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The theoretical scope of Fujita Shōzō’s later concept of contemporary totalitarianism: integrating ‘totalitarianism towards unruffled ease’ and ‘totalitarianism as market economy’

Takamichi Sakurai

ABSTRACT

My research explores the theoretical relevance of the Japanese intellectual historian Fujita Shōzō’s later concept of contemporary totalitarianism, the theoretical essence of which is captured by his concepts of ‘totalitarianism towards unruffled ease’ and ‘totalitarianism as market economy’. His conception of totalitarianism is clearly different from the concept as it is generally understood that his theoretical focus on totalitarian orientations can be seen particularly in his views of contemporary life and the market mechanism. Fujita essentially divides the semantic scope of contemporary totalitarianism into these two socio-political concepts, although he did not build a clear theoretical bridge between them. In this research I argue that Fujita’s concept of contemporary totalitarianism reveals totalitarian orientations in contemporary life under the dialectical social conditions involving the rationalised system of a market economy and the strong narcissistic impulse to satisfy unruffled ease, particularly through seeing twentieth-century society in continuity. Furthermore, I argue that this leads us to critically understand contemporary social and political phenomena, thereby bringing us self-criticism and self-reflection in socio-pathological terms.

1. Introduction

My research examines the essence of the later contributions of the Japanese intellectual historian Fujita Shōzō (1927–2003). The primary focus is on his concept of ‘contemporary totalitarianism’ (gendai zentaishugi), particularly on his two socio-political notions of ‘totalitarianism towards unruffled ease’ (anraku e no zentaishugi) and ‘totalitarianism as market economy’ (shijō keizai zentaishugi). Through this examination, it is possible to identify the theoretical scope of his later work within the discipline of intellectual history. As has often been mentioned, Fujita started his academic career with research on the Tennō system (Tennōsei) under the guidance of Maruyama Masao, a famous political theorist and historian of ideas in Japan.¹ This experience had a powerful impact on
Fujita, who became a historian of ideas, for he laid the foundations of his research using ‘spiritual structure analysis’ (seishin kōzō bunseki), an analytical method that he had learnt from Maruyama. However, he later formulated a distinctive method of ‘intellectual history’ rigorously distinguished from the history of ideas, as seen in his representative later work Seishinshiteki kōsatsu (Reflections on Intellectual History) (1982). It is believed that here, influenced primarily by Georg Simmel and Wilhelm Dilthey, he first showed his original ‘method of illuminating the essence of history by shining a light on the transformation of the living spirit (ikita seishin), thereby succeeding in moving beyond his great mentor’s framework.

Apart from these facts, Fujita’s later scholarly activities are characterised by his political concept of totalitarianism, the idea of which is derived from Fascist Italy. It should be noted, however, that his usage of the concept is quite specific in the sense of its semantic scope. Distinct from the general usage of the term, which simply signifies dictatorial, violent politics controlling a society with the effective use of ideology and terror, such as Nazism, Stalinism and communism in the Cold War context, it stresses the totalitarian aspects of the contemporary way of life and the market mechanism, while still preserving the more general signification. Fujita’s conception of totalitarianism essentially divides its semantic meaning into three levels: ‘totalitarianism as war’ (sensō no zentaishugi), ‘political totalitarianism’ (seijiteki zentaishugi) and ‘contemporary totalitarianism’. ‘Contemporary totalitarianism’ can be further divided into ‘totalitarianism towards unruffled ease’ and ‘totalitarianism as market economy’, both of which focus on the adverse aspects of contemporary society based on the principles of a free market economy.

From this perspective, Fujita attempted to link contemporary market society to totalitarianism through seeking totalitarian orientations in seemingly peaceful, everyday life and democratic practice, thereby criticising and diagnosing the core disease of its spiritual structure. In this discussion, I argue that Fujita’s concept of contemporary totalitarianism reveals totalitarian orientations in the contemporary way of life under the dialectical social conditions involving the rationalised system of a market economy that causes alienation and the strong narcissistic impulse to satisfy unruffled ease. Moreover, I argue that this leads us to critically understand contemporary social and political phenomena, thereby bringing us self-criticism and self-reflection in socio-pathological terms.

Firstly, I will offer a brief account of Fujita’s criticism of Japan’s high-speed growth and its place in his conception of totalitarianism. Secondly, I will give a brief description of Fujita’s categorisation of totalitarianism, focusing on his three kinds of totalitarianism. Finally, through describing his later intellectual formation, I will give a detailed account of Fujita’s concept of ‘contemporary totalitarianism’, especially his two socio-political notions of ‘totalitarianism towards unruffled ease’ and ‘totalitarianism as market economy’, and thereafter define the theoretical scope of the notion.

2. Fujita’s criticism of Japan’s high-speed growth

As has often been mentioned, Fujita’s scholarly activities are best described by his transformation from a criticism of the Tennō system to a criticism of Japan’s high-speed growth (kōdo seicho), a significant economic progress that occurred in Japan between the mid-1950s and the early 1970s. In his early contributions (the early 1950s to the late
1960s), Fujita conducted research on the Tennō system using spiritual structure analysis. In his later contributions (the late 1960s to the late 1990s), he changed the object of his research to totalitarianism and to a criticism of its political involvement in the everyday-life dimension, while continuing to apply that same analytical method. Through witnessing defeat in the anti-Security Treaty struggle (Anpo tōsō) in the 1960s and postwar Japan’s devotion to kōdo seichō during the 1950s-1970s, especially in the 1960s, Fujita’s orientation moved towards criticising the root of societal evils, which he saw as a totalitarian impulse to achieve high economic success and eliminate whatever obstacles might impede progress towards this goal. In other words, he believed that the spiritual-structural problems of the Tennō system were transformed into those of kōdo seichō by the two crucial historical events in postwar Japan: the conclusion of the Security Treaty and kōdo seichō.

On the basis of this recognition, Fujita restarted his academic career, publishing an interview entitled “‘Kōdo seichō’ hantai’ (A protest against Japan’s high-speed growth) (1969), in which he directly and emphatically criticised kōdo seichō. The essence of his work can be briefly summarised: ‘he first bitterly opposed “society nudging itself towards ‘high-speed growth’”’.6 In the 1980s, Fujita identified the essence of Japan’s high-speed economic growth as totalitarianism; this is clearly indicated in his socio-political concepts, especially in ‘totalitarianism towards unruffled ease’ and ‘totalitarianism as market economy’.7 This is why, in his theory, the concept of totalitarianism plays a predominant role in the context of his criticism of kōdo seichō in his later years.

3. Fujita’s definition of totalitarianism

According to Fujita, there are three types of totalitarianism: ‘totalitarianism as a way of war’ (sensō no arikata ni okeru zentaishugi), ‘totalitarianism as a way of political rule’ (seiji shihai no arikata ni okeru zentaishugi) and ‘totalitarianism as a contemporary way of life’ (seikatsu yōshiki ni okeru zentaishugi). These terms can be abbreviated, respectively, to ‘totalitarianism as war’, ‘political totalitarianism’ and ‘contemporary totalitarianism’.³ The first concept is explained by referring to World War I, which is, in his view, characterised by a ‘commercial war’ and a ‘war of attrition’.⁹ The emergence of ‘total war’ and ‘mass destruction’ that results, says Fujita, typifies totalitarianism as war. The second concept is archetypically described by Hannah Arendt’s conception of totalitarianism, a totalitarian, political rule that controls a society under mass social conditions by using ‘ideology’ and ‘terror’, generating ‘displaced persons’.¹⁰ The third concept has both institutional and psychological aspects of contemporary society; the characteristics of a free market society, however, capture its essence. The first aspect of this describes Fujita’s contemporary totalitarianism in terms of the free market mechanism; this is clearly explained by his concept of totalitarianism as market economy. The second aspect describes it in terms of the psychological mechanism of contemporary people and society, as elucidated by his concept of totalitarianism towards unruffled ease. According to Fujita, these two aspects characterise the concept of contemporary totalitarianism as a new way of life that has come into existence by integrating into contemporary society the two other types that previously emerged.

Significantly, Fujita’s contemporary totalitarianism shows its raison d’être to reveal the adverse aspects of contemporary society in socio-pathological terms.¹¹ It is important
to note that the primary reason for this characteristic of the concept is precisely that he recognises totalitarian orientations even in postwar society on grounds for some major societal similarities between postwar and wartime, thereby seeing twentieth-century society in continuity; society therefore needs diagnosis in socio-pathological terms. To be aware of this focal point concerning the theoretical relevance of the concept is particularly important in understanding not simply Fujita’s theory of totalitarianism but also his social and political theory, for they are both characterised by its theoretical function. Above all, his two socio-political concepts of ‘totalitarianism towards unruffled ease’ and ‘totalitarianism as market economy’ play a central role in its socio-pathological task.

4. Fujita’s concept of contemporary totalitarianism: ‘totalitarianism towards unruffled ease’ and ‘totalitarianism as market economy’

4.1. The Tennō system and totalitarianism

In his later years, particularly in the 1990s, Fujita, on the basis of his hypothesis, devoted himself to explaining why Japanese society was totalitarian during the twentieth century, even in the postwar period; perhaps the question of why it is so even today is still relevant. He answers that Japan in the twentieth century inherited from past societies the root of evils, the Tennō system in the form of the ‘Tennō system society’ (Tennōsei shakai), which shows its raison d’être as avoiding the destruction of harmony in the ‘existential form of fear that individuality is exposed’. Tennō, a symbol of society, comes into being as a god carried on a ‘mikoshi’ portable shrine, a miniature of the societal system. According to Fujita, the Tennō system manifested itself as totalitarianism after the Russo-Japanese war (1904–1905), whereby Japan’s ‘Tennō system state’ (Tennōsei kokka), based on the political act of statesmen, transformed itself into the Tennō system society, a society based on a symbolic character, status and authority, which is profoundly associated with Japan’s totalitarian orientations. Tennō was thereby transformed from a political actor into a ritual being in particular. From these perspectives, it is acknowledged that the Tennō system inherently contains totalitarianism.

Fujita’s conception of totalitarianism, linking its concept to the Tennō system in terms of his distinctive social theory, might look a bit odd, particularly in the sense of its theoretical focus on socio-character features rather than on a political system per se, in addition to his specific usage of the word, as can be seen in his concept of contemporary totalitarianism structured as the main theoretical ingredient of the conception. However, it is of vital importance to recognise his distinctive intellectual formation exactly in this point since his later spiritual transformation, which started with Seishinshiteki kōsatsu in the early 1980s, reached its climax in the mid-1980s, particularly by introducing the term totalitarianism (zentaishugi). The introduction of the word was aimed at clarifying postwar society’s totalitarian phenomena that were described precisely by ‘contemporary totalitarianism’. In addition, it must be noted that Fujita related postwar Japan’s Tennō system to totalitarianism in the spiritual dimension by discerning totalitarian aspects of society in the pathological socio-economic phenomenon kōdo seichō. Most importantly, here we can clearly recognise the intellectual historian Fujita Shōzō who seeks to identify a spiritual continuity in history in more global terms by way of spiritual structure analysis. From this perspective, let us next look into the detailed content of his contemporary totalitarianism.
4.2. Totalitarianism towards unruffled ease

As mentioned above, in the later thoughts of Fujita, the concept of totalitarianism has vital importance in the sense that it fulfils a core function in his later social and political theory. However, the theoretical point of his conception of totalitarianism is that it rather highlights some of the totalitarian orientations of contemporary society, absorbing the critical essence of his conception of the ‘Tennō system. As we saw above, Fujita finds that Japan has historically continued to be totalitarian, taking the three forms of totalitarianism as war, political totalitarianism and contemporary totalitarianism. In this sense, it has contemporary relevance that contributes to identifying societal evils invisible behind society’s peaceful appearance in a way that reveals its social pathologies; the conception is therefore essentially separate from the concept of totalitarianism in general.

His concepts of totalitarianism towards unruffled ease and totalitarianism as market economy, as can be seen particularly in the economic movement and psychological mechanism of kōdo seichō, clearly show these facts. Essentially, the former concept signifies the characteristics of a society controlled by ‘the strong narcissistic impulse to satisfy unruffled ease’. This aspect of contemporary society is therefore described in terms of its psychological mechanism, as explained above. This mechanism is elucidated by his assertion that ‘contemporary society does not hesitate to exterminate all the things causing discomfort’, and ‘is [thus] driven by the desire to root out the uncomfortable to obtain “ease”’. According to Fujita, this psychology requires avoiding encounters with whomever and whatever is not known beforehand. It therefore forces one to encapsulate oneself in a ‘cocoon-like chamber’ (hoikuki), as he calls it, in which one stays only with homogeneous friends without heterogeneity. On this view, Fujita maintains as follows:

Others (tasha), whether human beings or things, are avoided so as not to suddenly encounter them; one encapsulates himself. In a cocoon-like chamber, he feels really comfortable only with homogeneous friends. In this way, experience, aiming to establish interpersonal relationships with others, is eliminated.

This psychological attitude, says Fujita, leads people to apply a kind of ‘apriorism’ (senken-shugi) whereby everything must be known in advance, and thereby controlling their own psychology, particularly by eliminating whatever induces psychological conflicts such as pain, anxiety and fear. In his view, this aprioristic, psychological impulse causes the pathology of ‘voluntary servitude towards unruffled ease’ (anraku e no jihatsuteki reizoku), the concept of which was coined by Richard Sennett. Because people come to follow the principles of ‘unruffled ease’, they thereby rule society.

On the basis of the above discussion, Fujita later connected the concept with totalitarianism in his work entitled ‘Anraku e no zentaishugi: Jūjitsu wo torimodosu beku’ (Totalitarianism towards unruffled ease: towards the restoration of intersubjectivity) (1985), on the grounds that he found that the spread into an entire society of people’s strong impulse to avoid and eliminate whatever induces discomfort, namely the psychology of ‘uprooted-ness’ (nekogi), precisely signifies the emergence of totalitarianism on a psychological level. Indeed, in this connection, he introduced the concept of totalitarianism to his work in a rigorous sense, which shows exactly the fact that he became much more negative in the mid-1980s than he had been previously. Importantly, this means not only that he discerned totalitarian orientations in postwar Japanese society, which appeared to be peaceful; he also warned against the totalitarian symptom that society was being controlled...
by people’s desire for unruffled ease, thereby functioning in a way that satisfied their needs and leading to control by the mechanism of a society that fulfilled that desire.

4.3. Totalitarianism as market economy

In Fujita’s view, this social condition is totally supported by the market mechanism. He explains that, in this society, fictitious commodities – land, labour and money – fulfill society’s primary function in a way that satisfies people’s need for unperturbed ease, which removes anxiety, pain and discomfort from the society. Fujita first argues, however, that currency occupied this world by representing all value and wealth, and that society was thereby controlled by its mechanism. He says:

Currency (kahei) essentially based on the principle of currency (ryūdō, ryūtsū) represents all wealth – what a paradox! Doesn’t currency (ryūdō) representing all kinds of values and wealth precisely characterise totalitarianism per se? … Isn’t it a new totalitarianism in a different dimension, and wasn’t it formed by the original and classical type, which emerged in the catastrophic 1930s, in so far as fierce and ceaseless mobilisation (ryūdō and ryūtsū) sucks everything – figurations, objects and things – out of society, and in so far as its world typifies this feature, regardless of the banner?

This world, Fujita argues, reduced everything to a ‘simple quantitative dimension’ (ryōteki jigen e no kangen) by which society was considerably rationalised. He then argues that ‘the psychology that has a strong impulse to sweep out everything inducing discomfort and pain’ functions in the way that currency worked. From this perspective, he sees the essence of the reduction as ‘rationalising without reason’. He maintains that today’s finished products and completed devices, which have transformed the human capacity for imagination, are all produced in accordance with the ‘deductive-nomological model’ … Products, in this way, embody rationality. The embodiment of rationality means, therefore, exactly that finished goods completely rob the human mind of reason. Commodities produced come into existence from the absorption of things into reason, and ‘rationalisation’ as the finished reification of reason is completed when products completely deprive man of reason.

According to Fujita, ‘Reducing things which have been sophisticated through being affected by Western civilisation to a simple quantitative dimension’ means exactly the emergence of totalitarianism on a different level, that is of ‘a new type of totalitarianism’, since ‘representing all kinds of values and wealth precisely characterise totalitarianism’. In this way, the whole of society began to perform the function of satisfying people’s strong desire for unruffled ease, another aspect of totalitarianism in the contemporary world.

5. The theoretical scope of the concept of contemporary totalitarianism in terms of Fujita’s self-reflective and self-critical position

5.1. Between a thinker and a critical theorist

Can we find an indication of the theoretical scope of Fujita’s concept of contemporary totalitarianism in terms of the above analysis? At first glance, the concept is quite negative, pessimistic and critical; in fact, it is. However, it is particularly important to know the reason for this. It would seem that the concept captures these adverse
characteristics primarily because it absorbs not simply Arendt’s conception of totalitarianism but also the Marxist cultural criticism and the Hegelian-Marxist dialectic. This combination draws particular attention to paradoxical and dialectical social phenomena in self-reflective and self-critical terms, thereby reshaping society.\(^3\) This leads to Fujita’s emphasis on the negative social elements induced by a free market economy.\(^3\) Indeed, this is why Fujita’s later theory is sometimes considered to function as a critical theory.\(^3\)

However, the reason for the adverse characteristics of Fujita’s conception of totalitarianism must be explained not only by the above-described theoretical influences, but also by his actual experience of living in the twentieth century. As we have seen, the conclusion of the US-Japan Security Treaty and Japan’s devotion to kōdo seichō during the 1950s–1970s profoundly affected Fujita’s theoretical stance as well as his academic concern. In fact, these events provoked his interest in and reflections on the concept of totalitarianism.\(^3\) In particular, it is supposed that he was negatively influenced by postwar Japan’s transformation into the bubble economy in the late 1980s, which emerged as an extension of kōdo seichō. From these perspectives, it was quite natural that Fujita should start his academic career with an analysis of the spiritual structure of the Tennō system and end it with an analysis of the spiritual structure of totalitarianism, the politics of which emerged at the beginning of the twentieth century. The former political movement captures and embodies some of the primary aspects of the latter political structure, including its ideology, especially in twentieth-century Japan. It is no mystery that he found totalitarian orientations in postwar Japan’s mass society.

Having said this, it is, to be sure, difficult, only in historical terms, to sufficiently account for Fujita’s later intellectual transformation, particularly in his work of conceptualising totalitarianism, for its conception was no doubt formulated on the basis of his early intellectual foundations. In this respect, Fujita’s intellectual activities remained permanently under the influence of Maruyama, both in his early and later works. What is distinctive about Fujita, however, is his more negative and pessimistic attitudes, particularly towards the contemporary free market society that he believed must be transformed. This is profoundly associated with his unconscious position as a critical theorist; his concept of contemporary totalitarianism is essentially its representation.\(^3\) This is also explained by the fact that he sought to shed light on socio-pathological phenomena as represented by kōdo seichō from psychological and psychoanalytic perspectives. Nevertheless, he is not a simple social critic reduced to being a political commentator, but rather he is a definite intellectual who expresses opinions to lead both society and the individual to self-reflection precisely in the Critical Theory sense, thereby bringing them back down to earth. To this extent, Fujita has quite correctly been referred to by some as the ‘last thinker in contemporary Japan’, for it seems that in the country nowadays a person who earnestly considers and aggressively criticises society, and who at the same time influences people, is nowhere to be found.\(^3\)

### 5.2. Fujita’s self-reflective and self-critical position on market economy: his focus on spiritual continuity in history

From these perspectives, what is most important in the issue is to be aware of Fujita’s self-reflective and self-critical standpoint that illuminates contemporary social and political
phenomena by identifying the spiritual by-products of the market economy and a contemporary way of life. In this respect, the concept has socio-pathological, theoretical functions. At the same time, however, I must point out some of the problems with the notion. First, it does not offer any positive viewpoint with respect to our democratic politics, but rather focuses simply on the negative aspects of contemporary society, especially on those of a free market society. Second, the concept serves to blur the distinction between traditional and contemporary problems. Third, it simply identifies common aspects of present and past societies. Fourth, with respect to the second and third problems there exists the difficulty of whether it is appropriate to apply the term totalitarianism to advanced postwar societies in the first place. From these perspectives, it must be noted that ‘the taste of a soup including some vegetables can be masked in accordance with the quantity and quality of pepper’, or, more accurately, ‘both the problems and benefits of contemporary society are masked by a strong flavour of totalitarianism’,36 with respect to his way of using the concept.

Having said this, these difficulties do not diminish the raison d’être and relevance of his conception of totalitarianism; rather, it provides us with great opportunities for constructive criticism. Importantly, it gives them by way of a self-critical and self-reflective analysis highlighting the psychological by-products of contemporary market society, particularly of late twentieth-century society. To this extent, the theoretical scope of the concept of contemporary totalitarianism is, in self-critical and self-reflective terms, to reveal totalitarian orientations in a contemporary dialectical, consumptive everyday life, that is in the social conditions of the rationalised system of a market economy and a strong narcissistic impulse to satisfy the desire for unruffled ease. In other words, the concept reveals precisely the fact that people strongly desire a life of comfort by living in a ‘cocoon-like chamber’ while/because they are deprived of humanity by the rationalisation of society through living in the harsh environment of a rationalised market economy, thereby seeking effective ways of finding solutions to the dialectical problem.37 From this self-reflective and self-critical point of view, what Fujita left for our society is an effective way of identifying and dealing with social pathologies in spiritual continuity. Seen in this context, and given the extent to which his intellectual development took place in a way that captured the essence of history through understanding the transformation of the living spirit, it is most reasonable to consider Fujita to be an intellectual historian, regardless of whether he was a thinker or a critical theorist.

6. Conclusion
As we have seen, Fujita’s concept of contemporary totalitarianism captures the theoretical essence of a self-reflective, socio-pathological critique of contemporary market society in terms of the dialectical philosophy of Critical Theory. With regard to the issue of the concept, we should be aware, most importantly, that it has absorbed its critical essence from the Marxist cultural criticism and the Hegelian-Marxist dialectic, based on his mentor’s original standpoint of spiritual structure analysis. In this respect, it is not simply critical and reflective, but rather self-critical and self-reflective in the context of mass society during the mid- to late twentieth century, particularly with respect to Japan’s mass society in its post-high-speed growth period. From this perspective, it must be stressed that this concept has great potential to illuminate the spiritual by-products of
Japan’s economic progress, which was achieved during the mid- to late twentieth century, that can still be seen in twenty-first-century society.

Above all, the concept reveals totalitarian orientations in our contemporary way of life under the dialectical social conditions involving the rationalised system of a market economy and the strong narcissistic impulse to satisfy the desire for unruffled ease, which leads us to critically understand contemporary social and political phenomena, thereby bringing us self-criticism and self-reflection in socio-pathological terms. On this basis, it is possible to discern his scholarly image as an intellectual historian who seeks to identify a spiritual continuity in history in global terms while keeping a firm grip on spiritual structure analysis, thereby finding socio-pathological problems and vital solutions to them.

Notes

1. The Tennō system is Japan’s system of government that structurers a Tennō-centered monarchy.
3. Iida, Sengo seishin no kōbō, 331.
4. See, e.g. Sakurai, Political Theories of Narcissism, 71.
5. See, e.g. Sakurai, “The political theorist Fujita Shōzō”; Sakurai, “A philosophy of experience and totalitarianism in postwar Japan”; Wada, “Fujita Shōzō no sekai no seiritsu”.
8. Ibid., 43, 59–86.
9. Ibid., 49–56.
10. Ibid., 45–9, 56–76.
12. Fujita, Chosakushū 1; Fujita, Chosakushū 6.
13. Fujita, Chosakushū 1, 301–4; cf. Fujita Chosakushū 6, 197; Sakurai, Political Theories of Narcissism, Sect. 5.2.
14. Fujita, Chosakushū 6, 49–61; Fujita, Chosakushū 1, 15–19, 298–304; cf. Sakurai, Political Theories of Narcissism, Sect. 5.2.
15. Sakurai, Political Theories of Narcissism, 105.
16. Fujita, Chosakushū 6, 7–8.
17. Ibid., 7–8.
18. Ibid., 24.
24. Ibid., 82–3; emphasis original.
25. Ibid., 76.
27. Ibid., 7.
29. Fujita, Chosakushū 6, 43, 76, 83.
30. With regard to the theoretical functions of Fujita’s totalitarianism in relation to Critical Theory, see Sakurai, Political Theories of Narcissism, Ch. 5, Sect. 5.4.3.
32. See, e.g. Ichimura, ‘Kaisetsu’; Sakurai, “A philosophy of experience and totalitarianism in postwar Japan”; Sakurai, Political Theories of Narcissism; Ueno, “Infancy and Critical Theory”.
33. Sakurai, Political Theories of Narcissism, Ch. 5, Sect. 5.4.
34. See p. 2 above; cf. Sakurai, “A philosophy of experience and totalitarianism in postwar Japan”.
35. I, “Zainichi chōsenjin no me de mita Fujita Shōzō”.
36. Ibid., 248.
37. With regard to the dialectical condition of contemporary life and the free market system, the Japanese social economist Saitō Hideharu, referring to Fujita’s totalitarianism as market economy, sheds light on a similar issue in terms of the ‘industrial use of nuclear energy’ in his article ‘Genshiryoku no sangyōteki riyō to shijō keizai zentaishugi’ (2013). Here he sees the dialectic of a market economy in the relationship between human capital and totalitarianism as market economy.
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