# JJPS

RESEARCH ARTICLE

# The political theorist, Fujita Shōzō: between his sense of hope (*kibō*) and his sense of despair (*zetsubō*)

Takamichi Sakurai[1,2]

[1]Graduate School of Media and Governance, Keio University, Fujisawa, Kanagawa, Japan and [2]Department of General Psychiatry, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany
Corresponding author. Email: tsakurai@sfc.keio.ac.jp

(First published online 16 July 2018)

## Abstract

In this article, I describe an important aspect of the intellectual tradition of Japanese political theory while focusing on the Japanese scholar Fujita Shōzō's political and scholarly activities. Not surprisingly, he has been chiefly considered a thinker or a historian of ideas, due to his being a pupil of Japan's brightest political scientist, Maruyama Masao. It must be stressed, however, that his scholarly works do not confine his academic scope to their ingredients; they are composed of theoretical requisites for the disciplinary activity of political theory, as can be seen particularly in his early contributions. He requires his theory to constitute integral aspects of practice, experience and perspective on the basis of his political concerns and practices in terms of detachment realism. From this perspective, I explore how Fujita changed his primary purpose from criticising Japan's 'Tennō system' (*Tennōsei*) to criticising its 'high-speed growth' (*kōdo seichō*) by highlighting the psychological transformation of his self-critical and self-reflective political thinking and acting according to his optimistic state of 'hope' (*kibō*) and his pessimistic state of 'despair' (*zetsubō*), especially in terms of his early work.

## 1. Introduction

My research aims to write a potted intellectual biography of the Japanese political theorist, Fujita Shōzō (1927–2003) through focusing on his political activities and his struggle with reality. With respect to the person of Fujita, there are already some excellent works that accurately depict both the man and his intellectual activities (e.g., Iida, 2006*a*, 2006*b*; Miyamura, 2009; in particular, Iida's works describe Fujita's theoretical activities including his bibliography in great detail).[1] Unfortunately, however, there is no translation of Fujita's writings, nor any work focusing on Fujita in English, apart from Sakurai's book (Sakurai, 2018).[2] His academic works have not yet been recognised by most non-Japanese researchers, even in relevant subject areas, due to the fact that they seem hidden behind the veil of his mentor, Maruyama Masao, who is often regarded as a founder of modern politics in Japan. It is certainly possible to discern Fujita's contributions within the disciplinary categories of the history of ideas (*shisōshi*) and intellectual history (*seishinshi*), but much more importantly it is also possible to discern his contributions in the intellectual tradition of Japanese political theory (*seiji riron*). In addition, it should be noted that they are of particular importance to the subject in the sense that he contributed especially to research into the spiritual basis of Japan's Tennō system

---

[1]As far as I know, there is still no translation of his works into English. But there exist translations of 'Shōwa hachi-nen wo chūshin to suru tenkō no jōkyō' (The Ideological Conversion in Japan in 1933) (1960) into German, translated as 'Die ideologische Konversion um 1933' (Fujita 1990 [1960]), and *Zentaishugi no jidai keiken* (The Experience of the Times of Totalitarianism) into Korean (Fujita 1998*d*), the contents of which are slightly different from the original. Also, there is a great work on Fujita in German that focuses on his early contributions (Seifert, 2010).

[2]There are, however, some works referring to Fujita, for example, Miriam Silverberg's *Erotic Grotesque Nonsense* (Silverberg 2007: 265–266).

(*Tennōsei*) and its high-speed economic growth (*kōdo keizai seichō*), both of which are profoundly associated with the core structure of politics in postwar Japan. For these reasons, his scholarly heritage is of great value, not only to the above two fields, familiar with his works, but also to the disciplines of contemporary political science and political theory.

In Japan, as noted above, he is generally known as a pupil of Maruyama and also as a scholar who contributed to the study of the Tennō system particularly from the standpoints of the history of ideas and intellectual history. Perhaps the reason why this image of Fujita exists is primarily due to the two following facts: first, that he began his academic career by publishing an article entitled 'Tennōsei' (The Tennō System) (1954),[3] which contains an interesting anecdote that this particularly important earliest work was written *on behalf of* his mentor Maruyama – this story has often been referred to when this writing is introduced (e.g., Iida, 2006*a*: 254–255, 287, 351; Iida, 2006*b*: 348–349); and second, that his representative early work is 'Tennōsei kokka no shihai genri' (The Principles of Rule of the Tennō System State) (1956) – abbreviated to 'Shihai genri' below. As regards this issue, it is important to remember that the theme of 'Shihai genri' addressed subsequent to the first essay was to 'construct the adequate logic that blows a hole in the "Tennō system state" (*Tennōsei kokka*) in prewar and wartime Japan – and the Tennō system society (*Tennōsei shakai*)…by finding out the logical essence of the system and by objectifying the whole structure' (Iida, 2006*a*: 255). From these perspectives, it is admitted that Fujita's early concerns gave rise to his image as a scholar of the Tennō system that has haunted him since.

To be sure, it seems true that the most popular image of Fujita noted above has so far confined his role to a historian of Japanese ideas who devoted himself primarily to analysing the Tennō system as a follower of Maruyama by laying great stress on the aforementioned facts. On this view, the Japanese sociologist Wada Yū, giving firm evidence, says: '*in general*, Fujita Shōzō, when referring to his thought, is categorised as part of Maruyama's genealogy, namely as a historian of Japanese ideas (*Nihon shisōshi-ka*) who "analysed and criticised, for example, the Tennō system and the principles of the system of the Meiji state (*Meiji kokka*) in his works such as 'Shihai genri' (1966) and 'Ishin no seishin' (The Spirit of the Meiji Restoration) (1967) by highlighting western modernist senses of value" (*The Asahi Shimbun*, 04.06.2003)' (Wada, 2004: 186).[4] In fact, the Japanese philosopher Kawamoto Takashi refers to himself as, 'a university student who had had a secret longing for the discipline of the history of political thought (*seiji shisōshi*) knew the name of Fujita Shōzō as an extension of Maruyama Masao and Hashikawa Bunzō.[5] The first of Fujita's books I bought were *Tennōsei kokka no shihai genri* (Miraisha, 1966) [abbreviated to *Shihai genri* below] and *Ishin no seishin* (Misuzu Shobō, 1967)' (Kawamoto, 2004: 231). This story provides enough evidence that we have labelled

---

[3]This is counted as Fujita's 'first article' (*shojo ronbun*) despite the fact that he previously published several essays, such as 'Kōdōryoku to shite no gunbu: Nihon fashizumu no kōzō' (The Military as Leverage: The Structure of Fascism in Wartime Japan) (1951), contributed to *Tōdai Shimbun* (The University of Tokyo Newspaper) when he was a student at the University of Tokyo, and 'Shohyō: Shinobu Seizaburō *Taishō seijishi 1, 2*' (A Book Review: Shinobu Seizaburō's *The Political History of the Taishō Period*, vols. 1–2) (1952), written in conjunction with Inumaru Giichi, who was a member of *Tōkyō Daigaku Rekishigaku Kenkyūkai* (University of Tokyo's Historical Science Society) – on this view, see, for example, Miyamura, 2009: 149. It is noted that Miyamura Haruo uses the expression of *shojo ronbun*, meaning the first written and published article, in his 'Editor's Note for *The Writings of Fujita Shōzō, vol. 1*' (Miyamura 1998: 318). However, this word is not provided in his work later published noted above, in which the contribution was to some extent modified. In the latter work, Miyamura has replaced it by the words of 'Fujita's *first writing*' (*Fujita no hajimete no ronbun*) (2009: 149; emphasis added).

[4]In his lecture in 1985 – this was later published as 'Tennōsei ni tsuite' (On the Tennō System) printed in the work *Hōsei Heiwa Daigaku kōgiroku 3: Heiwa to yutakasa wo toinaosu* (Transcripts of Lectures at Hōsei Peace University 3: Reflections on the Meanings of Peace and Affluence) edited by Hōsei Heiwa Daigaku (Origin Publishing Centre, 1991) – with respect to the view that he is regarded as a scholar of the Tennō system, Fujita himself says as follows: 'he [facilitator of the programme] requested me to give a lecture on the Tennō system on the grounds that I'm regarded as a specialist in the system…To be sure, I explored and wrote some articles on it in youth, but I didn't do anything about it except for such tasks, and merely carried out research into the Tennō system in the post-Meiji period…so I'm not even a leading professional or a working specialist in the Tennō system' (Fujita, 1998*c*: 480–481).

[5]Hashikawa is a famous follower of Maruyama.

Fujita as *a pupil of Maruyama*, that is to say, his academic efforts have been seen exclusively as *an extension of* his *great* mentor's work, namely as a scholar of the 'Maruyama School' (*Maruyama gakuha*).

Despite these facts, on the other hand, it is also true that Fujita has another aspect of his career, apart from being a scholar of the school, which has been commented on. Indeed, it is acknowledged that it is not only this aspect, being under the shadow of Maruyama, but also another aspect characterising his post-'"despair" period' (*zetsubō no jidai*) (Iida, 2006a: 260),[6] that have been recognised (e.g., Higashi, 2004; Hondō, 2004; Taraba, 2004). Representative works written in the period undoubtedly include *Seishinshiteki kōsatsu* (Reflections on Intellectual History) (1982) – abbreviated to *Kōsatsu* below – which, as Iida Taizō (who has the same mentor as Fujita and was a colleague of Fujita's) puts it, is regarded as 'the memorial writing signifying the birth of "the world of Fujita Shōzō" (*Fujita Shōzō no sekai*)' (Iida, 2006a: 330). One of his masterworks, *Zentaishugi no jidai keiken* (The Experience of the Times of Totalitarianism) (1995), is also counted as his representative writing published after his 'despair'. Roughly speaking, the concept constituting these two works is to restore the 'substance of things' (*honraiteki na mono*) on the basis of 'experience' (*keiken*) (Iida, 2006a: 336); nowadays these two notions have become important key terms for understanding the essence of the 'later Fujita' (*kōki Fujita*) that is provided primarily in the above two works.[7] For instance, all the three essays on Fujita noted above often refer at least to one of those two works – Hondō's and Taraba's articles deal with both works. In these respects, it is admitted that these data support the fact that there exists a different aspect constituted primarily by the two books regarded as his representative later works, whose importance has sometimes been highlighted in addition to his early contributions.

However, it must be stressed that it is not accurate to consider Fujita only as an extension of a thinker and a historian of ideas in the shadow of Maruyama. It is possible, or rather, necessary, to discern him as a political theorist by focusing on his early work. The purpose of my research is to demonstrate this scholarly aspect of Fujita by identifying the meaning of the political in his early political and theoretical contributions. In this exploration, I will illustrate its importance, as seen in his early works, by describing the significance of his critique of the Tennō system and Japan's high-speed growth (*kōdo seichō*) in terms of his self-critical and self-reflective political thinking and acting, depicted by his optimistic psychological state of 'hope' (*kibō*) and his pessimistic psychological state of 'despair' (*zetsubō*).

## 2. Fujita's encounters with Maruyama and the Tennō system

Fujita Shōzō was born in Ehime in Shikoku, 'the fourth largest island in Japan' (Iida, 2006a: 252), on 17 September 1927. It is believed that, in the educational stage of the lower sixth form (*kōkō ni-nen*), Fujita already decided to go to the University of Tokyo (*Tōkyō Daigaku*) in order to study the 'spiritual structure' (*seishin kōzō*) of the Tennō system under Maruyama, on the grounds that he was particularly impressed by Maruyama's essay 'Gunkoku shihaisha no seishin keitai' (Thought and Behaviour Patterns of Japan's Wartime Leaders) (1949), which critically analysed the psychic disease of wartime Japan noted above (Iida, 2006a: 253; Iida, 2006b: 346). It is possible to anticipate the later birth of the political theorist (*seiji rironka*) Fujita Shōzō by stressing this strong passion for studying politics on the basis of Maruyama's research method.[8]

---

[6]It is believed that the 'period of despair' marked a turning point in his career, around between the early 1960s and the mid-1970s. For example, Iida clearly mentions that '"Kōdo seichō" hantai' (A Protest against Japan's High-Speed Growth) (1969) marked the point (e.g., Iida, 2006a: 346–347).

[7]Wada, for example, establishes the distinction between the early Fujita (*zenki Fujita*) and the later Fujita (*kōki Fujita*) (Wada, 2004).

[8]So far, no one has viewed Fujita as a political theorist. Most researchers on Fujita's work have believed him to be either a 'thinker' (*shisōka*) (e.g., Iida, 2006a; Ichimura, 2010; Cho, 2012, 2015) or a 'historian of ideas' (*shisōshi-ka*) (e.g., Ichimura, 2003, 2010; Miyamura, 2009). As we shall see later, however, it seems that these ways of understanding Fujita have been

In 1950, Fujita actually started to study in the Faculty of Law at the University of Tokyo – in July of this year, the Korean War began. In 1952, as per his wishes, he was allowed to participate in Maruyama's seminar, and studied the method of the history of political thought with the use of the English text *Ideology and Utopia* (1936 [1929]) by Karl Mannheim. In 1953, Fujita graduated from the university and started to work in the Faculty of Law at Hosei University (*Hōsei Daigaku Hōgakubu*), where he lectured on the history of Japanese politics (*Nihon seijishi*). In the same year, as noted above, he wrote his first article 'Tennōsei' printed in *The Lexicon of Politics* (*Seijigaku jiten*) (1954) on behalf of Maruyama due to a relapse of his tuberculosis. Iida precisely depicts Fujita's research aim at this time – here Iida's sentences are cited again although they were already partly quoted above: 'Fujita's subject of research in the postwar period designated as his starting point of forming his thought was…to construct the adequate logic that blows a hole in the "Tennō system state" in prewar and wartime Japan (and the Tennō system society), which led this country to destructive militarism and fascism on the grounds that the people *got carried away* (*yarikirenai*) with the specific mood of the whole nation, by finding out the logical essence of the system and by objectifying the whole structure' (Iida, 2006*a*: 255). It is presumed that this theme became the fundamental basis of his study thereafter. In fact, the subject of his masterwork, 'Shihai genri' (1956), captures the essence of the Tennō system. It claims,

> The absolutist Tennō system (*Tennōsei zettaishugi*) enabled the arbitrary and absolute manner of action to permeate every aspect of society, paradoxically, not by carrying absolutist power (*kenryoku zettaishugi*) throughout society; it thereby succeeded in laying the incomparable and solid foundations of an absolutist system (*zettaishugi taikei*) (Fujita, 1998*a*: 48).

## 3. The *Anpo tōsō* and *kōdo seichō*

The 1956 declaration that 'it is no longer "postwar"' (*mohaya sengo de wa nai*) by *Keizai Hakusho* (Economic White Paper of Japan), which aimed at 'Japan's economic growth and modernisation' (*Nihon keizai no seichō to kindaika*), and which meant the transition from the postwar period to the 'high-speed growth' (*kōdo seichō*) period,[9] signified the 'departure from the "postwar"' (*sengo e no ketsubetsu*) and the experience of 'intellectual conversion (*tenkō*) stemming from the despair of radicalism in the postwar era';[10] this denoted the necessity of reflecting upon 'postwar' (*sengo*) and 'prewar' (*senzen*) Japan, which gave rise to another essential reflection on 'modern Japan' (*kindai Nihon*) (Iida, 2006*a*: 256–257). As Iida puts it, 'the period from 1956 to 1959 marked a huge turning point for intellectuals in postwar Japan (*sengo chishiki-jin*)' (2006*a*: 256).

---

largely determined by some partial views of the persons carrying out research on his work, that is, by *their research fields*. In other words, they simply reflect their fixed views, as exemplified by the fact that mostly those who have studied Fujita's theory have regarded themselves and have also been regarded as neither political theorists nor scholars of political theory, primarily *due to their research areas*. In Japan, the two disciplines of political theory and *Japanese* political theory, which should have close links with one another – generally, the latter is called '(the history of) Japanese political thought' (*Nihon seiji shisōshi* or *Nihon seiji shishō*), and is also sometimes called the 'history of Japanese ideas' (*Nihon shisōshi*) – have been separated, and it is sometimes believed that they are different fields. It is generally considered, on the one hand, that the former studies *Western* political theory including its history with a focus on studying its ideas, exploring political principles and laying the foundations of political norms, and, on the other hand, that the latter studies *Japanese* political thought with a particular focus on understandings of its historical development and its ideas. Admittedly, the latter discipline *very often does not consider and reflect upon* political principles and norms, as does the former. In other words, there is a distinct difference in disciplinary characteristics between them. Although Fujita researchers are not necessarily confined to these two disciplines, these facts to a certain extent explain *what concern* their works have been based on, and *why* the above views have primarily been provided. In short, most scholars who have tackled topics of Fujita's writings have *unconsciously* disregarded his aspect of a *political theorist*.

[9]This term has specific meaning to Fujita, and it is therefore much better to use the Japanese expression of *kōdo seichō* than the English words equivalent to the term such as 'high-speed growth' and 'high-speed economic growth'. Hence, my research rather prefers the Japanese original.

[10]On the meanings of *tenkō*, see, e.g., Tsurumi (1991, 2011).

In 1960, Fujita, in conjunction with Maruyama and other Japanese intellectuals, was actively involved in the 'the anti-Security Treaty struggle of 1960' (*Anpo tōsō*) – the latter Japanese term will primarily be used below – which was organised on the grounds that Prime Minister Kishi Nobusuke at the time concluded the 'USA–Japan Security Treaty' (1960 *Anpo*) on 19 January,[11] which was finally approved by the House of Representatives on 20 May of the same year. Through taking part in this political activity, Fujita contributed several writings on those political events such as: 'Tokkenteki chishikijin e no yōsei: arata na kōdō no jihatsuteki soshiki wo' (An Appeal to Japan's Privileged Intellectuals: Towards Establishing Voluntary Associations Aiming for New Politics) (1960) printed in *The University of Tokyo Newspaper* (*Tōkyō Daigaku Shimbun*), which encouraged students at the University of Tokyo to try to get rid of '*Tōdai*' as a 'school for bureaucrats' (*kanryō yōseijo*) that cultivated a sense of perquisite and to transform the university into a 'place of genuine and authentic scholarship' (*junsui na gakumon no fu*) (Fujita, 1998*b*: 183); '6/15 jiken, ryūketsu no kachū kara: Kono me de mita keisatsu kenryoku no bōryoku' (The Front Line of Defence against Violence and Bloodshed in the 6/15 Incident in Japan: The Truth of the Violence of Police Authority) (1960), which, as an actual document of the 6/15 Incident,[12] was contributed to *Asahi Journal*; and 'Shaku-shaku daiji wo eien ni hakaran: Kikyō gakusei S-kun e no tegami' (On the Basis of Common Sense: A Letter to Mr S, a Japanese Student in Favour of His Hometown) (1960) – abbreviated to 'Shaku-shaku' below – printed in the monthly journal *Sekai*, a speculative article that imitated a letter for 'Japanese students in favour of their hometown' (*kikyō gakusei*), and that aimed at discussing '*jinmin-shugi*' – although this can be translated as 'people-ism' in which politics is based on the principles of Fujita's theory of the 'sovereignty of the people' (*jinmin shuken*),[13] the Japanese term will primarily be used below – with the students (Fujita, 1998*b*: 220). These facts elucidate the person of Fujita who did not always closet himself in his study but sometimes actually took part in political activity. In fact, he formulated his theory through these political practices. As Iida puts it, 'Fujita's basic position at the time was to seek to find out the conditions (possibilities) for establishing the principles of "sovereignty of the people" – the conditions of "democratisation" (*minshuka*) – through reflecting upon and identifying a new political situation brought about on "19 May 1960"[14] – abbreviated to the '5/19' below – with the past situation, in which an original individual freedom and a sense of "natural rights" (*shizenken*) came into existence from the "state of nature" (*shizen jōtai*) without a state (*kokka izen*) – a "tabula rasa" (*hakushi*) – under the conditions that the people had to live in the "burnt-out ruins and the black market" (*yakeato yamiichi*) since "V-J Day" in 1945 (the "postwar" in the narrow sense)' (2006*a*: 259).

The above description clearly explains that Fujita was not a scholar who was simply satisfied with speculative, empirical and positive theories. Rather, his stance was characterised as the complete opposite of the habitual scholarly styles, and required observing *practice*, collecting *experience*, achieving '*perspective* upon [his] own society' and 'appraising the *importance of what had been observed* in the light of what was known' (Wolin, 1968: 319; emphases added). In this respect, he is regarded exactly as a *theorist* in the original Greek sense. In fact, his theory of 'primordial man' (*Urmensch*,

---

[11]This is usually abbreviated to '*60-nen Anpo*' or '*Anpo*' in Japanese.

[12]This is the incident that, on 15 June 1960, an anti-Security Treaty demonstration organised by several groups such as *Anpo Kaitei Soshi Kokumin Kaigi* (The People's Council to Prevent the Revision of the Security Treaty) and *Zengakuren* (The All-Japan Federation of Student Associations) had fought with the police, who had injured many demonstrators, and this violent behaviour led a student at the University of Tokyo, Kanba Michiko, to her death.

[13]For example, Fujita's sovereignty of the people is defined by Fujita himself 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, 1998*b*: 220).

[14]It is said that, on this day, the anti-Security Treaty movement supporting parliamentary democracy had begun to gain strength before the Security Treaty bill was railroaded through the Lower House late at night (e.g., Iida, 2006*a*: 258).

*genjin*),[15] whose standpoint was first provided in his interview 'Zero kara no shuppatsu' (Start from Scratch) (1960), was advanced through actually observing, experiencing and appraising the political movement, the *Anpo tōsō*, particularly through focusing on the 5/19. Fujita says:

> I believe that in the spiritual dimension the *Anpo tōsō* was constituted by the social conditions of the black market, that is by the characteristics of the primordial man (*genjin-sei*) in postwar Japan. Almost all the people in Japan have been living through the market. This way of life has given them the prototype of the character features. There is the living spirit claiming the right to live outside the law represented as natural rights in them (Fujita *et al.*, 2006*a* [1960]: 132).

As Iida clearly mentions, 'after the *Anpo tōsō*, Fujita fell into "despair" (*zetsubō*) particularly after the 1960s, during the age of "Japan's high-speed economic growth" (*kōdo keizai seichō*)' (2006*a*: 260). However, it is possible to believe that, in the early 1960s, he still retained his strong interest in actual politics. In fact, Fujita actively contributed some *politically charged* works that show that he was a political *activist* and *theorist*: for example, 'Nihon ni okeru futatsu no kaigi' (The Two Kinds of Discussions of Japan) (1960) – abbreviated to 'Futatsu no kaigi' below – which warned *against* the Japanese 'gossip session model of existing primarily to meet and talk' (*hanashiai-shugi*),[16] and, at the same time, which tried to design the '*principles* of genuine and authentic discussion' (*ikita kaigi*); 'Tōjisha yūi no genri: Terorizumu to shihaisha e no kōgi' (Towards the Principles Based on Persons Concerned: A Protest against an Act of Terrorism, and the Attitude of Japan's Rulers) (1961) – abbreviated to 'Tōjisha' below – which was 'aimed at protesting against an act of terrorism, the "Shimanaka Incident" (*Shimanaka jiken*), and against the attitude of Japan's rulers and conservative thinkers towards it' (1998*b*: 267), and at applying the 'principles based on "persons concerned" (*tōjisha*)'; 'Jiyū kara no tōbō hihan' (A Criticism of Escape from Freedom) (1962) – abbreviated to 'Tōbō hihan' below – which criticised a compromise solution adopted by *Shisō no Kagaku Kenkyūkai* (Research Association for the Science of Thought) towards 'Shisō no Kagaku Incident' (*Shisō no Kagaku jiken*) provoked by *Chūō Kōron-sha* (*Chūō Kōron* Publishing Company), and which called for 'civil liberties' (*shiminteki jiyū*).

At this point, it is interesting to note that all the above three works published after the *Anpo tōsō* are more *theoretical* than his other writings previously published while taking a stronger position of 'protest' and 'criticism'. Perhaps this is profoundly associated with Fujita's more sophisticated theoretical view of politics, which was taken particularly since 'Shaku-shaku', in which, as noted above, Fujita provided the essential framework of his theory of the 'sovereignty of the people'. In fact, his article "5/19' zenshi' (The History of the Preceding Period of the 5/19) (1960), published just after 'Shaku-shaku', presented a more precise view of his conception of the people. As Fujita writes, 'nations (*kokumin*) mean the people (*jinmin*) who are willing to be nations (*kokumin*) and those who formulate a theory for their nation (*kuni*)' (Fujita, 1998*b*: 245). Significantly, this implies that Fujita recognised that the 'autonomous subjects' (*jiritsuteki shutai*) came into being in the 5/19.

For these reasons, it should be considered that all of the above three works, 'Futatsu no kaigi', 'Tōjisha' and 'Tōbō hihan', as well as the above two works, 'Shaku-shaku' and "5/19' zenshi', were intended particularly as a theoretical process of establishing his theory of the sovereignty of the people. For instance, 'Tōjisha' suggested the direction that postwar Japan should have taken in the light of the

---

[15]Fujita provides a brief account of this concept: 'The term bourgeois is often translated as citizen (*shimin*, *citoyen*) [he most often intends the French term *citoyen* by the Japanese *shimin*]. Although Japanese language has a lack of the terminological tradition, I do not mean bourgeois or the middle class by citizen, particularly when referring to citizenism (*shimin-shugi*). All the classes and workers, that is "primordial men" (*Urmensch*, *genjin*), are meant by the word. In short, it denotes *citoyen*' (Fujita et al., 2006*a* [1960]: 131–132). For Fujita, therefore, the German *Urmensch* and the Japanese *genjin* mean the French *citoyen* equivalent to the English 'citizen'. In this respect, it can be argued that, in his sense, the former two terms imply the German *Bürger*.

[16]This is Wesley Makoto Sasaki-Uemura's translation (2001: 138).

experience of Shimanaka Incident, entertaining Fujita's hopes of laying the foundations of the principles of sovereignty of the people:

> There is still no sovereign spirit (*shukensha no seishin*) in most of the people (*kokumin*) of this county. In principle, however, it must be built, and they would be the people (*Nihon kokumin*) who accomplish this objective in the future, when necessary. It is believed that the Constitution requires that they should do so, and I hope that they will complete the task (1998*b*: 285–286).

Here it is possible to see an adequate image of a political theorist who sought to find out what politics ought to be *through political practice*. In this period, in addition, he published some significant writings such as 'Atarashii seijiteki shutai no shutsugen' (The Emergence of New Political Subjects in Japan) (1962), which also constructed his theory of the sovereignty of the people, and 'Gendai ni okeru "risei" no kaifuku' (The Restoration of Reason in Contemporary Times) (1962) – abbreviated to '"Risei" no kaifuku' below – which provided his essential theoretical stance on the political situation in terms of philosophical thought.

It is noted, however, that there was a gradual change in Fujita's state of mind at this time. An opportunity of changing his mind was provided, as Iida says, by 'the fact that Fujita's "disappointment at defeat in the *Anpo tōsō*" (*anpo zukare*) had a lasting effect on him', that is to say, 'the experience of the "defeat in *Anpo*" (*haiboku*) and "high-speed growth" (*kōdo seichō*), while society gradually underwent a radical transformation of culture and spirit…, crushed his "hopes" (*kibō*) based on the sole possibility of restoring society in postwar Japan, and it rather led him to start to seek a way of more radical "restoration" (*saisei*) by keeping himself within the "disappointment" (*shitsubō*)' (2006*a*: 263). From this perspective, Fujita's masterworks, 'Puroretaria minshushugi no genkei: Rēnin no shisō kōzō' (The Principles of Proletarian Democracy: The Structure of Lenin's Thought) (1964), 'Genshoteki jōken' (The Primordial Conditions) (1964) and 'Jinmin shuken no seishinteki ichi jōken' (A Spiritual Condition of the Sovereignty of the People) (1964) – abbreviated to 'Jinmin shuken' below – all of which were published after his silence for 1½ years, are regarded precisely as 'the declaration of his new start' (Iida, 2006*b*: 364).

## 4. The Vietnam War and Fujita's '15 August statement'

In the mid-1960s, just when Japan was in the midst of strong economic growth and the Vietnam War was heating up, Fujita's series of works 'Ishin no seishin' (The Spirit of the Meiji Restoration) (1965) began to be published. As Iida puts it, the work 'aimed to see the driving force of reform by shining a light on the fact that an "unbiased and impartial style of argument, behaviour and solidarity" (*ōgi, ōkō, ōketsu*), signifying the new "spirit of the Meiji Restoration" (*Ishin no seishin*), came into existence from the old regime' (Iida, 2006*a*: 263; cf. Fujita, 1997: 1–43). However, here I am intrigued primarily by Fujita's '15 August statement', which was issued in 1965, while he was writing the article 'Rondan ni okeru chiteki taihai' (Intellectual Decay in Discourse in Japan) and preparing for the interview conducted by *Sekai* 'Betonamu shinryaku hantai undō no hitotsu no jiko ninshiki' (My Own View on the Anti-Vietnam War Movement), both of which raised the politically charged topic of US military intervention in Vietnam. I will first quote the statement, and then consider it briefly below – although it consists of relatively long sentences, its entirety is cited, so we can be aware that he consistently concerned himself with the same issue after his first work.

Declaration:

On 15 August 1945, the whole world brought an end to World War II, which produced tens of millions of casualties, and which left the basis for human life in ruins, defeating fascism and militarism. It was an epoch-making day in world history. For us, the people of Japan (*Nihon kokumin*), in particular, that revolutionary day, bringing about a considerable change in social values, marked a starting point for nation-wide reflection (*kokuminteki hansei*).

Today, going back to our first objective twenty years ago, we who are gathering together at Kudan Kaikan hall (*Kudan Kaikan*) appeal vigorously to the people (*kokumin*): first, that we resolve on making utmost efforts to realise the principles of fundamental human rights (*kihonteki jinken*) and unarmed neutrality (*hibusō*) under the Constitution; second, that in the global community we assign maximum value to equal rights for and independence of people in the world, and oppose all uses of military force endangering the dignity based on this first principle. On the basis of these principles, then, we appeal for the following necessity for the US and Japan concerning the present political situation: first, to leave the fate of resolving the political conflict over Vietnam in the hands of the Vietnamese people on the grounds that we protest against the US military intervention in the country; second, to resume diplomatic relations with China and to bring it into the fold of the international community; and third, to put an end to all of Japan's policies harmful to the unification of Korea.

It goes without saying that for twenty years the people of Japan have made a tireless effort to realise democracy (*minshushugi*) and to achieve lasting peace (*heiwa*) up until now. To be sure, therefore, we have yielded valuable results. At the same time, however, it is observed that we have constantly experienced political resistance to this attempt. We have a challenging task ahead of us. V-J Day is not yet over; it has been twenty years. We the People hereby pledge to continue unremittingly with our efforts to realise the universal value shared by all humanity (*jin-rui kyōtsū no mokuteki*), represented by fundamental human rights and freedom of all the people in the world, together with them.

<div align="center">

Tokyo, 15 August 1965
(1998*c*: 714–715)

</div>

We are well aware that this description captures the essence of the early Fujita. First of all, the above statement overlaps with the essential standpoint of the early Fujita: first, that it 'construct[s] the adequate logic that blows a hole in the "Tennō system state" in prewar and wartime Japan (and the Tennō system society), which led this country to destructive militarism and fascism … by finding out the logical essence of the system and by objectifying the whole structure' (Iida, 2006*a*: 255); and second, that it 'seek[s] to find out the conditions (possibilities) for establishing the principles of "sovereignty of the people" – the conditions of "democratisation" (*minshuka*) – through reflecting upon and identifying a new political situation brought about on the "5/19" in 1960 with the past situation, in which an original individual freedom and a sense of "natural rights" came into existence from the "state of nature" without a state – a "tabula rasa" – under the conditions that the people had to live in the "burnt-out ruins and the black market" since "V-J Day" in 1945' (Iida, 2006*a*: 259). In addition, it is understood that his 'tireless effort(s)' (*fudan no doryoku*), regarded as the process of advancing his theory of the 'sovereignty of the people', faced 'political resistance to [his] attempt' (*doryoku wo habami samatageru seijiteki dōkō*), which presumably signifies, for example, the direction of *Anpo* and *kōdo seichō* determined exactly by *politics*. For Fujita, perhaps, the 'first objective' (*shoshin*) must also have meant his decision to study the method of 'spiritual structure'. In sum, it can be argued that these attitudes to the 'postwar', namely his fundamental principles that had been consistently retained since his first objective, were methodologically applied to his position on actual politics represented by the Vietnam War. In particular, the three principles of 'sovereignty of the people' (*kokumin shuken*), 'fundamental human rights' (*kihonteki jinken*) and 'pacifism' (*heiwashugi*), which the 'Constitution of Japan' (*Nihon-koku kenpō*) requires, must have reminded him of his theory of the 'sovereignty of the people' based on the autonomy of the people and the 'principles of universal value of human beings'[17] (*fuhen ningenteki kihanshugi*) on the basis of 'fundamental rights'

---

[17]"'Risei' no kaifuku' (1962) (see p. 8 above) primarily presents this theoretical standpoint.

(*kihonken*) guaranteed by 'common sense' (*komon sensu*).[18] For these reasons, it must be stressed that Fujita's 8/15 declaration is of huge significance for his early work.

Since the statement, Fujita went into his silence again after having issued '"Shingi" ni tsuite' (On Decision-Making) (1965). As Iida puts it, 'it is believed that at the time Fujita internally philosophised in a deep trough, as seeking for a new direction of his study as later suggested by "Itan-ron danshō" (*The Writings of Fujita Shōzō, vol. 10: Political Fragments of Unorthodoxy*), which was to be written next spring (1967)' (2006*a*: 266). Under this state of mind, he left for the UK for his study in 1967.

## 5. Conclusion

As can be seen in Fujita's early political and theoretical engagement, he is also counted as a political theorist in so far as the discipline of political theory, derived from ancient Greece, requires that its disciplinary work should establish a new theory, showing 'public concern' (Wolin, 1969: 1078–1079) and touching on 'political practice' (*seijiteki jissen*) (Maruyama, 1969: 238; 1995: 149); in other words, political theory essentially concerns itself with *res publica* (or *ta politika*) by engaging in theoretical, political activities, as Fujita demonstrated through seeking to define *the political* via his own involvement in them. In fact, Fujita formulated his political theory through taking a self-critical and self-reflective perspective of political thinking and acting, and through showing both his optimistic psychological state of *kibō* and his pessimistic psychological state of *zetsubō*, by means of criticising the Tennō system and *kōdo seichō*, both of which are profoundly associated with the core political structure of postwar Japan, thereby trying to find out *what politics ought to be*, namely the political.

From these perspectives, Fujita's political theory is characterised as normative theoretical attempts to identify what politics ought to be, as can be seen particularly in his theories of the 'sovereignty of the people' and 'primordial man'. As we saw above, in his early work he is still under Maruyama's strong influence, in the sense of seeing politics in the dualism of theory and practice in terms of Western modernism. It is interesting to note, however, that in his early contributions, we can precisely recognise the idea of radical democracy that citizens are willing to establish their political power by themselves through their political participation, as exemplified by the fact that Fujita lays stress on their involvement in public decision-making, rather than on the functions of the parliamentary system; in this respect, it is believed that his political theory has its raison d'être in helping citizens to perform that task. Indeed it is possible to discern the Habermasian conceptions of public deliberation and consensus formation in Fujita's political theory, but much more importantly, it is also possible to discern the Arendtian conception of power particularly in his conception of the people, in the sense that this theoretical component is exactly characteristic of his political theory. With regard to the latter view, I emphasise his theory that primordial men with an 'original individual freedom and a sense of natural rights' (p. 6 above) come into being as the people who establish their own political power under the conditions of the burnt-out ruins and the black-market, regarded as the state of nature. To put it differently, in his view, their voluntary association gives rise to legitimate political power on the basis of a social contract.

It must be noted that, although Fujita's scholarly activities are not restricted to the subject area of *political* theory, it is undoubtedly true that as we saw in his early contributions, his way of showing his concern is typified particularly by being involved in 'public life' – or 'political life' – for example, by way of public decision making, with which the discipline is essentially associated (e.g., Grant, 2002; Brown, 2010; cf. Kaufman-Osborn, 2010). In this respect, it is possible to consider that his political

---

[18]For example, Fujita has stressed the importance of 'common sense' in relation to the Constitution of Japan (Fujita *et al.*, 2006*b* [1966]: 337–8); he called for an act of 'filibuster' (*giji bōgai*), 'a right based on the spirit of parliamentarism' (*gikaishugi no seishin ni nezashita kenri*), as the common sense of the Constitution. Needless to say, he intended particular emphasis on the role of common sense in every constitution. Also, it is noted that Fujita employs the term *kyōtsūkō* as a translation of the English common sense, e.g., in his work 'Jinmin shuken' (Fujita 1998*b*: 383), and the term *kyōtsū no shiki*, a translation of common sense, in 'Shaku-shaku' (Fujita 1998*b*: 223).

theory seems to be in favour of the 'detachment form of realism' with respect to ongoing debates about realism in political theory (Baderin, 2014; cf. Gunnell, 2010; Philp, 2010). Most importantly, apart from these issues, Japanese scholars in the field of political theory aim to find theoretical implications of the academic discipline and formulate their own theories *not in the Western context but in their own social context*. In my view, Fujita's political theory is a good example with great potential to contribute to the intellectual tradition of the academic field in Japan, precisely because in his scholarly endeavours we can clearly recognise *Japanese* political theory (*seiji riron*), which is different from political thought (*seiji shisō*) that essentially devotes itself to understanding and illuminating thinkers' texts and ideas. No doubt, the raison d'être and survival of the academic discipline of *seiji riron* depend heavily on whether Japanese researchers in relevant fields seek disciplinary ingredients of the subject *within its Japanese intellectual tradition* (e.g., Kakuta, 2012; Ochi, 2016; Yamawaki, 2016). A key clue to dealing with the long-lasting, unresolved problem of the 'sterility (*funinsei*) of Japanese political science' lies exactly in this issue (Maruyama, 1969: 227; 1995: 136).

## References

**Baderin A** (2014) Two forms of realism in political theory. *European Journal of Political Theory* **13**, 132–153.

**Brown W** (2010) Political theory is not a luxury: a response to Timothy Kaufman-Osborn's 'Political Theory as a Profession'. *Political Research Quarterly* **63**, 680–685.

**Cho S-E** (2012) '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**, 128–153.

**Cho S-E** (2015) *'Taishū' to 'shimin': Fujita Shōzō to Matsushita Keiichi ni okeru 'taishū minshushugi' no seiji shisō (The Conceptions of the 'Masses' and 'Citizen': Fujita Shōzō's and Matsushita Keiichi's Political Thoughts of 'Mass Democracy')* (PhD thesis). The University of Tokyo.

**Fujita S** (1990) [1960], 'Die ideologische Konversion um 1933' (The Ideological Conversion in Japan in 1933) [Shōwa hachi-nen wo chūshin to suru tenkō no jōkyō], Detlef Foljanty (trans). In Masao N and Masato M (eds), *Japan zwischen den Kriegen. Eine Auswahl japanischer Forschungen zu Faschismus und Ultranationalismus (Japan during the* Interwar Period: *A Selection of Research on Fascism and Ultranationalism in* Japan), Hamburg: Gesellschaft für Naturund Völkerkunde Ostasiens, pp. 379–409.

**Fujita S** (1997) *Fujita Shōzō chosakushū 4: Ishin no seishin (The Writings of Fujita Shōzō, Vol. 4: The Spirit of the Meiji Restoration)*. Tokyo: Mishuzu Shobō (abbreviated to *Chosakushū* below).

**Fujita S** (1998a) *Chosakushū 1: Tennōsei kokka no shihai genri (The Writings, Vol. 1: The Principles of Rule of the Tennō System State)*.

**Fujita S** (1998b) *Chosakushū 7: Sengo seishin no keiken I (The Writings, Vol. 7: The Experience of Postwar Spirits in Japan I)*.

**Fujita S** (1998c) *Chosakushū 8: Sengo seishin no keiken II (The Writings, Vol. 8: The Experience of Postwar Spirits in Japan II)*.

**Fujita S** (1998d) In Sune I (ed.), *Zentaishugi no jidai keiken (The Experience of the Times of Totalitarianism)*. Seoul: Sōsaku to Hihyōsha.

**Fujita S et al.** (2006a) [1960], 'Zero kara no shuppatsu' (Start from Scratch). In Fujita S, *Fujita Shōzō taiwa shūsei 1 (The Selected Interviews of Fujita Shōzō, Vol. 1)*. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō, pp. 119–118.

**Fujita S et al.** (2006b) [1966], 'Sengo minshushugi no kiki to chishikijin' (The Crisis of Democracy in Postwar Japan and Japan's Intellectuals). In Fujita S, *Fujita Shōzō taiwa shūsei 1 (The Selected Interviews of Fujita Shōzō, Vol. 1)*. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō, pp. 311–344.

**Grant RW** (2002) Political theory, political science, and politics. *Political Theory* **30**, 577–595.

**Gunnell JG** (2010) Professing political theory. *Political Research Quarterly* **63**, 674–679.

**Higashi T** (2004) 'Arayuru hihan wa hikaete kudasai' (Refrain from criticism). *Gendai shisō* **32**, 152–157.

**Hondō A** (2004) Fujita Shōzō-shi no koe no hōi ni tsuite: Dokuritsu seishin to wa nani ka' (Fujita Shōzō's critique: what is an independent spirit? *Gendai shisō* **32**, 84–105.

**Hōsei Heiwa Daigaku** (ed.) (1991) *Hōsei Heiwa Daigaku kōgiroku 3: Heiwa to yutakasa wo toinaosu* (Transcripts of Lectures at Hōsei Peace University 3: Reflections on the Meanings of Peace and Affluence). Tokyo: Origin Publishing Centre.

**Ichimura H** (2003) *Yomu to iu ikikata (Reading as a Way of Life)*. Tokyo: Heibonsha.

**Ichimura H** (2010) 'Kaisetsu: Fujita Shōzō wo yomu tame ni' (The Editor's Note for The Selected Writings of Fujita Shōzō, Heibonsha Edition: For Readers of Fujita Shōzō's Works). In Hiromasa I (ed.), *Fujita Shōzō serekushon (The Selected Writings of Fujita Shōzō, Heibonsha Edition)*. Tokyo: Heibonsha, pp. 408–437.

**Iida T** (2006a) *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.

**Iida T** (2006b) 'Kaisetsu' (The Editor's Note for The Selected Interviews of Fujita Shōzō, Vol. 1), in Fujita 2006a, pp. 345–369.

**Kakuta S** (2012) Radical democracy and methodology in post-Marxist Maruyama Masao. *Ritsumeikan Keizaigaku* **61**, 359–375.

**Kaufman-Osborn TV** (2010) Political theory as profession and as subfield? *Political Research Quarterly* **63**, 655–673.

**Kawamoto T** (2004) Furyō seishin to kommittomento: Fujita Shōzō no rinrigaku wo meguru dansō' (A sense of independ-ence and commitment: a fragment of Fujita Shōzō's ethics). *Gendai shisō* **32**, 231–237.

**Maruyama M** (1969) [1947], 'Politics as a science in Japan: retrospect and prospects', Arthur Tiedemann (trans). In Morris I (ed.), *Thought and Behaviour in Modern Japanese Politics*, expanded edition, London: Oxford University Press, pp. 225–244.

**Maruyama M** (1995) [1947], 'Kagaku to shite no seijigaku: Sono kaiko to tenbō' (Politics as a Science in Japan: Retrospect and Prospects), in *Maruyama Masao shū, dai-3 kan: 1946–1948* (The Writings of Masao Maruyama, Vol. 3: 1946–1948), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, pp. 133–152.

**Miyamura H** (1998) 'Kaidai' (The Editor's Note for *The Writings of Fujita Shōzō, Vol. 1: The Principles of Rule of the Tennō System State*). In Fujita S, *Chosakushū 1: Tennōsei kokka no shihai genri*. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō, pp. 313–339.

**Miyamura H** (2009) *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.

**Ochi T** (2016) 'Seiji riron ni okeru "Yūkōsei": Takabatake Michitoshi to sengo Nihon' ('Utility' in Political Theory: Takabatake Michitoshi and Postwar Japan). *The Bulletin of the Faculty of International Studies at Niigata University of International and Information Studies* **1**, 75–88.

**Philp M** (2010) What is to be done? Political theory and political realism. *European Journal of Political Theory* **9**, 466–484.

**Sakurai T** (2018) *Political Theories of Narcissism: Towards Self-Reflection on Knowledge and Politics from the Psychoanalytic Perspectives of Erich Fromm and Fujita Shōzō*. Zürich: LIT Verlag.

**Sasaki-Uemura WM** (2001) *Organizing the Spontaneous: Citizen Protest in Postwar Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

**Seifert W** (2010) 'Der Staat des modernen Japan. Fujita Shōzōs Analyse des "Tennōsystems"' (The State of Modern Japan: Fujita Shōzō's analysis of the 'Tennō System'). In Lee E-J and Fröhlich T (eds), *Staatsverständnis in Ostasien*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, pp. 55–82.

**Silverberg M** (2007) *Erotic Grotesque Nonsense*, 1st Edn. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

**Taraba M** (2004) 'Fujita Shōzō-shi ni tsuite no danshō: Zentaishugi to toki, moshiku wa "seishin no yatōsei" to kon'nichi no fūkei' (A fragment of Fujita Shōzō's thought: totalitarianism and time, or a 'sense of minority' and today's landscape). *Gendai shisō* **32**, 174–185.

**Tsurumi S** (1991) *Tsurumi Shunsuke shū, 4: Tenkō kenkyū* (The Writings of Tsurumi Shunsuke, Vol. 4: A Study of the Conversion of Japan's Intellectuals). Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.

**Tsurumi S** (2011) *An Intellectual History of Wartime Japan: 1931–1945*. New York: Routledge.

**Wada Yū** (2004) 'Fujita Shōzō no sekai' no seiritsu' (The formation process of the 'world of Fujita Shōzō). *Gendai shisō* **32**, 186–201.

**Wolin SS** (1968) 'Political theory: trends and goals'. In Sills DL (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. **12**. New York: Macmillan Company and Free Press, pp. 318–331.

**Wolin SS** (1969) Political theory as a vocation. *The American Political Science Review* **63**, 1062–1082.

**Yamawaki N** (2016) *Glocal Public Philosophy: Toward Peaceful and Just Societies in the Age of Globalization*. Zürich: LIT Verlag.

**Takamichi Sakurai**, PhD, completed his doctoral research on comparative political theory at the University of Heidelberg, Germany. Recently he published a book entitled *Political Theories of Narcissism: Towards Self-Reflection on Knowledge and Politics from the Psychoanalytic Perspectives of Erich Fromm and Fujita Shōzō* (LIT Verlag, 2018). In 2011, he worked as a lecturer in Japanese social science at Heidelberg, and in 2014–2017 he was appointed to a sociological researcher at Keio University, Japan. Since 2017, he has researched on sociological autism as a visiting scholar in Heidelberg University's Department of General Psychiatry. This research is based on a biography of Fujita Shōzō in my PhD thesis, Appendix 3 (2014). The original dissertation can be found at the following link of heiDOK (The Heidelberg Document Repository): http://www.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/archiv/20786. Special thanks to the Faculty of Philosophy at Heidelberg University.