fear. To control emotions means both, releasing and restraining. But as far as I see, they do not go into this matter further. I sent Negri some passages from Alain in order to ask him how he thinks about it, for example.

### V. Response from Negri (SLIDE <29>)

#### 5.2.1 Is it possible or better to overturning the modern principles?

So, in February, Teresa and I went to see Negri in Paris and talked about such issues. I am going to prepare the reworked version of our conversation and this time I only introduce some part. As Teresa knows, Negri talked so much in Italian and because of time there are so many words that had not translated into English, so I would like to ask Teresa if there is something you can add or correct.

As for the 5.2.1, I found out that he also sees such way of Hegelian dialectical or dualistic argument has problems, but I think he intentionally does that, with purpose to change the world better. He also pointed out my formula Self-State-International Relations also falls into the same mistakes and we bursted out laughing.

### **5.2.2 Is future always ambiguous (a coin always has two sides)?**

In this respect, his answer was quite simple. He is both philosopher and activist and I think he knows things always have both aspects, but as an activist, he bet the one side and decided to construct his argument in the way he wish to. Resistance is his fundamental belief. Of course, I expect such answer, but this inspired me what to do next.

### **5.2.3 Western Philosophy and non-western practices**

According to him, this is exactly what they are working on in their next project, Empire after twenty years. Negri admitted that those cultural element was been overlooked and now trying to reach. I am not sure if I should take it seriously or not, but he even suggested a possibility for collaboration with me in this point.

### **5.2.4 People**

He also admits the need for their theory to include such people in their theory, but it seemed to me he would like to stick to the definition of multitude, who works, who are laborers. I understand this attitude because he has been long fighting against government or authority standing on the side of workers, and his intellectual base is Marxism. But maybe in the next project, he might find a better way to incorporate such people.

### **5.2.5 Laugh, Joy, and Love**

According to him, this is also another crucial point for their next project. Especially he aims to argue how to fight against fear, and to my surprise he referred to a nuclear deterrence for example (now the situation of North Korea is drastically changing, though).

However, it seems to me that he still stick to the positive side of emotion. He repeatedly stressed the importance of passion. Interestingly, he never appreciate Alain, because according to him neo-Stoicist like Alain only recommend to sustain emotions and such negative way don't lead to positive act. It is quite interesting that both Negri and Alain frequently cited Spinoza (*Les passions de l'ame*), but reached to different attitude. I do not think this interpretation is fair for Alain, but this shows his basic understanding about the role of emotion.

## **VI. Implication of Negri, or interaction between Negri and me for advancing the study of Global Relations (Global Studies) as a whole (SLIDE <30> ~ <32>)**

### **6.1 Dialectical way of argument about societal change**

Lastly, I review the findings and implication from this ongoing study. As for the fallacy of dialectical way, but me and Negri have not find any clear answer. To talk about change without depending on such dialectical way is possible or not. Or, is there a better way of doing it? This lead us to think about how we construct a theory, especially for prospecting future.

### **6.2 Western and Non-Western Cultural aspects**

Second point invites me to study those cultural issues. I do not want to denounce their view, but I think we need to build a more comprehensive view on history (you may call it global history if you wish) and the in-

roducing the element of culture, especially the analysis of interaction between cultures into their theoretical construct might be of some help.

In this context, I also have an interest of the way of their collaboration and a comparison of translation of their books. Negri told us that he had a trouble in Chinese translation, because Empire means traditionally China itself.

### **6.3 Emotion and Intelligence**

As I have noticed, I think their treatment of emotion is somewhat biased, taking only one sides. If I may pose more balanced theoretical framework made from my researches, that might help their argument more persuasive.

### **6.4 Theory (Philosophy) and Practice**

This point stems from my observation on the self-referential or self-reflexive aspects in the discourse on globalization. Negri and Hardt also cannot get out of this structure. And also one further research topic is to investigated relations between what they do and what they write. My speculation is that the idea of multitude and common partly stems from their way of collaboration.

### **6.5 Scholar and Activist**

Last point is very classical polemic about normative aspects and descriptive aspects in academic writings. We agree that 100% genuine and pure objectivity is not possible and there must be some kind of bias in every academic works. Here, my purpose is not to criticize Negri that he is biased, but to elucidate how he or they managed to control both aspects in their collaboration and in their writings.

## **VII. Conclusion – Conversation continues (SLIDE <33>)**

### **Future prospects**

So, the conversation with Negri continues, by making a reworked script of the interview and publish. I also think about interviewing Michael Hardt, in order to ask some questions arisen. And as well as other scholars, I think his intellectual style or characteristics could be found in his early writings and if my Italian become good enough someday, I might try to analyze them. Together with the issue of translation and collaboration, there is a long but interesting research subject in front of me.

Vielen Dank!

注記) 本稿は「講演録」である関係上、文末のスライドと照らし合わせつつご覧いただけると幸いです。便宜のため、文中に対応するスライドの箇所を示しておいた。

謝辞) ドイツ語・フランス語の要約に関しては、EuropainstitutのCornelia Knabb氏とDominique Biebl氏の多大な助力を得た。ここに感謝の意を表したい。

  **EUROPAINSTITUT**  
Institute for European Global Studies

24.4.2018  
Seminar Room, EuropaInstitut, University of Basel

Working Lunch  
«Towards Global Multitude and Assembly: An  
Analysis of the Works of Antonio Negri »  
A project now working in progress

Atsushi Shibasaki, Ph.D.  
Professor, Faculty of Global Media Studies,  
Komazawa University, Japan  
Guest Professor, EuropaInstitut, University of  
Basel, Switzerland

<1>

I. Introduction – How I encountered with Mr. Negri  
PHASE TWO: 1999-2009

04 “You ain’t goin’ nowhere:  
prolegomena for the aporia of IR as a  
discipline” (2000)

05 Self, State, and International  
Relations: Tomonaga Sanjuro  
(1871-1951), Immanuel Kant, and the  
naissance of the worldview in modern  
Japan (2009) based on Ph.D. thesis  
\*abridged English version available

<4>

I. Introduction – How I encountered with Mr. Negri  
1.1 Academic interests

©history, thought and philosophy, theory and  
discipline of/on international relations and  
international cultural relations from interdisciplinary  
perspective  
©culture, cultural relations, cultural change as  
mutual process  
©what is the concept “international relations?”:  
Obsolescence of the discipline of IR  
©from the study of international relations towards a  
discipline called “Global Relations”: comprehensive  
description of the world as a whole, humanity as a  
whole: How do we describe it, and how to change the  
world and people on earth better based on the  
renewed description

<2>

I. Introduction – How I encountered with Mr. Negri  
PHASE THREE: 2009-2015

06 History of thoughts and ideas on  
foreign cultural policy in modern  
Japan, 1919-2012 (2013)

07 Thought and Behavior on the Idea  
of the ‘international’: Towards the  
study of global relations (2015)  
contains major previous researches

<5>

I. Introduction – How I encountered with Mr. Negri  
1.2 Research history

PHASE ONE: 1995-1999

History of international cultural relations (ICR) in  
modern Japan

01 Japan America Student Conference, 1934-40  
(1999) based on graduation thesis  
02 International Cultural Relations and Modern Japan:  
History of Kokusai Bunka Shinkokai (KBS, the center for  
international cultural relations), 1935-45 (1999) based  
on M.A. thesis \*abridged English version available  
03 Kotaro Tanaka (1889-1974) and his thought and  
behavior concerning international culture and  
international relations (1999) \*abridged English version  
available

<3>

I. Introduction – How I encountered with Mr. Negri  
PHASE FOUR 2015-present

08 The Future of the Study of International Relations: From the study of  
international realtions to the study of Global Relations (in The Annals of  
Japanese Political Science Association, 2015-1) (2015)  
09 Deconstructing the Westphalian Discourse: International Relations as  
Historiography (co-written and co-edited) (2016) \*abridged English draft is  
available  
10 Akira Yanabu and The act of Translation in modern Japan (Review  
article, 2017 in English, in Journal of Global Media Studies n.21, to be  
published in May 2018 in Japanese, in International Relations, annals of  
The Japan Association of International Relations n.191)  
11 International Cultural Relations between disciplines of international  
relations (2018 in Japanese, in Journal of Global Media Studies n.22, with  
English and German summary)  
12 Bob Dylan as the ‘sound’ and its relevance to peace studies (in Peace  
and Sound: Peace Studies, annals of Peace Studies Association of Japan  
n.50, to be published in July 2018)  
13 Is it Really the End of IR As We Know It? (working title) (co-edited) (to  
be published in October 2018)  
14 Concept of Time and the Study of International Relations (in  
Challenges towards making of Chronopolitics, edited by Ryosuke Takahashi  
and Nozomu Yamazaki, Minerva Publishing, to be published in 2019)

<6>

Towards Global Multitude and Assembly: An Analysis of the Works of  
Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt (Atsushi Shibasaki)

I. Introduction – How I encountered with Mr. Negri  
Then,

Negri 3 (in English, based on this seminar, 2018)

Negri 4 (conversation with Negri, February 8, 2018-19, Paris, translation: Prof. Pullano, both in English and Japanese)

Negri 5 (future contribution for the project, Politics in the Post-Globalized World (working title), to be published around 2019-20).

<7>

III. Basic Structure and Concepts in their works

In Sum

Today's world: Struggle between Empire and Multitude, network of rulers vs network of ruled

Enjeu: the Common

How: Assembly

<10>

II. Antonio Negri and his collaboration with Michael Hardt

2.1 Profile of Negri and Hardt

Antonio Negri (1933-) born in Padua/1953-54 became communist/1953-66 Italian Communist Party/1967-79 Professor of the University of Padua, intellectual activist, socialism, operaismo, autonomia/ 1979-83 arrested/ 1983-97 exiled to Paris/1997-2003 back to Italy and back to prison/2003- Paris based activities

Michael Hardt (1960-) born in Maryland/ comparative literature, literary theory, philosophy/1986- met Negri, moved to Paris, received Ph.D on Deleuze / Professor at Duke

<8>

III. Basic Structure and Concepts in their works

3.1 Empire (2000)

3.1.1 Empire

a) Network of three-layered sovereignty

1> First tier of Pyramid: USA (global military power and international cooperation), powerful major states (ex. G7, Dvos etc... controlling and parasitizing global economy), other 'heterogeneous set of associations'

2> Second tier: Networks of transnational capitalist corporations, other nation states

3> Third tier: Media, religious organizations, NGOs, etc.

<11>

II. Antonio Negri and his corroboration with Michael Hardt

2.2 Collaboration with Michael Hardt (1960-)

Labor of Dionysus: a Critique of the State-form (1994)

★Empire (2000)

★Multitude (2003)

★Commonwealth (2009)

Declaration (2012)

Assembly (2017)

(Next Project (20??))

<9>

III. Basic Structure and Concepts in their works

(IN THEIR WORDS)

Throughout the contemporary transformations, political controls, state functions, and regulatory mechanisms have continued to rule the realm of economic and social production and exchange. Our basic hypothesis is that sovereignty has taken a new form, composed of a series of national and supranational organisms united under a single logic of rule. This new global form of sovereignty is what we call Empire. (Empire, xii).

Empire is the political subject that effectively regulates these global exchanges, the sovereign power that governs the world. (xi)

It(Empire) is a decentered and deteriorizing apparatus of rule that progressively incorporates the entire global realm within its open, expanding frontiers. (xii)

<12>

**III. Basic Structure and Concepts in their works**

3.1.2 Basic features

- a) No outside: covers globally, always absorbing outside, cannot get out
- b) Decentered/deteritoriarized, not only USA: it's everywhere, heterarchical
- c) Biopower and Society of control (Foucault, Surveiller et punir, Naissance de la prison (1975), Histoire de la sexualité,(1976,84,2018), etc.): from 'to kill' to 'to control every aspect of lives'

(IN THEIR OWN WORDS)

Biopower is a form of power that regulates social life from its interior, following it, interpreting it, absorbing it...The highest function of this power is to invest life through and through, and its primary task is to administer life. (24)

<13>

**III. Basic Structure and Concepts in their works**

3.2.2 Common (2009)

- a) The Common (commonality): through cooperation and communication of multitude

Examples of common

- 1: natural resources (land, air, water, ocean, river, woods, species, etc.)
- 2: biopolitical productions by immaterial and cooperative labor (knowledge, language, idea, image, code, passion, human relations, etc.)

(IN THEIR OWN WORDS)

Our point of departure is our recognition that the production of subjectivity and the production of the common can together from a spiral, symbiotic relationship. Subjectivity, in other words, is produced through cooperation and communication and, in turn, this produced subjectivity itself produces new forms of cooperation and communication, which in turn produce new subjectivity, and so forth. (189)

<16>

**III. Basic Structure and Concepts in their works**

3.1.3 Backgrounds

- a) 1990s: Post-cold war era, Gulf war, regional conflicts, IT revolution, RMA, globalization
- b) Another history is possible: 13-16c subjectivation process ('Humans declared themselves masters of their own lives, producers of cities and history, and inventors of heavens'(70)), but oppressed
- c) Immaterial labor and biopolitical production with cooperation
- d) Multitude is the mother of Empire, not vice versa

(IN THEIR OWN WORDS)

Empire pretends to be the master of that world because it can destroy it. What a horrible illusion! In reality we are masters of the world because our desire and labor regenerate it continuously. The biopolitical world is an inexhaustible weaving together of generative actions, of which the collective (as meeting point of singularities) is the motor. (388)

<14>

**III. Basic Structure and Concepts in their works**

- b) Global revolution

from <identity-property-sovereignty> to <singularity-Common-revolution>

- d) Global absolute democracy through political love and joy (also from Spinoza)

(IN THEIR OWN WORDS)

"We need to recuperate the public and political conception of love common to premodern traditions."(352)

The new movements demanding global democracy not only value the singularity of each as a fundamental organizing principle but they also pose it as a process of self-transformation, hybridization, and miscegenation. The multiplicity of the multitude is not just a matter of being different but also of becoming different. Become different than you are! These singularities, ac in common and thus form a new race, that is, a politically coordinated subjectivity that multitude produces. The Primary decision made by the multitude is really the decision to create a new race or, rather, a new humanity. When love is conceived politically, then this creation of a new humanity is the ultimate act of love. (356)

<17>

**III. Basic Structure and Concepts in their works**

3.2 Multitude and Common

3.2.1 Multitude (2003)

- a) Multitude: network of people with singularities, owners of biopolitical production/immaterial labor, and producer of the common by exercising constituent power

(IN THEIR OWN WORDS)

The multitude too might thus be conceived as a network: an open and expansive network in which all differences can be expressed freely and equally, a network that provides the means of encounter so that we can work and live in common. (Negri and Hardt 2003: xiv)

Singularities: "a social subject whose difference cannot be reduced to sameness, a difference that remains different."(99)

- b) Not people, not mob, not mass, not crowd, the poor but "living fresh"

- c) Goal: global absolute democracy=democracy of everyone (Spinoza), not many, not ochlocracy

<15>

**III. Basic Structure and Concepts in their works**

3.2.3 Backgrounds

- a) Multitude: Global Apartheid (from 9.11 to Iraq War): Globalization of civil wars, global inequality and global governance
- b) Common: after global financial crisis, from Bush to Obama
- c) Movements of 'exodus': EZLN (1994), MST, Seattle (1999), WSF (2000-), Genova Summit (2001), Anti-Iraq War Protest(2002-) etc.

<18>

Towards Global Multitude and Assembly: An Analysis of the Works of  
Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt (Atsushi Shibasaki)

**III. Basic Structure and Concepts in their works**

3.3 Declaration (2012) and Assembly (2017)

- a) Declaration: agenda re-setting in the midst of new democratic movement  
Present situation of subjectivity: the indebted/ the mediatized/ the securitized/ the represented → let's overturn!
- b) Assembly: new type of leadership (entrepreneurship of multitude), Multitude assemblage and machinic assemblages (agencements machiniques, Deleuze et Guattari) human and nonhuman

<19>

**IV. Interpretation, and Questions towards Negri**

4.2 Critics

4.2.1 Is it really possible or better to overturning the modern principles?

- \* from <identity-property-sovereignty> to <singularity-<common>-revolution> (in Common)
- \* exodus from sovereignty, not emancipation but liberation, create happiness

- a) Is it possible?  
Are there some merits in <i-p-s> in order to maintain the political order?
- b) Meaning of "liberation" What would happen when the former was abandoned?

<22>

**IV. Interpretation, and Questions towards Negri**

4.1 Appreciation: Overlapping interests

- a) Description of the world and people as a whole: Empire vs IR (global governance etc..)

IR and Marxism: oil and water, but now Marxism based description of the world outstrips?

- b) Description of the comprehensive epistemological basis in the modern/postmodern world, and challenge to overcome constitutional epistemological mechanism of modern world (how to tackle with sovereignty)

<20>

**IV. Interpretation, and Questions towards Negri**

4.2.2 Is future always ambiguous?

- a) Various kinds of people: Multitude/could be but cannot be/could be but do not wish to be/don't want to be

	Able	Unable
Willing	Multitude	2
Unwilling	3	4

<23>

**IV. Interpretation, and Questions towards Negri**

from <Self-State-International Relations> (exclusive, hierarchical) to <Empire-Multitude> (network, open), but both based on human subjectivity

In brief, this was a three-tiered structure: the individual, rooted in an independent and autonomous Self, the nation-state (society), made up of such individuals, and international relations (society), constituted of these independent and autonomous nation-states and premised on non-dissolution into a world state. We can provisionally call this "Self-State-International Relations". It is a cross-referential mechanism that specifies the modern worldview and acts as a framework for asking the question, "What is international relations" in modern times. The modern epistemology of international relations has, whichever way we look at it, undeniably assumed a kind of world based on this mechanism, regardless of whether we accept it or criticize it. (From English translation of my paper, translated by Gainer Sekimori)

- c) Challenge to seek the happiness and welfare for all: issue of common material, cultural, environmental, etc.
- d) Challenge to how to change the world: assembly and global revolution
- e) Putting emphasis on emotion: passion, love, joy, laugh vs fear.

<21>

**IV. Interpretation, and Questions towards Negri**

cf. The Great Inspector in Brothers Karamazov (1880), the power of Gleichschaltung by Nazi regime in Milton Mayer, They thought they were free (1955)

To live in this process is absolutely not to be able to notice it, please try to believe me unless one has a much greater degree of political awareness, acuity, than most of us had ever had occasion to develop. Each step was so small, so inconsequential, so well explained or, on occasion, regretted, that, unless one were detached from the whole process from the beginning, unless one understood what the whole thing was in principle, what all these little measures that no patriotic German could resent must some day lead to, one no more saw it developing from day to day than a farmer in his field sees the corn growing. One day it is over his head (Mayer, op. cit., p. 168)

<24>

**IV. Interpretation, and Questions towards Negri**

b) Underestimation of the power of Empire and overestimation of the power of Multitude?

Principiis obsta, Finem respice : not so easy

c) Only seeing a bright side?

<25>

**IV. Interpretation, and Questions towards Negri**

4.2.5 Emotion: Love and hate

- a) Putting into the element of emotion into social science, without 'killing' the essence of emotion
- b) The power of controlling people by fear, anger and hate (Orwell, terrorism, false flag operations, etc.)
- c) How to control emotions: urge theory (Masanao Toda) and beyond, how to manage one's situated cognition that leads to urge some kind of emotion
- d) one useful optimistic way of dealing with emotion: Propos d'Alain?

Et si vous allez quêter la joie, faites d'abord provision de joie. Remerciez avant d'avoir reçu. Car l'espérance fait naître les raisons d'espérer, et le bon présage fait arriver la chose. Que tout soit donc bon présage et signe favorable : « C'est du bonheur, si tu veux, que le corbeau t'annonce », dit Épicète. Et il ne veut pas dire seulement par là qu'il faut faire joie de tout ; mais surtout que la bonne espérance fait réelle joie de tout, parce qu'elle change l'événement. (Alain, Propos sur le Bonheur, 1928, XX Humour)

<28>

**IV. Interpretation, and Questions towards Negri**

4.2.3 Western Philosophy and non-western practices

- a) How to be a multitude: Must we all really read Negri and Hardt or Spinoza, and understand history of Western philosophy like him? Practice makes philosophy or philosophy makes practice?
- b) Seeing from the 'non-western' world  
Modernity is particular; Indigenous is universal (Yusuke Maki, 1977)  
Altermodernity (in Common) is not hard to find?
- c) Do they need to overcome modernity in the same way and through the same route as Negri and Hardt do and go? Different paths but similar goals in reality

Ex. Makoto Oda (1932-2007, activist and author, who initiated most important and hugest citizen movement in post-war Japan), Yo Naoshi No Rinri To Ronri (Ethics and Logics of World Restoration) (1972):

Entangled can strike back because of being entangled: The ordinary people who are entangled, involved, and ruled by authorities from above, but because of being entangled, we can entangle back!

#Negri and Hardt are also one of such intellectual multitude?

<26>

**V. Response from Negri**

V. Response from Negri

5.2.1 Is it possible or better to overturning the modern principles?

"You made the same mistake!"

5.2.2 Is future always ambiguous (a coin always has two sides)?

Negri as activist

5.2.3 Western Philosophy and non-western practices

One of the most critical point in their next project: culture, non-western elements

5.2.4 People

Labor is the most important element, but:...

4.2.5 Laugh, Joy, and Love

Another crucial point in their next project, especially fear  
Passion (Spinoza) is important, not killing emotions like neo-Stoicism does

<29>

**IV. Interpretation, and Questions towards Negri**

4.2.4 People

- a) Multitude is basically labors, people who work. How about other powerless people, "the poorest of the poor (Mother Theresa)"? If we include such people in their argument, what happens?
- b) The usage of "people" and "everyone" in their writings

<27>

**VI. Implication of Negri, or interaction between Negri and me for advancing the study of Global Relations (Global Studies) as a whole**

6.1 Dialectical way of argument about societal change

- a) From A to B, A to post A, After A
- b) Reality is not simple and Negri knows it.

6.2 Western and Non-Western Cultural aspects

- a) Element of western centrism in Negri and Hardt, not for denouncing but for helping them
- b) What happens when people encounter different culture?  
Cf. acculturation process
- c) Issue about collaboration, translation (ex. translation of Empire (帝国) in China)

6.3 Emotion and Intelligence

- a) How to make and keep a stable balance between igniting and repressing emotions
- b) Negri seems to concentrate more on setting a fire.

<30>

Towards Global Multitude and Assembly: An Analysis of the Works of  
Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt (Atsushi Shibasaki)

**VI. Implication of Negri, or interaction between Negri and me for advancing the study of Global Relations (Global Studies) as a whole**

6.4 Theory (Philosophy) and Practice

- a) The act of publishing those works and doing activities related to what they write is also a practice as multitude.
- b) They are also one of the "bees" (Mandeville, from their quote), one of intellectual multitude in the world, but they have been occupying some kind of privileged position.
- c) The process of producing these works as the origin of their view (cooperation, common, machinic assembly to write from Empire to Assembly)?

6.5 Scholar and Activist

- a) Tendency to seeing one side of the coin, arbitrarily (drop the other side, in their structure of argument and interpretation of cited philosophers and theorists)
- b) Issue of subjective bias in academic writings
- c) How he conceives this issue? Resistance is his starting point?

<31>

Thank you / Danke schön / Merci beaucoup/ Grazie Mille



<34>

**VII. Conclusion – Conversation continues**

Future prospects

- a) Continuing conversations
- b) Interview with Michael Hardt, or other important figures
- c) His intellectual roots by analyzing his early initial works (Hegel, Dilthey, Kant)
- d) Comparison of various translations of their works in many languages
- e) Investigating the process of their collaboration: Which comes from which? Need to disassemble and reassemble their works

<32>

**VII. Conclusion – Conversation continues**

(Early writings by Negri)

Stato e diritto nel giovane Hegel: studio sulla genesi illuministica della filosofia giuridica e politica di Hegel. Padova, Cedam, 1958.  
Saggi sullo storicismo tedesco: Dilthey e Meinecke. Milano, Feltrinelli, 1959.  
Alle origini del formalismo giuridico: studio sul problema della forma in Kant e nei giuristi kantiani tra il 1789 e il 1802. Padova, Cedam, 1962.  
Scritti di filosofia del diritto : 1802-1803 di G. W. F. Hegel. Bari, Laterza, 1963.

<33>

