



## A philosophy of experience and totalitarianism in postwar Japan: Fujita Shōzō's social critique of Japan's high-speed growth

Takamichi Sakurai

To cite this article: Takamichi Sakurai (2018): A philosophy of experience and totalitarianism in postwar Japan: Fujita Shōzō's social critique of Japan's high-speed growth, Global Intellectual History, DOI: [10.1080/23801883.2018.1530065](https://doi.org/10.1080/23801883.2018.1530065)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23801883.2018.1530065>



Published online: 05 Oct 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 232



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)



# A philosophy of experience and totalitarianism in postwar Japan: Fujita Shōzō's social critique of Japan's high-speed growth

Takamichi Sakurai<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Graduate School of Media and Governance, Keio University, Fujisawa, Japan; <sup>b</sup>Department of General Psychiatry, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany

## ABSTRACT

This paper is an intellectual biography of the Japanese social and political theorist Fujita Shōzō focusing on his later work. The centrepiece of his scholarly contributions is an analysis of the Tennō system (*Tennōsei*) and a diagnosis of postwar Japan's totalitarianism from his distinctive socio-pathological perspective. Through a discussion on his philosophy of 'experience' (*keiken*) and theory of 'totalitarianism' (*zentaishugi*), I outline his social critique of Japan's high-speed growth (*kōdo seichō*) in terms of the transformation from his optimistic state of 'hope' (*kibō*) to his pessimistic state of 'despair' (*zetsubō*). I argue that Fujita criticised *kōdo seichō* to restore 'experience' by preventing Japan rationalising without reason and by leading the country to be open to diverse people and objects.

## KEYWORDS

Totalitarianism; high-speed growth; experience; hope; despair

## Glossary

<i>anraku e no zentaishugi</i>	安楽への全体主義
<i>atarashii seishin no undō</i>	新しい精神の運動
<i>botsuraku</i>	没落
<i>busshōka</i>	物象化
<i>danshuteki hassō</i>	断種的発想
<i>danzetsu</i>	断絶
Fujita Shōzō	藤田省三
<i>Fukkatsu</i>	復活
<i>gendaiteki jōken</i>	現代的条件
<i>gendai zentaishugi</i>	現代全体主義
<i>genshoteki jōken</i>	原初的条件
<i>gisei shōhin</i>	擬制商品
<i>gōrika</i>	合理化
<i>hōhōteki saishuppatsu</i>	方法的再出発
<i>hoikuki</i>	保育器
<i>hōkai</i>	崩壊
<i>hōkai-shi</i>	崩壊史
<i>honraiteki na mono</i>	本来なもの
<i>ikita seishin</i>	生きた精神
<i>jiga</i>	自我

**CONTACT** Takamichi Sakurai ✉ [tsakurai@sfc.keio.ac.jp](mailto:tsakurai@sfc.keio.ac.jp)

This article has been republished with minor changes. These changes do not impact the academic content of the article.

© 2021 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

<i>jinmin-shugi</i>	人民主義
<i>jinmin shuken</i>	人民主權
<i>keiken</i>	經驗
<i>keiken no shōmetsu</i>	經驗の消滅
<i>keiken no sōshitsu</i>	經驗の喪失
<i>keiken no tetsugaku</i>	經驗の哲学
<i>kibō</i>	希望
<i>kiso ni made tassuru botsuraku</i>	基礎にまで達する没落
<i>kōdo seichō</i>	高度成長
<i>kongenteki keiken</i>	根源的經驗
<i>monogoto</i>	物事
<i>monogoto no kiso ni tassuru</i>	物事の基礎に達する
<i>narushizumu</i>	ナルシズム
<i>risei naki gōrika</i>	理性なき合理化
<i>rōnin</i>	浪人
<i>saigo no keiken</i>	最後の經驗
<i>saisei</i>	再生
<i>seihin bunka no sekai</i>	製品文化の世界
<i>seiji shihai no arikata ni okeru zentaishugi</i>	政治支配の在り方における全体主義
<i>seikatsu yōshiki ni okeru zentaishugi</i>	生活様式における全体主義
<i>seisei keiken</i>	生成經驗
<i>seishin no yatōsei</i>	精神の野党性
<i>Seishinshiteki kōsatsu</i>	精神史的考察
<i>sekkei sareta keiken no daiyōhin</i>	設計された經驗の代用品
<i>sengo minshushugi</i>	戦後民主主義
<i>senken-shugi</i>	先驗主義
<i>sensō no arikata ni okeru zentaishugi</i>	戦争の在り方における全体主義
<i>shijō keizai zentaishugi</i>	市場經濟全体主義
<i>shinpin bunka</i>	新品文化
<i>shisōka</i>	思想家
<i>shisōshi</i>	思想史
<i>shisōshika</i>	思想史家
<i>sōgo shutaisei</i>	相互主体性
<i>tasha</i>	他者
<i>Tennōsei</i>	天皇制
<i>Tennōsei-teki seishin kōzō no byōri</i>	天皇制的精神構造の病理
<i>tokubetsu no danzetsu</i>	特別の断絶
<i>zentaishugi</i>	全体主義
<i>‘Zentaishugi no jidai keiken’</i>	全体主義の時代經驗
<i>zetsubō</i>	絶望

## 1. Introduction

Fujita Shōzō (1927–2003) is a Japanese social and political theorist who contributed to research on the ‘Tennō system’ (*Tennōsei*)<sup>1</sup> and ‘totalitarianism’ (*zentaishugi*) through socio-pathological critiques.<sup>2</sup> Since he was strongly influenced by the famous Japanese scholar Maruyama Masao,<sup>3</sup> he is generally considered either a ‘historian of ideas’ (*shisōshika*)<sup>4</sup> or a ‘thinker’ (*shisōka*).<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, his scholarly contributions are not confined to these academic ranges. In particular, we can discern a different aspect of his academic career as a *social critic*, especially by focusing on his later works.

Fujita’s scholarly contributions are extremely important not only in a theoretical knowledge of contemporary Japanese society but also in Japan’s intellectual tradition and a better understanding of it, in the sense that these contributions clarify key aspects of Japanese intellectual history, as well as those of its social and political theory. Alternatively, more specifically, they contribute, in socio-pathological terms, to detecting psychic by-products that

were generated by the core socio-political structures of postwar Japan, that is the Tennō system and high-speed growth (*kōdo seichō*),<sup>6</sup> and are, therefore, absolutely essential for Japanese scholarship. Fujita's works play a significant role in enhancing our understanding of the essence of Japan's economic and intellectual development during the twentieth century. In addition, it is valuable to link some parts of Fujita's oeuvre to the Western intellectual traditions in the four following respects. First, not only does Fujita's theory capture the essence of 'critique' in the sense of Critical Theory, but it also contributes to enhancing the latter's theoretical quality.<sup>7</sup> Second, his theory of 'totalitarianism', a concept derived from Europe (Fascist Italy) – particularly his unique concepts of 'totalitarianism as a contemporary way of life' (*seikatsu yōshiki ni okeru zentaishugi*), 'contemporary totalitarianism' (*gendai zentaishugi*) and 'totalitarianism as market economy' (*shijō keizai zentaishugi*) – has great potential to reveal the core adverse aspects of contemporary market society by relating the Japanese and Western pathological phenomena of totalitarianism in the postwar period.<sup>8</sup> Third, Fujita's theory can possibly broaden a disciplinary perspective of intellectual history in global terms, particularly by showing the relevance of the theoretical components of his conception of 'totalitarianism', a notion that incorporates core Western intellectual facets, such as those of Marx, Ludendorff, Polanyi, Bloch, Arendt, some important figures of the Frankfurt School, Riesman and Sennett. And finally, fourth, Fujita's philosophy of 'experience' absorbs the West's rich intellectual heritage and identifies the intellectual concepts that were lost by society during the twentieth century.<sup>9</sup> However, apart from some recent publications, depictions of the theoretical contributions to Fujita's thought in English remain limited.<sup>10</sup>

According to Fujita's philosophical theory, 'experience' (*keiken*) is the act of encountering and establishing interpersonal relationships with others and new things, particularly through one's attempts to understand the essence of things. His philosophy of 'experience' is a theoretical base on which he seeks to find effective ways of restoring 'experience' from the perspective that it has ceased to exist. Significantly, it serves not only to obtain a vital clue to finding solutions to the 'loss of experience' – an account of this term will be provided later – by pinpointing the concepts that disappeared during the twentieth century, but also to integrate some important spiritual aspects of Japanese intellectual history and the rich traditions of Western intellectual history in terms of the cross-cultural, theoretical framework of 'experience' internalising several pivotal Western ideas, such as Benjamin's '*Untergang zum Grund*', Bloch's 'rationalising without reason' and Hegel's 'self-knowledge of the other'.<sup>11</sup>

This paper, which discusses Fujita's philosophy of 'experience', describes the core facets of his later theoretical contributions in terms of his social critique of Japan's high-speed growth, which is central to his theory of 'totalitarianism'.<sup>12</sup> I thereby demonstrate why Fujita experienced a dialectical inner conflict between hope and despair in his criticism of Japanese society by diagnosing its economic phenomenon as 'contemporary totalitarianism' while amplifying the concept of experience for the purpose of establishing a society based on his conception of interpersonal relationships.

## 2. Fujita's criticism of spiritual structures in contemporary times

Fujita started his academic career as a pupil of Maruyama, under whom he focused on research into 'psychological diseases of the spiritual structure of the Tennō system'

(*Tennōsei-teki seishin kōzō no byōri*).<sup>13</sup> Based on this research method, he later changed his primary scholarly interest from a socio-pathological analysis of the Tennō system to critical reflections on the psychology of *kōdo seichō*, an unreasonable impulse to care exclusively about one's own needs, to use every crumb to one's personal advantage and to avoid encounters with others and objects. While struggling with this serious psychosis of society, Fujita fell into 'despair' (*zetsubō*) on viewing the extremely narcissistic society of Japan, which was heavily dependent on its own high-speed economic growth.<sup>14</sup>

Fujita, after having returned to Japan from the United Kingdom, showed a significant change in his work in the sense that it is believed that in those days there was a perceptible change in his sense of despair of theory and practice.<sup>15</sup> In this regard, it is possible to assume that the two years' duration between 1967 and 1969 when he studied in Sheffield and Oxford marked his huge turning point in his career,<sup>16</sup> as a result of his new experience and encounter with new things subsequent to the above crucial event.<sup>17</sup> This is largely explained by the fact that this new attitude towards reality brought about new methods – *exposing* his state of despair as his criticism of contemporary times and analysing the spiritual structure of Japanese society that *prevents* the people seeing politics as the basis of the principles of 'sovereignty of the people'.<sup>18</sup> In fact, after having returned from the UK, Fujita first published an interview entitled "'Kōdo seichō" hantai' (A Protest against Japan's High-Speed Growth) (1969) – abbreviated to 'Kōdo seichō' below – in which 'he first bitterly *opposed* "society nudging itself towards 'high-speed growth'"'.<sup>19</sup> His stance on reality in this work is tangibly described by his words: 'only those who learn the lessons of history can make *progress*'.<sup>20</sup>

This evidence, then, accounts to a certain extent for his significant change. The Japanese intellectual historian Iida Taizō clearly describes Fujita's state of mind at this time, broaching the subject of the work 'Jiyū kō' (On liberty) (1970), published in the following year after the publication of 'Kōdo seichō':

'Jiyū kō' shows that 'high-speed growth' was produced by the full of energy of free competition edging out one's rivals under the conditions of being jostled by the crowds, and that it was leading society to be on 'the cutting edge' of Joan Robinson's 'new mercantilism' ... on the basis of the historical conditions of the country of 'the absence of the constitution guaranteeing human rights' and 'the lack of capacity for autonomously establishing a social order based on freedom by way of bottom-up decision making'. Japan's high-speed growth in its developmental process dashed Fujita's 'hopes' (*kibō*) of laying the foundations of the principles of 'sovereignty of the people' brought about by the 'state of nature' coming into being soon after World War II.<sup>21</sup>

Obviously, this description shows a marked change in his position on and understanding of reality. As we shall see, it is evident that the above fact, that his 'hopes' gradually faded, had a profound effect on his later works. For this reason, it appears that, from then on, Fujita did not tackle any topics of *actual* politics. As noted above, however, he consistently retained his essential standpoint of analysing a spiritual structure in his later works. Rather, it seems to me that the indispensable device for him was more sophisticated, particularly as a result of a 'methodological change' (*hōhōteki sai-shuppatsu*).<sup>22</sup>

Fujita left his academic job in 1971 on the grounds that 'he was no longer able to stand the situation of holding his privileged position of a "professor" constituting the fabricated university system under the conditions of "intellectual decay" based on "Japan's high-speed growth"'.<sup>23</sup> This gives a clear indication of his outlook on reality at the time.

During 1968 and 1969, ‘university troubles’ burgeoned in many universities in Japan. Perhaps this extremely violent behaviour *in the place of the university* must also have constituted a major factor in leading Fujita to take the decision to hand in his resignation as a professor in addition to the ‘intellectual decay’ induced by *kōdo seichō*, a movement that contributed to spoiling his aim of realising ‘democracy in postwar Japan’ (*senjo minshushugi*), namely Fujita’s *jinmin-shugi* – this Japanese term can be translated as ‘people-ism’, in which politics is founded on the principles of his theory of the ‘sovereignty of the people’ (*jinmin shuken*).<sup>24</sup> From this perspective, it is not surprising that he did not return to his old place of work for nine years.

In 1980, Fujita returned to his work. It is noteworthy, however, that he continued to publish his articles even during these nine years. His activities during that time give the impression of being more active in writing than before, as far as the number of essays issued during the period is concerned.<sup>25</sup> It is presumed that during this time Fujita had already restored his energy by repairing the damage done to his intellect by his sense of despair, which was replaced with his ‘new intellectual movement’ (*atarashii seishin no undō*).<sup>26</sup> *Seishinshiteki kōsatsu* (Reflections on Intellectual History) (1982) – abbreviated to *Kōsatsu* below – is undoubtedly one of the works illustrating this restoration. In fact, all the writings printed in this book were written between 1975 and 1981, when he did not officially belong to any university, with the exception of 1980 and 1981. This demonstrates why the work is described as a ‘memorial work’ created as a result of reaching a peak of his spiritual movement, ‘signifying the birth of “the world of Fujita Shōzō”’.<sup>27</sup> In addition, Iida precisely describes Fujita’s idea of this seminal work as follows:

Perhaps Fujita intended not only Burckhardt’s *Reflections on World History* (*Sekaishiteki kōsatsu*) but also Dilthey’s and Simmel’s ‘intellectual history’ (*shisōshi*) by the title of ‘Seishinshiteki kōsatsu’ (Reflections on Intellectual History).<sup>28</sup> It is most likely, however, that the title, aimed at putting forward his position and method, represented a radical departure from a *passing fad* for the ‘history of ideas’ that existed in the publishing industry of the country from the late 1960s to the early 1970s. ... In short, it can be argued that Fujita sought to discover the method of illuminating the essence of history by shining a light on the transformation of the living *spirit* (*ikita seishin*), creating himself and things – particularly on the historical significance of decline (*hōkai*) and fall (*botsuraku*) – through encountering many different kinds of facets and through responding to and communicating with the world.<sup>29</sup>

The ‘living spirit’ (*Dem lebendigen Geist*), on which Fujita places great stress, probably best explains his fundamental position articulated particularly after his ‘pause’ (*rōnin*),<sup>30</sup> that is since his ‘methodological change’. In other words, this concept elucidating the *transformation of the living spirit* sheds light on why the spirit deemed the *subject of history* changed itself *by itself*. In addition, Fujita’s emphasis on the essence of the notion accounts for why, exactly from then on, he focused all his attention on another concept of experience. The ‘transformation of the living *spirit* ... creating himself and things’ captures the essence of ‘experience’, which requires ‘encountering many different kinds of facets and ... responding to and communicating with the world’. Here we perceive that his attention to the concept of experience, meaning the ‘communication between the world and a spirit’ (*sekai to seishin to no ōtō*),<sup>31</sup> became his new method based on analysing a ‘spiritual structure’.

### 3. Fujita's philosophy of experience

Fujita's style of *criticising* contemporary times represents another key aspect of the above book. The primary subject of the work, showing the new phenomenon of the 'loss of experience' (*keiken no sōshitsu*), was undoubtedly also aimed at criticising *kōdo seichō* that prevented people encountering the 'substance of things' (*honraiteki na mono*), and, at the same time, that spoilt his hopes of establishing *jinmin-shugi* based on his theory of the sovereignty of the people. In the chapter 'Aru sōshitsu no keiken: Kakurenbō no seishinshi' (The Experience of Deprivation: An Intellectual History of Hide-and-Seek) (1981), Fujita argues:

It is quite natural that the 'new mercantilism', which requires making money hand over fist, should take a heavy toll on society, and that 'high-growth economy' (*seichō keizai*) should come at the cost of social foundations, as explained by the law of costs, that profit comes at the expense of something – we cannot have it all. This results in our forgetting what economic activity is for when distracted by increases in wages, unless well aware of what has been lost; due to moneymaking, in that case, we are bound to lose a set of values and the criteria of our way of life. This is the exact nihilism of the new mercantilism.<sup>32</sup>

Significantly, these words elucidate Fujita's fundamental stance on *kōdo seichō*. According to him, contemporary times characterised as a 'world surrounded by finished products' (*seihin bunka no sekai*),<sup>33</sup> above all, have brought about the 'loss of experience' (*keiken no shōmetsu*)<sup>34</sup> by way of 'rationalising without reason' (*risei naki gōrika*),<sup>35</sup> a concept that was particularly highlighted in an introduction to *Chosakushū 5: Seishinshiteki kōsatsu*, 'Shinpin bunka: Jōshō ni kaete' (The World Surrounded by Finished Products: An Introduction to *The Writings*, vol. 5: *Reflections on Intellectual History*) (1981). For Fujita, *kōdo seichō* was a world in which everything was bound to be rationalised by 'given alternatives to experience' (*sekkei sareta keiken no daiyōhin*) instead of by reason:<sup>36</sup>

today's finished *products* (*kanseihin*) 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, precisely that finished goods completely rob the human mind of reason. Commodities produced come into existence from the absorption of things into reason, and 'rationalisation' (*gōrika*) as the finished reification (*busshōka*) of reason is completed when products completely deprive man of reason.<sup>37</sup>

In Fujita's view, the direction of *kōdo seichō* meant the *last* process of decline and resulted in fall. As he put it in his later work 'Kon'nichi no keiken: Habamu chikara no naka ni atte' (Experience in These Days: What Prevents Us Experiencing?) (1982) – the English title will be used below – 'we are living through the *last experience* (*saigo no keiken*), meaning the loss of experience (*keiken no shōmetu*).'<sup>38</sup> This is why he took the methodological style of the 'chronological history of decline' (*hōkai-shi*) in *Kōsatsu*.<sup>39</sup> Fujita argues that the 'world surrounded by finished products' (*shinpin bunka*) is going through the last phase of history.

Not only did Fujita advance a new method and criticise the contemporary way of life in his 'memorial work', but he also tried to give society some possible remedies for 'rationalising without reason' through reflecting upon the history of decline. He suggested some of them by applying several remedial concepts such as 'intersubjectivity' (*sōgo shutaisei*), a 'sense of minority spirit' (*seishin no yatōsei*) and Walter Benjamin's '*Untergang zum*

*Grund'* (*kiso ni made tassuru botsuraku*),<sup>40</sup> meaning to perish, in conjunction with his key conception of 'experience'. According to Fujita,

combining some possibilities for our capacity for imagination, plenty of scope for reason and the intersubjectivity of experience, all of which have nowadays shrunk to insignificance, we should devote ourselves to completing this task so as to direct the fragmentary combination amongst them against 'rationalising without reason'. ... only ... a sense of minority spirit, keeping a sceptical attitude, has potential for designing the originality of experience (*seisei keiken*), revival (*saisei*) and restoration (*fukkatsu*).<sup>41</sup>

For Fujita, as Iida puts it, 'death (*shi*) and revival (*saisei*) were precisely the *fundamental experience* (*kongenteki keiken*)'.<sup>42</sup> In this respect, it was quite natural that Fujita should require us to perish (*zugrunde gehen, monogoto no kiso ni tassuru*), and that he should claim that we can thereby revive our society, which has become a 'dead body with ruddy cheeks' (*kesshoku yoku shinde iru jōtai*).<sup>43</sup> Here we become aware that his long-lasting standpoint of exploring the 'conditions (possibilities) for establishing the principles of "sovereignty of the people" – the conditions of "democratisation"' was replaced with a 'philosophy of "experience"' (*keiken no tetsugaku*) for exploring the 'fundamental conditions of contemporary times' (*gendaiteki jōken*) by way of finding out the 'primordial conditions' (*genshoteki jōken*).<sup>44</sup>

Fujita's philosophy of 'experience' seems to have come to a climax with his writing 'Experience in These Days'. His view on Japan in this work was presented precisely by the words that 'Japanese society is nowadays being confronted with the crucial problem that experience has gradually ceased to exist'.<sup>45</sup> It is a world subject to the contemporary attitude of 'apriorism' (*senken-shugi*) – the Japanese original will be used below – that 'requires complete knowledge of others and things before encountering them'.<sup>46</sup> In such a society, there is no opportunity to experience anything or to encounter things (*monogoto*) and the other (*tasha*).<sup>47</sup> Everything is required to live in a 'cocoon-like chamber' (*hoikuki*) in this world.<sup>48</sup> For these reasons, 'Experience in These Days' introduced the term 'totalitarianism' (*zentaishugi*) containing the weird attitude of *senken-shugi* towards all things.<sup>49</sup>

As an editor's note puts it, however, 'Fujita's concern, instead of raising the theme of "experience", turned to analysing *psychology avoiding experience*' after the main work focusing on the establishment of his theory of 'experience'.<sup>50</sup> Thereafter, he devoted himself to writing a series of quasi-psychoanalytic works, 'Experience in These Days', 'Narushizumu kara no dakkyaku: Mono ni iku michi' (To Break Free from Narcissism: A Way of Finding out the Essence of Things) (1983) – abbreviated to 'Narushizumu' below – and "Anraku" e no zentaishugi: Jūjitsu wo torimodosu beku' (Totalitarianism to Unruffled Ease: Towards the Restoration of Intersubjectivity) (1985). The reason why I employ the term 'series' above is, first, because 'Experience in These Days' already put forward his psychological view primarily by using terms such as 'anxiety' (*fuan*), 'avoidance' (*kaihi*) and 'pain' (*kutsū*),<sup>51</sup> all of which explained detrimental aspects of our psychology invisible to our eyes, and second, because these three articles were published consecutively. It is herein possible to discern the transformation of his approach from a 'philosophy of experience' to an 'analysis of the psychology of human beings and society'. In particular, in 'Narushizumu' Fujita drew particular attention to the term 'ego' (*jiga*), which, in his view, captures the essence of the concept of narcissism.<sup>52</sup> He says:

Nowadays ... the ‘ego’, concentrating its concern on itself, acts in a dominant fashion ... The contemporary state of mind, in this way, characterises the *age of the ego on a mass scale*.<sup>53</sup>

These sentences clearly describe why Fujita applied the term ‘narcissism’ (*narushizumu*). In his view, this psychoanalytic word illuminates products of *kōdo seichō*. Perhaps his emphasis on the psychology of self avoiding anxiety and pain led him to introduce to his work Richard Sennett’s concept of ‘a voluntary servitude to unruffled ease’. The common subject of his three quasi-psychoanalytic works is undoubtedly described by the concept; Fujita must have discerned some relevance of the notion of narcissism for the social sciences through reading Sennett’s books. For him, however, it was provided not just as a metaphorical term that illuminates the disciplines and contemporary problems in the sense that he actually had a great deal of interest in *psychiatry*, particularly in the philosophical foundations of psychiatry in terms of ‘intersubjectivity’ and ‘common sense’,<sup>54</sup> which means that he highlighted the ethical and moral significance of *medical* and *psychiatric* connotations represented by the term. Rather, it is much more plausible to think that Fujita was intrigued primarily by its mythical and medical implications, as exemplified by the fact that he had first of all become interested in analysing the ‘spiritual structure’ (of the Tennō system), the method of which examines and diagnoses *inner* problems of the human mind. For this reason, it is presumed that Fujita’s encounter with the term narcissism meant the discovery of another type of his methodological device that he retained since his most memorable encounter with his mentor Maruyama.

As noted above, Fujita considered as ‘totalitarianism’ the ‘psychological basis’ (*seishin-teki kiban*)<sup>55</sup> of people’s attitude that ‘requires complete knowledge of others and things before encountering them’<sup>56</sup>. It is ‘a psychology that has a strong impulse to sweep out *everything* inducing discomfort and pain’;<sup>57</sup> in his view, this is detailed by the political concept that depicts the age of the twentieth century. This is why Fujita called contemporary ‘high tech society’ (*kōdo gijutsu shakai*) ‘totalitarianism towards unruffled ease’ (*anraku e no zentaishugi*).<sup>58</sup>

#### 4. Three types of totalitarianism

In this way, the concept of totalitarianism became one of his most important analytical devices since Fujita had seen the psychology of contemporary people that avoids ‘experience’ as *senken-shugi*, which has a lot in common with the political term. This analysis with a focus on the concept reached a climax with his article ‘Zentaishugi no jidai keiken (jō)’ (The Experience of the Times of Totalitarianism, original edn.) (1986) – abbreviated to ‘Zentaishugi (jō)’ below. Roughly speaking, the subject of this work was to grasp the characteristics of the age of the twentieth century by focusing on the concept of totalitarianism. In this writing, Fujita first of all described ‘totalitarianism as a way of war’ (*sensō no arikata ni okeru zentaishugi* or *sensō no zentaishugi*) – abbreviated to ‘totalitarianism as war’ below – which is, according to him, typical of World War I, regarded as a ‘commercial war’ and a ‘war of attrition’.<sup>59</sup> Referring primarily to Hannah Arendt, then, Fujita explained ‘totalitarianism as a way of political rule’ (*seiji shihai no arikata ni okeru zentaishugi*, *seiji shihai no zentaishugi* or *seiji no zentaishugi*) – abbreviated to ‘political totalitarianism’ below – which is characterised particularly by the use

of ‘ideology’ and ‘terror’ and by the appearance of the ‘masses’.<sup>60</sup> Through shining a light on the connection between the former and latter concepts, Fujita contended,

not only does *political totalitarianism* (*seiji no zentaishugi*) denote the secondary stage of the history of the formation of totalitarianism in the twentieth century, but the violent extension movement, namely the war meant by the concept, also notably and intentionally contains *totalitarianism as war* (*sensō no zentaishugi*) that emerged in the first stage. In this respect, the latter totalitarianism was integrated into the former.<sup>61</sup>

Subsequently, ‘totalitarianism as a contemporary way of life’ (*seikatsu yōshiki ni okeru zentaishugi*, *seikatsu yōshiki no zentaishugi* or *gendai zentaishugi*) – abbreviated to ‘contemporary totalitarianism’ below – which was first provided in the revised edition of ‘Zentaishugi no jidai keiken’ (1995) – abbreviated to ‘Zentaishugi’ below – was broached fundamentally as an extension of the above two types of totalitarianism.<sup>62</sup> In this kind of society, says Fujita, Karl Polanyi’s ‘fictitious commodities’ (*gisei shōhin*) – ‘land’ (*tochi*), ‘labour’ (*rōdō*) and ‘money’ (*kahei*) – and Marx’s ‘labour power’ play a major role.<sup>63</sup> In particular, money is bound to subsume all those things. Fujita writes:

Currency (*kahei*) based essentially 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 form from the *original* and classical one (*sōzōteki na kotenteki zentaishugi*), 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 this world typifies this feature, regardless of that banners?<sup>64</sup>

The above sentences explain why Fujita claims that ‘contemporary totalitarianism’ is ‘not the opposite of totalitarianism, but rather captures its essence in peaceful appearance’.<sup>65</sup> Admittedly, he herein stresses the problematic situation that it is *quite difficult* for contemporary people even *to be aware of the existence of the problem per se*, for apparently it *looks nonviolent*.

Another important viewpoint ‘Zentaishugi’ presents, is to diagnose Japan as a representative ‘contemporary totalitarianism’- this is of vital importance to Fujita. Previously, he already pointed out that Japan was characteristic of ‘political totalitarianism’ in ‘Zentaishugi (jō)’, in which, similarly, he said that it thrived subsequent to ‘totalitarianism as war’.<sup>66</sup> In this work, however, ‘contemporary totalitarianism’ was neither clarified nor even outlined; instead, he simply observed that a strong need for ‘newness’ (*atarashisa*, *shinpin*) is an essential feature of totalitarianism in contemporary Japan. In ‘Zentaishugi’, later published, Fujita by contrast offered a more precise account. A focus on this new edition indeed makes it to understand what the article intends by introducing the concept of totalitarianism. In short, his intention of advancing the concept of ‘contemporary totalitarianism’, following two kinds of totalitarianism noted above, is orientated towards criticising ‘contemporary Japanese society’. As he puts it,

The characteristics of the totalitarianisation of Japan are described simply by the fact that the attitude that ‘New is beautiful!’<sup>67</sup> (*sōdai na atarashii mono wa yoi mono da*) provoked totalitarianism based on the whole society by exploring or copying or modifying or highly streamlining it, regarding even the newest evil as good. This resulted in Japan becoming a leading and typical contemporary totalitarianism as the third type of totalitarianism.<sup>68</sup>

According to Fujita, Japan's proposition that 'New is beautiful!' is derived from the ancient 'ritsuryō kokka' (code-based state).<sup>69</sup> He claims that the Meiji Restoration also inherited its spirit from the ancient state. It appears that Japan has so far valued its conventional spirit for long periods of time. For instance, referring to the thinker of the Meiji era, Fukuzawa Yukichi, who is often regarded as a founder of modern Japan, Fujita points out that most of the Japanese 'Europeans in the nineteenth century' including Fukuzawa were absorbed in the act of 'imitating the original'.<sup>70</sup> In addition, focusing on the 1930s, Fujita emphasises that their strong praise for newness and magnificence plainly explains that Japan was intrigued by totalitarianism, such as Fascism and Stalinism, characterised as new and magnificent – he provides an interesting piece of data that the book entitled *Zentaishugi sōsho* (A Series of Totalitarianism), which seems to 'put a high value on the total (*zentai*) and totality (*zentai sei*)', was published in Japan in the 1930s.<sup>71</sup> Needless to say, here he recognises one of the salient characteristics of Japan that even puts a high value on 'the newest evil'. Through these analyses, Fujita offers a remedial suggestion for ways of dealing with 'totalitarianism' as follows:

every part (*bubun*) is described by them as such, and possible comparative differences between them are therefore represented simply either as *a more important part* or as *a part previously existing*; there is no privileged part representing the total as such.<sup>72</sup>

From these perspectives, we can precisely acknowledge that, as Fujita argues, Japan has consistently sought to obtain *newness* by means of an act of *imitation*. It is argued that the efficiency of this Japanese mimetic approach has been greatly improved, for example, through experiencing Fascism in wartime Japan and *kōdo seichō*. Presumably this is why Fujita had to distinctly highlight Japanese 'totalitarianism'. He believed that Japan has been totalitarian continuously for long periods, particularly through encapsulating the essence of newness and magnificence, and that, after WWII, it has made more sophisticated the problematic feature by way of 'rationalising without reason'. Most importantly, his object of study was always the 'present age', and he therefore criticised 'contemporary totalitarianism' in *our time*. (In many respects, Fujita's stance particularly on contemporary society has much in common with Critical Theory's, regardless of the roughly 30-year generation gap between them.<sup>73</sup>)

In the interview 'Gendai Nihon no seishin' (The Spirit of Contemporary Japan) (1990) – abbreviated to 'Gendai seishin' below – Fujita's interest somewhat changed. As the editor's note for *Chosakushū* 6 puts it, Fujita concerned himself 'neither with the theory of "experience" nor with the psychology of society but with ethics'.<sup>74</sup> Briefly speaking, Fujita summarised the essence of his knowledge cultivated since 'Kōdo seichō', and addressed issues of contemporary Japan from his new *ethical* perspective. First, in terms of the 'ability of self-criticism' (*jiko hihan nōryoku*), namely 'ethics' (*rinriteki burēki*), he primarily criticised *kōdo seichō* and 'companyism' (*kaisha-shugi*),<sup>75</sup> which were, according to him, based on 'narcissism', 'totalitarianism towards unruffled ease', the 'spirit of the imitation of the original', the 'impulse of extension' (*bōchō-shugi*) and 'exclusionary collectivism' (*haigaiteki shūdanshugi*), all of which were induced by Japanese uncontrollable instincts without self-criticism.<sup>76</sup> Referring primarily to Konrad Lorenz's perspective of the 'point of no return'<sup>77</sup> and Edward M. Forster's perspective that 'man can't touch',<sup>78</sup> Fujita presented the provocative view that 'ethics (*rinri*) is aimed at learning our own personal boundaries'.<sup>79</sup> Significantly, 'Gendai seishin' introduced his new

perspective of ethics with a particular focus on several scholars, including natural scientists such as zoologists and biologists, and in this respect, there was no change in his primary aim of criticising contemporary society.

In the interview ‘Marukusushugi no baransu shīto’ (The Balance Sheet of Marxism) (1991), Fujita suggested his significant proposition that ‘democracy is the minimum purpose’, referring to Russell and Laski.<sup>80</sup> In addition, he highlighted the importance of ‘personal relationships’ in the work.<sup>81</sup> Most importantly, however, as he puts it, ‘I, as a Japanese, cast doubt on the *raison d’être* of pure science that *is not motivated to deal with precarious conditions* about which the well-organised society, Japan, has brought, and from which one has suffered enough’.<sup>82</sup> Perhaps this motivation untangles Fujita’s most fundamental academic position throughout his works, that academic knowledge ought to be an asset to find solutions to our actual problems.<sup>83</sup>

It is important to remember that, after his rectal cancer had been diagnosed in 1993, Fujita published ‘Zentaishugi’ mentioned above. Given the fact that he wrote the volume of forty-nine pages during that serious illness, it is possible to discern how seriously he devoted himself to the work. In this respect, it is a chef-d’oeuvre in his later years, in which, as we have seen, he tried to settle the primary issue of his later work, *kōdo seichō*. However, Fujita had already provided its brief summary in the preceding work ‘Mitsu no zentaishugi’ (Three Types of Totalitarianism) (1994), an interview, which he began by expressing his state of mind of ‘discontinuity’ (*danzetsu*). As Fujita puts it:

Since the extension of the Japanese economy had been completed at the stage of the end of so-called industrial capitalism and national economy, there remained only the possibility of some economic bubbles; recently, in fact, there were such opportunities ... in the 1960s and 1980s. These experiences described by high-speed growth, regarded either as capitalism or as market society, demonstrate how society is to renounce all connections (*danzetsu*) to cultural history. We were given the last experience through the events. This led me to conclude that all my tasks were completed, and I gave up; I got rectal cancer at precisely the same time.<sup>84</sup>

Needless to say, this is a crucial matter for Fujita, since this statement denotes that Fujita *abandoned* political practice; it therefore gives a vital meaning to his life’s work, namely the task of establishing *jinmin-shugi* that was unalterably of huge importance to him. In this interview, then, Fujita put forward three kinds of totalitarian concepts noted above, and claimed that ‘Japan has led itself to a leading totalitarianism *towards* unruffled ease’.<sup>85</sup> From this perspective, he concludes that, ‘[t]he twentieth century is the age of totalitarianism’.<sup>86</sup> At this point it is worth looking into Fujita’s diagnoses of contemporary society are based on his diagnostic approach. He says,

Japan’s high-speed growth gave society the specific discontinuity (*tokubetsu no danzetsu*) ... around the mid-1960s ... . The high-speed economic growth, market society or, say, perpetuating or revitalising bubble society ... brought about the transmutation of and discontinuity in cultural history concerning individuals.<sup>87</sup>

This statement attaches special importance to both Fujita’s early and later works, for it profoundly affected his final examination and diagnosis, as noted previously. We remind ourselves that his ‘8/15 declaration’, in which he publicly expressed his anti-Vietnam War position, was issued in the mid-1960s.<sup>88</sup> In this period, on the other

hand, as Iida puts it, “high-speed growth” ... while society gradually underwent a radical transformation of culture and spirit ... crushed his “hopes” based on the sole possibility for restoring society in postwar Japan’.<sup>89</sup> It is presumed that it was during the time Fujita underwent his inner conflict between ‘hope’ of realising *jinmin-shugi* and ‘despair’, a conflict that stems from the spiritual change of Japanese society aiming at *kōdo seichō* and brought him a considerably negative perspective. However, although the conflict had given rise to his pessimistic view on *kōdo seichō*, he managed to overcome it. Perhaps he repeatedly experienced such a psychological conflict. After all, it led Fujita to arrive at the above final conclusion that brought about his abandonment of hopes for politics. Thus, Fujita must have fallen into ‘despair’ again after overcoming it through considering as his home ‘the place severing ties with society’ (*danzetsu no basho*).<sup>90</sup> Such a conclusion is a sure sign that he also *abandoned being a theorist*, for his words that ‘all my tasks were completed’ questions the value of a theorist.

## 5. Conclusion

The later intellectual works of Fujita are characteristically described in terms of his social critique of *kōdo seichō*, which captures the essence of his philosophy of ‘experience’ and his political theory of ‘totalitarianism’. His struggle with the prevalent social condition is depicted by a negative way of transferring his optimistic psychological state of hope to his pessimistic psychological state of despair. From this perspective, his scholarly efforts are deemed a self-critique of and self-reflection on society in the sense that his social theory self-critically reflects on the social phenomenon of ‘totalitarianism’ in Japan. Given this theoretical background, Fujita’s early ideas, such as ‘castrated thinking’ (*danshuteki hassō*),<sup>91</sup> can even be considered an uncontrollable impulse that eliminates ‘experience’ as an extension of his conception of ‘totalitarianism’.

It is interesting that, to this extent, Fujita’s self-critical and self-reflective perspective analysing the spiritual structure of *kōdo seichō* must have seemed quite different from other works that affirmed Japan’s uniqueness in terms of its economic growth, particularly between the 1970s and 1990s. Despite his criticism, however, it is true that Japan’s current influential position in the world economy and politics is based heavily on the country’s economic achievements. In this respect, his critique might seem self-destructive. It is nevertheless not accurate to believe that Fujita’s critique is of no value to contemporary society since his social criticism continues illuminating and enables us to reflect on the *spiritual by-products* of *kōdo seichō* from a *socio-pathological* perspective; in this regard, it still has great relevance. Despite Fujita’s later abandonment of his role as a social theorist, his theory of ‘experience’ reveals the pathological spiritual structure of Japanese society in terms of his self-reflective social critique, thereby providing the society with vital clues about how to prevent itself rationalising without reason and how to re-establish a society that engenders encounters with others and objects.

In conclusion, Fujita’s social critique, which is made up of *cross-cultural, theoretical ingredients*, has great potential not only to identify the forgotten social concepts that should be retrieved by society, but also to enable the society to do so by combining ‘our capacity for imagination, plenty of scope for reason and the intersubjectivity of experience’. This fragmentary combination aims to prevent rationalising without reason, and thereby ‘the fragments undergo a process of metamorphosis, and, as a result, a renewal

of relationships'.<sup>92</sup> Fujita's socio-critical conceptions of 'experience' and 'totalitarianism' are enormously important in the context of global intellectual history.

## Notes

1. The Tennō system is a Japanese system of government that existed as an absolute monarchy from the beginning of the Meiji period (1868) to the early Shōwa period (1945) and has been existing as a constitutional monarchy since 1947. Fujita describes this system as 'the system of rules (regime) organised by the constitution based on the Tennō-centred social structure' (Sakurai, *Political Theories of Narcissism*, 81; Fujita, *Chosakushū* 1). The central issues pertaining to the Tennō system are whether this system is a constitutional monarchy and whether Tennō is the head of the state of Japan in the political system of postwar Japan.
2. See, e.g. Sakurai, *Political Theories of Narcissism*, Ch. 5; Sakurai, "The Political Theorist, Fujita Shōzō"; Ueno, "Infancy and Critical Theory".
3. In Japan, Maruyama is the best-known political scientist and historian of Japanese ideas and is sometimes called the 'father of modern politics in Japan' (e.g. Ishida, *Maruyama Masao to no taiwa*, 124). For more details on Maruyama, see, e.g. Seifert, "Masao Maruyama (1914–1996)".
4. See, e.g. Ichimura, *Yomu to iu ikikata*; Ichimura, "Kaisetsu: Fujita Shōzō wo yomu tame ni"; Miyamura, *Sengo seishin no seijigaku*.
5. See, e.g. Cho, "'Kōdo seichō' hantai"; Cho, *Taishū' to 'shimin' no sengo shisō*; Ichimura, "Kaisetsu"; Iida, *Sengo seishin no kōbō*.
6. The content of *kōdo seichō* was a highly controversial topic, particularly between the 1970s and 1990s. In general, it signifies the period of Japan's high-speed growth, during which a significant economic growth was observed from the mid-1950s to the early 1970s, and is known as the 'Japanese miracle' (see, e.g. Forsberg, *America and the Japanese Miracle*; Johnson, *MITI and the Japanese Miracle*; Vogel, *Japan as Number One*). The term has special significance for Fujita since it brought about a significant change in the theoretical schemes of his philosophical, social and political theories.
7. See, e.g. Ichimura, "Kaisetsu"; Sakurai, *Political Theories of Narcissism*, Ch. 5; Ueno, "Infancy and Critical Theory"; Wada, "'Fujita Shōzō no sekai' no seiritsu".
8. See, e.g. Cho, "'Kōdo seichō' hantai"; Saitō, "Genshiryoku no sangyōteki riyō to 'shijō keizai zentaishugi'"; Sakurai, *Political Theories of Narcissism*, Ch. 5, App. 3.
9. See, e.g. Iida, *Sengo seishin no kōbō*; Sakurai, *Political Theories of Narcissism*, Ch. 5, App. 3.
10. Sakurai, *Political Theories of Narcissism*; Sakurai, "The Political Theorist, Fujita Shōzō"; Ueno, "Infancy and Critical Theory".
11. Regarding Hegel's concept, I do not discuss its issue with respect to Fujita's philosophy of 'experience'.
12. Essentially, Fujita's conception of totalitarianism sees democratic life based on market capitalism, meaning 'liberal democracy', in the same line as totalitarian ways of life signifying Fascism and Stalinism, in the sense that its market mechanism makes society extremely one-dimensional by leading people and their needs to conform to the system of capitalism, as do the two typical totalitarian politics in a similar way – on this, see Cho, "'Kōdo seichō' hantai," 144–5; Sakurai, *Political Theories of Narcissism*, Ch. 5 and App. 3; Taraba, "Fujita Shōzō-shi ni tsuite no danshō," 175–6. Significantly, the dialectical conception contributes fosters reflection on a contemporary way of life, enabling us to identify the totalitarian aspects of contemporary society.
13. On this term, see Maruyama, "(Zōho-ban) *Gendai seiji no shisō to kōdō*, dai-1 bu tsuiki oyobi hochū," 496 [Maruyama, "Logic and Psychology of Ultra-Nationalism," 23 (translation modified)]; cf. Maruyama, "Logik und Psychologie des Ultra-nationalismus," 144; Fujita, *Fujita Shōzō Chosakushū* 8, 680; cf. Sakurai, *Political Theories of Narcissism*, Ch. 5.
14. Iida, *Sengo seishin no kōbō*, 346–7; cf. Iida, Miyamura and So, "Kaidai ni kaete," 446–7.

15. Iida, *Sengo seishin no kōbō*, 346–7.
16. With regard to his academic activities in the UK, all that is certain is that Martin Collick, a British scholar of Japanese social history, helped Fujita study abroad in Sheffield. However, other facts regarding Fujita’s activities remain unknown with respect to his studies in the country.
17. My own experience also to some extent supports the idea that living in a foreign country whose culture and lifestyle are considerably different from one’s own for over several years significantly affects one’s mind. From this perspective, it can be argued that there was a marked change in Fujita’s mind through his *first* study abroad, though he hesitated to discuss his experience – e.g. in ‘Kōdo seichō’, which was first published shortly after his return to Japan (Fujita, *Chosakushū* 8, 1). Indeed, it was the first time the *Japanese* Fujita had ever lived in Europe.
18. On his theory of the sovereignty of the people, see n. 24 below.
19. Iida, *Sengo seishin no kōbō*, 266.
20. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 8, 8; emphasis added.
21. Iida, *Sengo seishin no kōbō*, 267.
22. Miyamura, *Sengo seishin no seijigaku*, 194–9.
23. Iida, *Sengo seishin no kōbō*, 269.
24. For example, Fujita defines his theory of the sovereignty of the people as follows: ‘We, as the people (*jinmin*) engaging in certain occupations respectively, aim to establish relationships with *others* (*kojin*). Ways of communicating with them are bound to depend upon respective interpersonal relationships between *the people*. I believe that communication independent of the state system will come into existence, and that we will gradually be able to create *the people* (*jinmin*) as subjects who check and control political power on the basis of these principles. This is the exact *sovereignty of the people*’ (Fujita, *Chosakushū* 7, 220).
25. According to ‘Fujita Shōzō chosaku mokuroku’ (A List of the Writings of Fujita Shōzō) edited by Iida Taizō, Miyamura Haruo and Hondō Akira, Fujita published over ninety writings – albeit mostly short essays – between April 1971 and March 1980, that is during the period from when he did not work at the university to his return.
26. Iida, *Sengo seishin no kōbō*, 270.
27. *Ibid.*, 330; cf. Wada, “‘Fujita Shōzō no sekai’ no seiritsu”.
28. Burckhardt’s book was originally entitled *Weltgeschichtliche Betrachtungen*, published in 1905, which is based on his lectures at the University of Basel from 1868 to 1872. Significantly, in this work, he reveals his original viewpoint on history while criticising Hegel’s philosophy of history. In addition, for an intellectual history depicted by Dilthey and Simmel, the German word *Geistesgeschichte* is used; the concept of this word refers to a historical method that attempts to understand history in terms of intellectual transformations. According to Iida, Fujita applied the book’s title *Reflections on Intellectual History*, thereby implying these semantic contents.
29. Iida, *Sengo seishin no kōbō*, 331.
30. *Ibid.*, 270.
31. *Ibid.*, 332.
32. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 5, 11–12.
33. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 5, 7.
34. Fujita, e.g. *Chosakushū* 5, 17; Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 15.
35. This is a Japanese translation of Ernst Bloch’s term *Rationalisierung ohne Ratio*.
36. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 10.
37. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 5, 3; emphasis added.
38. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 15.
39. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 5, iii.
40. Fujita himself does not give the German original. This is Iida’s suggestion (e.g. Iida, *Sengo seishin no kōbō*, 358). Essentially, the notion refers to a determined effort to let one touch the bottom and start from scratch.
41. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 5, 8.

42. Iida, *Sengo seishin no kōbō*, 334.
43. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 10.
44. See, e.g. Iida, *Sengo seishin no kōbō*, 259, 311, 334, 336, 350, 354.
45. Katō, “Kaidai,” 234.
46. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 9.
47. *Ibid.*, 8–13.
48. *Ibid.*, 7.
49. *Ibid.*, 9.
50. Katō, “Kaidai,” 234.
51. *Ibid.*, 234.
52. In the article Fujita depends almost exclusively on the ‘ego’ in respect of the semantics of the concept of narcissism due to the fact that he misconstrues contemporary psychoanalytic meaning of the notion. In contemporary psychoanalysis, narcissism consists not of the ego, but of the ‘self’ (*jiko*) – on the psychoanalytic self in terms of narcissism, see, e.g. Kohut, *The Analysis of the Self*; Ronningstam, *Identifying and Understanding the Narcissistic Personality*.
53. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 19–20.
54. Fujita, e.g. *Chosakushū* 5, 289, *Chosakushū* 6, 84–5, 89, 214–18.
55. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 29.
56. *Ibid.*, 9.
57. *Ibid.*, 29–30.
58. *Ibid.*, 29.
59. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 49–56.
60. *Ibid.*, 45–9, 61–76.
61. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 8, 524.
62. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 77–83.
63. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 77–81. Polanyi first put forward the concept of fictitious commodities in his book entitled *The Great Transformation* (1944). It broadly signifies public goods and necessities created according to the need of the free market, such as land, labour and money.
64. *Ibid.*, 82–3.
65. *Ibid.*, 77.
66. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 8, 526.
67. This is Erich Fromm’s expression – Fromm, *To Have or to Be?*, 62 – which seems to capture the essence of what Fujita intends by the words.
68. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 86.
69. *Ibid.*, 86.
70. *Ibid.*, 87.
71. *Ibid.*, 88–9.
72. *Ibid.*, 89.
73. On this, see Sakurai, *Political Theories of Narcissism*, Ch. 5.
74. Katō, “Kaidai,” 240.
75. On this term, Fujita writes: ‘The Japanese company self is always driven by the desire to expand its territory on the basis of *Mitsubishi*-ism, *Itōchū*-ism and *Marubeni*-ism; this is precisely the economic imperialism of Japan (*keizai teikokushugi*)’ (Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 94–5).
76. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 92–110.
77. On this topic, Fujita implies a news magazine interview with Lorenz: ‘Ich glaube, die Einsicht in die eigene Begrenztheit ist Voraussetzung für das Weiterleben des Menschen; er ist in höchster Gefahr, es ist die Frage, ob er den “point of no return” nicht schon überschritten hat, ob wir nicht schon zum Untergang verurteilt sind. Doch ich bin kein Pessimist’ (Lorenz, “Wir werden von Steinzeitmenschen regiert’ Spiegel-Gespräch”).
78. On this topic, Fujita refers to Forster’s famous words, ‘The sort of poetry I seek resides in objects man can’t touch’ (Forster, *Two Cheers for Democracy*, 368).
79. *Ibid.*, 112; cf. 110–26.
80. *Ibid.*, 168.

81. Ibid., 185–90.
82. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 141; emphasis added.
83. In addition, Fujita stresses the importance of the contribution of ‘knowledge’ (*gakumon*) towards establishing the sovereignty of the people. He says, ‘[k]nowledge is merely a means of achieving it [sovereignty of the people]’ – Fujita, *Chosakushū* 1, 231.
84. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 192–93.
85. Ibid., 207.
86. Ibid., 197.
87. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 191.
88. On this, see Sakurai, “The Political Theorist, Fujita Shōzō”.
89. Fujita Shōzō, *Fujita Shōzō taiwa shūsei* 1, 263.
90. Fujita, *Chosakushū* 6, 205.
91. According to Fujita, this was characteristically shown in the downfall of the Association of Democratic Scientists (*Minshushugi Kagakusha Kyōkai*), particularly during the 1950s (see Fujita, “Han-taisei no shisō undō,” 36–7). On this view, as Andrew Barshay phrases it, the pivotal dialectical function of theory/practice in this intellectual society was hampered by the totalitarian logic of ‘dogmatism, blind obedience to the organization and leadership, and a destructive tendency to eliminate through public castigation and purge those whose ideas are deemed unacceptable in a given situation’ (Barshay, *The Social Sciences in Modern Japan*, 232).
92. Silverberg, *Erotic Grotesque Nonsense*, 266.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## References

- Barshay, Andrew E. *The Social Sciences in Modern Japan: The Marxian and Modernist Traditions*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2004.
- Cho, Sung-Eun. “‘Kōdo seichō’ hantai: Fujita Shōzō to ‘1960-nen’ igo no jidai” [A Protest against Japan’s High-Speed Growth: Fujita Shōzō in the Post-*Anpo* Period]. *Shisō* 2, no. 1054 (2012): 128–153.
- Cho, Sung-Eun. “*Taishū*’ to ‘shimin’ no sengo shisō: Fujita Shōzō to Matsushita Keiichi [Postwar Thoughts of the ‘Masses’ and ‘Citizens’: Fujita Shōzō and Matsushita Keiichi]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2017.
- Forsberg, Aaron. *America and the Japanese Miracle: The Cold War Context of Japan’s Postwar Economic Revival, 1950–1960*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Forster, Edward M. *Two Cheers for Democracy*. London: Edward Arnold, 1951.
- Fromm, Erich. *To Have or to Be?* New York: Continuum, 2011 [1976].
- Fujita, Shōzō. *Chosakushū* 1: *Tennōsei kokka no shihai genri* [The Writings, vol. 1: The Principles of Rule of the Tennō System State]. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō, 1998.
- Fujita, Shōzō. *Chosakushū* 5: *Seishinshiteki kōsatsu* [The Writings of Fujita Shōzō, vol. 5: Reflections on Intellectual History]. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō, 1997 (abbreviated to *Chosakushū* below).
- Fujita, Shōzō. *Chosakushū* 6: *Zentaishugi no jidai keiken* [The Writings, vol. 6: The Experience of the Times of Totalitarianism]. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō, 1997.
- Fujita, Shōzō. *Chosakushū* 8: *Sengo seishin no keiken II* [The Writings of Fujita Shōzō, vol. 8: The Experience of Postwar Spirits in Japan II]. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō, 1998.
- Fujita, Shōzō. *Fujita Shōzō taiwa shūsei* 1 [The Selected Interviews of Fujita Shōzō, vol. 1]. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō.
- Fujita, Shōzō. “Han-taisei no shisō undō: Minshushugi Kagakusha Kyōkai” [Dissident Spiritual Movements: The Association of Democratic Scientists]. In *Sengo Nihon no shisō* [Thought in

- Postwar Japan], edited by Kuno Osamu, Tsurumi Shunsuke and Fujita Shōzō. Tokyo: Keisō Shobō, 1966 [1956].
- Ichimura, Hiromasa. “Kaisetsu: Fujita Shōzō wo yomu tame ni” [The Editor’s Note for *The Selected Writings of Fujita Shōzō*, Heibonsha edn.: For Readers of Fujita Shōzō’s Works]. In *Fujita Shōzō serekushon* [The Selected Writings of Fujita Shōzō, Heibonsha edn.], edited by Ichimura Hiromasa, 408–437. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2010.
- Ichimura, Hiromasa. *Yomu to iu ikikata* [Reading as a Way of Life]. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2003.
- Iida, Taizō. *Sengo seishin no kōbō: Maruyama Masao to Fujita Shōzō wo yomu tame ni* [The Brilliant Radiance of Postwar Spirits in Japan: For Readers of Maruyama Masao’s and Fujita Shōzō’s Works]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2006.
- Iida, Taizō, Haruo Miyamura, and Kyonshiku So. “Kaidai ni kaete: Iida Taizō, Miyamura Haruo-san ni kiku” [An Alternative to the Editor’s Note for *The Writings of Fujita Shōzō*, vol. 7: *The Experience of Postwar Spirits in Japan: An Interview with Iida Taizō and Miyamura Haruo*]. In *Chosakushū 7: Sengo seishin no keiken I*, 443–458. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō, 1998.
- Ishida, Takeshi. *Maruyama Masao to no taiwa* [Dialogue with Maruyama Masao]. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō, 2005.
- Johnson, Chalmers. *MITI and the Japanese Miracle: The Growth of Industrial Policy, 1925–1975*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1982.
- Katō, Keiji. “Kaidai” [The Editor’s Note for *The Writings*, vol. 6]. In *Chosakushū 6: Zentaishugi no jidai keiken* [The Writings, vol. 6: The Experience of the Times of Totalitarianism], 233–242. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō, 1997.
- Kohut, Heinz. *The Analysis of the Self: A Systematic Approach to the Psychoanalytic Treatment of Narcissistic Personality Disorders*. London: Hogarth Press and Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1971.
- Lorenz, Konrad. “Wir werden von Steinzeitmenschen regiert’ Spiegel-Gespräch mit dem Verhaltensforscher Konrad Lorenz über die Zukunft der Menschheit.” *Der Spiegel* 45 (1988) (Spiegel-Online).
- Maruyama, Masao. “Logic and Psychology of Ultra-Nationalism.” In *Thought and Behaviour in Modern Japanese Politics*, expanded ed., edited and translated by Ivan Morris, 1–24. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Maruyama, Masao. “Logik und Psychologie des Ultra-nationalismus.” In *Freiheit und Nation in Japan: Ausgewählte Aufsätze 1936–1949, Bd. 1.*, edited by Wolfgang Seifert, 113–144. Munich: Indicum, 2007.
- Maruyama, Masao. “(Zōho-ban) Gendai seiji no shisō to kōdō, dai-1 bu tsuiki oyobi hochū” [Postscript to *Thought and Behaviour in Modern Japanese Politics*, expanded edn., Part I]. In *(Zōho-ban) Gendai seiji no shisō to kōdō* [Thought and Behaviour in Modern Japanese Politics, expanded edn.], edited by Maruyama Masao, 495–497. Tokyo: Miraisha, 1964 [1957].
- Miyamura, Haruo. *Sengo seishin no seijigaku: Maruyama Masao, Fujita Shōzō, Hagiwara Nobutoshi* [Politics in Postwar Japanese Spirits: Maruyama Masao, Fujita Shōzō and Hagiwara Nobutoshi]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2009.
- Ronningstam, Elsa F. *Identifying and Understanding the Narcissistic Personality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Saitō, Hideharu. “Genshiryoku no sangyōteki ri-yō to ‘shijō keizai zentaishugi’: Fujita Shōzō, Kāru Porannī, Misheru Fūkō no shijō keizai ninshiki no kentō wo tōshite” [The Industrial Use of Nuclear Energy and ‘Totalitarianism as Market Economy’: In Terms of Fujita Shōzō’s, Karl Polanyi’s and Michel Foucault’s Theories of Market Economy]. *Osaka Sangyō Daigaku Keizai Ronshū* 14, no. 1 (2013): 29–53.
- Sakurai, Takamichi. *Political Theories of Narcissism: Towards Self-Reflection on Knowledge and Politics from the Psychoanalytic Perspectives of Erich Fromm and Fujita Shōzō*. Zurich: LIT Verlag, 2018.
- Sakurai, Takamichi. “The Political Theorist, Fujita Shōzō: Between His Sense of Hope (*kibō*) and His Sense of Despair (*zetsubō*).” *Japanese Journal of Political Science* 19, no. 3 (2018): 519–529.
- Seifert, Wolfgang. “Masao Maruyama (1914–1996).” In *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, revised ed., vol. VI, edited by George Ritzer. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, online edn, 2016.

- Silverberg, Miriam. *Erotic Grotesque Nonsense: The Mass Culture of Japanese Modern Times*. 1st ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.
- Taraba, Masashi. “Fujita Shōzō-shi ni tsuite no danshō: Zentaishugi to toki, moshiku wa ‘seishin no yatōsei’ to kon’nichi no fūkei” [A Fragment of Mr. Fujita Shōzō’s Thought: Totalitarianism and Time, or ‘a Sense of Minority’ and Today’s Landscape]. *Gendai shisō* 32, no. 2 (2004): 174–185.
- Ueno, Toshiya. “Infancy and Critical Theory.” *Wakō Daigaku Hyōgen Gakubu kiyō* [The Bulletin of the Faculty of Representational Studies at Wako University] 15 (2015): 9–22. Accessed March 20, 2015. <http://id.nii.ac.jp/1073/00004078>.
- Vogel, Ezra F. *Japan as Number One: Lessons for America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Wada, Yū. “Fujita Shōzō no sekai’ no seiritu” [The Formation Process of the ‘World of Fujita Shōzō’]. *Gendai shisō* 32, no. 2 (2004): 186–201.