

“MARXIST DEBATES ON THE STATE
IN POST-WAR JAPAN”*

Fukuji TAGUCHI

Tetsuro KATO

EXCERPT FROM *HÔSEI RONSYÛ* (A JOURNAL OF LAW AND
POLITICAL SCIENCE) No. 105 (August, 1985),
NAGOYA UNIVERSITY

“MARXIST DEBATES ON THE STATE IN POST-WAR JAPAN”*

by Fukuji TAGUCHI (Nagoya University, JAPAN)
& Tetsuro KATO (Hitotsubashi University, JAPAN)

Contents :

- 1 The State of the Tennou (Emperor) System and Dabates on Japanese Capitalism (Before 1945)(1)
- 2 The Post-war State and Debates on the Subordination-Independence of Japan from US Imperialism (1945-61)(3)
- 3 Introduction of the Renaissance of Marxist State Theory and its Impact on Japanese Marxism (since 1961)(8)
- 4 Our Contributions to the Contemporary Debate on the State(14)
 - (1) Global Perspective, Standpoint of All Humanity, "Relativisation" of the State and its Re-absorption into Community
 - (2) An Objection to Worship of Productive Forces and the 'Austerity' Policy of Working Classes in Advanced Countries
 - (3) Methods of Analysis of the Contemporary Capitalist State
 - (4) Critical Analysis of Existing Socialist States

* Paper presented to the Session 2 of the Theme I-1 (Subtheme 1) at the 13th World Congress of IPSA (July 15, 1985, Paris)

(Main Theme) The Changing State and its Interaction with National and International Society

(Subtheme I) State and Government in Recent Political Theory

(Theme I-1) Assessment of the Great Theoretical Controversies about the State

1 The State of the Tennou (Emperor) System and Debates on Japanese Capitalism (Before 1945)

The Japanese state before the defeat of World War II was very repressive and authoritarian under the monarchy. Although the Meiji Constitution providing for the Diet was promulgated in 1889, sovereignty lay with the *Tennou* (Emperor), and the people were subjects of this living god. In 1925, universal male suffrage came into effect, but at the same time, all associations against the Tennou System and the private property system were prohibited. The state was also the driving force of capitalist development. Japan gained enormously by the colonization of Korea and China. Marxism was introduced into Japan at the beginning of the 20th century. In the 1920s, marxism became a popular mode of thought, and the Japanese Communist Party (JCP) was established in 1922 as a section of the Comintern. As criticism of the Tennou System was a taboo for academic marxists, it was only the illegal JCP that adapted marxist theory for the analysis of the Japanese state. The JCP was given some strategic resolutions by the Comintern during the period of its illegal actions from 1922 to 1935. The most important and influential decision about the Japanese revolution by the Comintern was the *1932 Thesis of the JCP*. The 1932 Thesis showed the ruling system in Japan consisted of a combination of three elements: (1) the absolutist monarchy (Tennou System), (2) semi-feudal landownership, and (3) monopoly capitalism. It stated that the Japanese monarchy was "the chief pillar of political reaction and of all the survivals of feudalism in Japan", and that the strategy of the Japanese revolution had to be a bourgeois-democratic revolution with a rapidly growing trend toward a socialist revolution. At about the same time as the 1932 Thesis, Japanese marxist theoreticians both within and without the JCP began to publish a series of their cooperative works, "*Lectures (Koza) on the History of the Development of Japanese Capitalism*". The authors stressed the feudal character of landownership, the backwardness of capitalist industrialization, and the patriarchal relationship in factories and families. This group was called the "*Koza School*" or the "Feudal School". Against the 1932 Thesis and the "*Koza School*", marxist intellectuals, grouped around the magazine

"*Rono (Labour and Farmer)*", argued that feudalism in Japan remained only ideologically, that landownership in rural districts was not feudal, and that the dominant element in Japan was monopoly capitalism. This group was called the "*Rono School*", and they suggested that the coming revolution had to be directly orientated toward a proletarian dictatorship. This debate between the "Koza School" and the "Rono School" attracted many readers not only in academic world but also in popular magazines, and was called "*Debates on Japanese capitalism*". But the Tennou System repressed both groups in 1936/38, and all academic freedoms were destroyed during the war.

The *first* basic characteristic of pre-war marxism in Japan was *its political character*. This means, on the one hand, that the debate developed under conditions of limited academic freedom and both the "Koza-School" and the "Rono-School" were repressed by the Tennou System, and on the other hand, that both schools believed the authority of the Soviet Union and the Comintern and the practical and revolutionary meaning of marxism. *Secondly*, Japanese marxism in the pre-war years had an *economic reductionist character*. As direct argument on the Tennou System was not legally permitted, the debate was limited to the economic side of Japanese capitalism. The "Koza School" stressed the survival of feudalism in rural landownership to give proof of the "absolutist" character of the Japanese state, and the "Rono School" insisted on the dominant role of finance capital and on the danger of fascism instead of claiming directly to a socialist revolution. They substituted studies on the history of capitalism and rural problems for the analysis of the Japanese state at the time. *Thirdly*, both schools *lacked a world-wide perspective*, and they used to compare Japan only with the Western developed countries. Thus, the "Rono School" stressed the characteristics of advanced monopoly capitalism common with European countries, and the "Koza School" found peculiar backward sides in Japanese society compared with England, France, Germany etc. Neither school could adequately place Japan in the global world system. Although *the Comintern World Program* (1928) suggested that Japan had to be located in the 'medium developed countries' of the world (that is to say, 'semi-peripheral' in the world system) and to be compared with

Eastern and Southern European countries or Southern American dependent countries, Japanese marxists had no adequate parameter except "typical" and "developed" capitalist countries in Western Europe and North America. They could at best find some references to Imperial Germany and Czarist Russia by Marx, Engels and Lenin, and compared Japan with these classical references to the late starting capitalist countries.

2 The Post-war State and Debates on the Subordination-Independence of Japan from US Imperialism (1945-61)

Through the defeat of World War II and the occupation by the Allied Forces, Japan experienced the de-militarization and democratization of the state and the Tennou System. The new 1947 Constitution proclaimed the sovereignty of the people, basic human rights and freedom, and the renunciation of war and armed forces, although the Tennou remained as "the symbol of the state". This change of the state-form from an authoritarian to a democratic type was only possible "from above" under the hegemony of the US Forces. But soon after a series of democratic reforms, the occupation forces led by General MacArthur turned to anti-communist imperialist policies. This turning in Japan due to the world-wide Cold War was called "the reverse course", and the USA saw Japan as a "bulwark for anticommunism" in Asia. In 1952, the US occupation was brought to an end by *the San Francisco Treaty*, and at the same time the new state of Japan was combined with the post-war imperialist bloc under the hegemony of the US by *the Japan-US Security Treaty*. According to the global strategy of the US, Japan had to rearm with the Self-Defence Force in spite of her peaceful Constitution, and Japanese capitalism recovered rapidly with US assistance and by "special procurements" during the Korean War. In 1955, all conservative political parties were merged in the Liberal Democratic Party, which has dominated the government since then. In 1960, The Japan-US Security Treaty was revised from a one-sided defensive treaty to a mutual aggressive military and economic alliance in spite of the united struggles

of the progressive forces in Japan against the Treaty.

After 1945, the JCP was legally reestablished, and the Japanese Socialist Party was organized by non-communist marxists, including the former "Rono School", and social democrats. Many marxist books were translated, and many marxist intellectuals gained posts in universities and colleges. Marxism grew into one of the most influential thoughts in social science, especially in the fields of economics and history. The JCP considered the US occupational power at first as "a part of liberation forces" for completing a democratic revolution. But after the turn of the occupational policies to anti-communism and the purge of the central committee of the JCP in 1950, which resulted in the party being split into several groups until 1955, the dominant group of the JCP adopted the *1951 Program*. It suggested that Japan was a dependent country under the rule of US Imperialism, and insisted on the almost same "people's war" strategy as the Chinese Communist Party. After the reunification of the JCP in 1955, the new majority group within the JCP rejected the line of violent revolution of the 1951 Program, but they insisted on the subordinate character of the Japanese state to US imperialism in spite of the formal independence granted by the San Francisco Treaty, and on a coming anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly democratic revolution. This view was adopted in the *1961 Program of the JCP*. The JSP came into the government once in 1947/48, but split into right and left over the valuation of the San Francisco Treaty, uniting again in 1955 with a strategy of socialist revolution.

From 1945 to the 1961 Program of the JCP, we can find two great debates on the state in Japanese marxism. The first is called "*the Tennoist Fascism Debate*" under the US occupation, and the second is "*the Debate on Subordination-Independence of Japan from US Imperialism*". The first debate was a direct inheritance of the pre-war debate on Japanese capitalism, but it was mainly amongst the former "Koza School" marxists. The 1932 Thesis of the JCP and the "Koza School" gained great authority in the academic world after 1945, because of their insistence on the absolutist character of the Tennou System and on the backwardness of Japanese society, for Japanese people experienced feelings of liberation from the Tennou System for the first time after the

democratization under the occupation power. But the war-time state in Japan could not be characterized as absolutist which is a state-from of feudalism in marxist terms, but had to be considered a military fascist state, a form of dictatorship by finance capital. Thus, marxist theoreticians tried to relate the absolutist monarchy at the time of the 1932 Thesis to the fascist dictatorship of war-time. This historical problem was politically summarized by the adoption of compromise expression of the "Tennoist Fascism", but debate on the transformation of the Japanese state from a feudal absolutist state to a capitalist fascist state continues as an important point of issues in the academic world till the present day.

The second debate was closely related with the program problem within the JCP, although many marxist intellectuals and the JSP took part in it. The dominant group was called the "*Subordination School*", because they stressed the subordinate character of the Japanese state in relation to US Imperialism. They insisted that the independence granted by the San Francisco Treaty was only formal, that the US Forces continued to stay all over the land under the Japan-US Security Treaty, that the economic recovery of Japanese monopoly capital could be possible only with the assistance of US capital, that Japan remained a dependent country under semi-occupation by US Imperialism in spite of her being a highly-developed capitalist country, and that the coming Japanese revolution had to be a new type of people's democratic revolution against the two enemies, US Imperialism and Japanese monopoly capital. Against these arguments, the minority group within the JCP and intellectuals of the former "Rono School" stressed the independent imperialist character of Japan. They were called the "*Independence School*" and their strategy was a peaceful anti-monopoly socialist revolution. They used new marxist theories from foreign communist parties to support their arguments. The possibility of the transformation to socialism through peaceful parliamentary means at the 20th CPSU Congress, the "structural reform" line posed by the Italian CP, and a theory of "double (public and class) functions of the state" in Italy were introduced. The "Subordination School" at least at that time rejected limiting tactics only to peaceful means, and stated that the form

— peaceful or violent — of the revolution would be determined by the “attitude of its enemies”. The Italian “structural reform” line was introduced along with Gramscian theories, and adopted by the right wing social democrats within the JSP. Thus, the “Subordination School” theoreticians considered Italian marxism as reformist, and criticized the Gramscian “philosophy of practice” as having an element of idealism. This theoretical situation was later called an “unhappy start for Gramsci” in Japan, for Gramscian marxism and the political line of the ICP were to have an increasing influence on Japanese marxists in the 1960s and 1970s after the adoption of the 1961 Program of the JCP.

Post-war debates on the state in Japanese marxism, represented by the “Tennoist Fascism Debate” in the 1940s and the “Subordination-Independence Debate” in the 1950s have inherited some aspects of pre-war marxism. The debates were colored by the political controversies concerning revolutionary strategies within the JCP and between the JCP and the JSP. At least at that time, belief in the Soviet Union and other existing socialist countries was not overcome, but was rather strengthened both politically and theoretically. Economic reductionism was also found when marxists argued that the “Absolutist Tennou System” could be proved by semi-feudal landownership, and the “Tennoist Fascism” by war-time state monopoly capitalism.

But the post-war debates on the state were more open to the development of marxist state theory than the pre-war debates. *Firstly*, marxists were able *freely to discuss the Japanese state* without fear of suppression. Thus, concerning “Tennoist Fascism”, some theoreticians argued not only the economic basis of the Tennou System but also the characteristics of the state itself, the fundamental arrangement of the state institutions, and the class struggles against the ruling classes. In the “Subordination-Dependence Debate”, the controversy contained not only economic but also military and politico-diplomatic indexes of subordination-independence. *Secondly*, marxist debates could use not only marxist classics and soviet theories, but many other marxist theories in European and Asian countries which were also introduced and referred to. These texts suggested the possibility of various *national roads to socialism* after the 20th CPSU congress. But the impact of Khrushchev’s

criticism of Stalin on Japanese marxism was not so great as in European countries, because the JCP experienced a division of the party in the first half of the 1950s, and the Stalin-Shock was just after the reunification of the JCP in 1955 when many marxists feared a redivision of the party. The “unhappy start” for Gramscian theory in Japan was also somewhat influenced by this situation. *Thirdly*, many marxist classics by Marx, Engels and Lenin were translated and marxists believed “*the proper marxist state theory*” could be extracted from the classic texts. Japanese marxism in academic world had originally a remarkable character of scholastic “interpretationalism” under the suppression by the Tennou System. Techniques of text criticism and rearrangement were so strangely developed that a rearranged systematic interpretation of Marx’s “*Capital*” by *Kozo Uno* could be produced. *Yoshitaro Hirano*, a former representative scholar of the “Koza School” arranged a collection of almost all references to the state by Marx and Engels, and published a book “*The Structure of the State Power*” in 1954. In this book, he tried systematically to rearrange fragmentary and often contradictory descriptions by Marx and Engels, insisted on the logical differences between “state form” and “government form”, and distinguished “social basis” from “material basis” of the state. These philological studies on marxist state theory influenced the debates. Other theoreticians began also to discuss “marxist state theory”, and several systematic theorizations of the state appeared. For example, a theory of the state as an “illusional community” suggested by Marx’s “*German Ideology*” or “the state of state monopoly capitalism” suggested by Lenin were argued. These theorizations were often very trivial and unproductive, but suggested a need to pay more attention to the complex and often contradictory character of Marx’s state theories, and to discard the dogmatic instrumental views of the state as the “instrument of the ruling class”. *Fourthly*, the debate produced some *concrete and realistic analyses of the Japanese state*. Although the terms used were borrowed from the SU or Europe, some aspects of the Japanese state, for example, the contradiction between the peaceful Constitution and the Self-Defence Force, the role of the symbolized Tennou System, the political role of the large business circles (*Zaikai*), analysis of each political party, etc., appeared from marxist viewpoints. *Lastly*, Japanese

marxists had to find a *political meaning for the peace movements* of this period owing to the experiences of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. They often considered such 'popular democratic' struggles as a type of class struggle however, for they stuck theoretically to the class-reductionist line.

3 Introduction of the Renaissance of Marxist State Theory and its Impact on Japanese Marxism (since 1961)

During the 1960s and 1970s, Japan experienced a great transformation of her economy, society and politics. Japan grew into the second economic power in the capitalist world owing to the period of rapid economic growth from 1955 to 1973. Japanese capitalism went overseas not only into Asian countries but also into the USA and Europe with export goods. Politically, the so-called "*Growth Politics*" (*Alan Wolfe*) were developed by the conservative government at least from the Ikeda Cabinet in 1960 to the Oil Shock in 1973. Intervention by the state in the economy through administrative guidance played a major role in the high accumulation of private big business. Although the number of political parties was increased by the formation of the Japan Democratic Socialist Party in 1960 and of the Clean Government Party in 1964 and by the significant party growth of the JCP, the dominance of the LDP was not shaken, and the tripartite ruling bloc of the business circle, high government officials and the LDP was fixed under the system of the US-Japan Security Treaty. Wage levels of workers rose steadily, and the American way of mass consumption was rapidly popularized. The welfare state in the European sense was never experienced however, and the so-called "Japan Inc." , a type of the *entrepreneurial state*, was established through the integration of workers in large enterprises within their companies by means of relatively higher wages, corporate welfare systems and company unions.

Structural changes in Japanese society during this period were drastic. Great migrations of the rural population into cities with urbanization as a result, heavy and chemical industrialization, popularization of television culture, development of traffic and information system symbolized by the

New Tokaido Line, the spread of nuclear families etc., all these elements destroyed the pre-modern basis of Japanese society. At the same time, social problems such as environmental pollution and destruction, traffic accidents, industrial accidents, "examination hell", decline in school education, became widespread. Destruction of living conditions in big cities resulted in the rise of progressive governors and mayors in Todyo, Osaka etc. from the late 1960s to the first half of the 1970s.

The international environment around Japan also changed dramatically. On the one hand, Japan's standing in the capitalist world was going up owing to the defeat of the USA in the Vientnam War and to the collapse of the IMF-GATT System. On the other hand, the authority of existing socialism was decreasing rapidly because of the revelation of such internal contradictions as the Sino-Soviet conflicts, the Czechoslovakian Affairs, the Sino-Vietnam War, the agression into Afghanistan by the SU, the military dictatorship in Poland etc. since the beginning of the 1960s. The majority of Japanese people came to think that capitalism with "freedom" would be better than socialism without freedom.

In the world-wide economic crisis which was brought about by the Oil Shock in 1973, Japanese capitalism continued to achieve relatively better performance than other advanced countries, and the recent LDP government has adopted a new ruling strategy. It is the strategy designed by the ruling bloc under conditions of good economic performance and the expansion of new conservatism and middle class feeling, that Japan should grow up to a "*international state*", which means not only an economic but also a diplomatic and military world superpower, and that the governmental sphere must be reduced by the reform of public administration. Of course, the Nakasone government has promised the Reagan government to cooperate more positively with the US and the other Western countries in times of tension in international relations, that is, the so-called "New Cold War", serious North-South problems and economic aggression of Japanese capitalism in Asian countries.

How did Japanese marxists come to grips with these profound changes in the state and society during the rapid economic growth in the 1960s and the 1970s? Although traditional weak points of Japanese marxism

which we have already pointed out (economic reductionism, class reductionism, the lack of world-wide perspective etc.) remained on the one hand, some marxists tried, on the other hand, to theorize new experiences of class and popular democratic struggles since 1960; for example, residential movements against environmental pollution and for progressive local self governments, and civic movements against the vietnam War. *Fukuji Taguchi*, one of the presenters of this joint paper, proposed a theoretical model of the "*three political scenes*", in which he considered parliament, local self governments and the progressive labor movement as the three main political scenes in advanced capitalist countries, and he saw the political reform as an organic linking of struggles in these three scenes. *Shingo Shibata*, a philosopher and also a sociologist, proposed an original theory of the "*public labourer*". He insisted on the dual character of labour by officials in public sector, and he argued that "public labourers" had to struggle not only against the state and capitalism as a part of the working class but also for real public services as agents of "the performance of common activities arising from the nature of all communities" (K. Marx).

As for Japanese politics, political scientists, jurists, and economists studied the US Force in Japan, the Self Defence Force, the Diet, the bureaucracy, the business circles, political parties, pressure groups, labor movements, process of the elections, institutions of policy-making, public finance, industrial relations, local self government, dominant ideologies, etc. from marxist viewpoints. Studies on European countries, the USA and Soviet Russia became more substantive, beyond the descriptions by Marx or Lenin. Studies on the third world also started in the 1960s. It was especially important for Japanese marxism that western neo-marxism and Eurocommunism were more marked and actively introduced in proportion to the devaluation of existing socialism. But on marxist state theory, there were very few works published in the 1960s to reform traditional theories and to develop the total reconstruction of the theory on contemporary capitalist states.

The publications of "*Political Power and Social Classes*" by *Nicos Poulantzas* in 1968 and "*The State in Capitalist Society*" by *Ralph Miliband* in 1969, and the controversies between them in "*New Left Review*" were

the starting points of the so-called *Renaissance of marxist state theory*. *Fukuji Taguchi* played the leading role of the introduction of the Renaissance into Japan. Taguchi and his co-workers translated not only these main works by Poulantzas and Miliband into Japanese, but also introduced the "*Debate on the Derivation of the State*" from West Germany, the ideas of the Magazine "*Kapitalistate*" from the USA, and a new democratic theory by *C.B. Macpherson* to Japanese readers and social scientists. We can now read almost all of the important books and articles of this Renaissance in Japanese, including the recent book, "*The Capitalist State*" by *Bob Jessop*. The introduction and acceptance of the Renaissance of marxist state theory in Japan can be characterized as follows: *Firstly*, it was linked with the practical perspective of a "*revolution in an advanced country*" in Japan, although it also considered the trends of Euro-communism and Euro-socialism in European countries. *Secondly*, it was associated with the same profound *interest in Gramscian political thought*, as the Renaissance of marxist state theory in European countries regarded rather Gramsci than Lenin as the forerunner. The new edition of Antonio Gramsci's "*Prison Notebooks*" are at present in translation into Japanese, "*Gramsci and the State*" by *Christens Buciu-Glucksmann* has already been translated, and professional studies on Gramscian political thought are promoted by *Eisuke Takemura* (a pioneer scholar of Gramscian theory in Japan), *Fusao Ushiro* (a young political scientist) etc. *Thirdly*, the Renaissance provided Japanese marxists with fresh aspects and problems; for example, "*the relative autonomy of the state*", which had no real tradition in state theory in Japan. Marxist political scientists were given the possibility of comparative studies of the contemporary Japanese state with the advanced capitalist states in Europe and the USA. But it is not yet developed enough to utilize these new aspects and categories for the historical study of the Japanese state since the Meiji Restoration or for the concrete analysis of the present Japanese state. *Tetsuro Kato*, one of the presenters of this paper, who started from the study of the Comintern, began to reconsider modern Japanese history from new perspectives in his english article "*A Preliminary Note on the State in Contemporary Japan*" (in, "*Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies*", Vol.16, No.1, April 1984). *Fourthly*, the

introduction of the Renaissance in Japan concentrated too much on the theorization of politics and the state in advanced capitalist countries and *lacked wider interest in the third world*, although this tendency was commonly found in the Renaissance itself. Japanese marxists tried to overcome this weak point by the supplementation of some aspects by "*the world capitalist system model*" by Immanuel Wallerstein or the so-called *dependency theory* by Andre Gunder Frank and Samir Amin. Fukuji Taguchi and his collaborators has already published a book of comparative study on three political systems in the world ("*Political Systems in the Contemporary World*", 1984)).

Of course, the contemporary development of marxist state theory in Japan can not be limited only within the introduction of the Renaissance in Europe and the USA. For example, Isamu Fujita, representative scholar of soviet law in Japan, argued that the state must be considered as "*one peculiar presentation of social relations*" or as "the core of the dictatorship within the social arrangement of ruler-subject relations among classes". This statement of the problem by Fujita is common to that of the "*relational theory of the state*" in the Renaissance, although he had started from the traditional theory in the SU and his study on the state was inspired by his original understanding of Marx's "*Capital*". He also proposed a series of categories for the state theory, that is: the nature of the state, its substance, its apparatus, and its internal and external forms ("*General Theory of the Law and Economics*", 1974). A famous marxist scholar of public finance in Japan, Atsushi Ikegami, developed Shibata's theory of the public labourer into a theory of the formation of *democratic governability*. He contrasted the law of the development of people's potentiality to govern by themselves with the law of growth of the state bureaucracy ("*Contemporary Theory on the State*", 1979). A parallel can be drawn between this argument and the study on *fiscal crisis of the state* by James O'Conner in the USA. Kenichi Miyamoto, one of the most creative and versatile social scientists in Japan, argued in his recent book "*Contemporary Capitalism and the State*" (1981), that Marx's scheme of reproduction, consisting of two departments (department I=means of production, and department II=articles of consumption), should now be rearranged by adding *the department O of*

public sectors, and that contemporary capitalist states can be classified into three types in relation to their public expenditure, that is, *the American military state*, *the European welfare state* and *the Japanese entrepreneurial state*.

Critical analysis of the existing socialist state is also being undertaken. In this area, studies of the Stalinist political system in the 1930s by *Yuzuru Taniuchi*, who studied under E.H. Carr, is far above the others. In the 1970s, many Japanese marxists began their belated criticism of Stalin and Stalinism. Marxists set about introducing the Yugoslavian model of socialism and analyzing political systems in Eastern European socialist countries concretely. Theories on the crisis of the state and on the democratic transformation of the state by Euro-communists are also introduced and examined together with theories on *the legitimation crisis* or *the crisis of crisis management* by *Jurgen Habermas* and *Claus Offe*, and on the "*Fordist Security State*" by *Joachim Hirsch*.

In Japanese marxism, especially among economists and historians, the importance of the state theory is as yet underestimated however. It seems that many left wing politicians and academicians continue to believe firmly in the traditional simple "instrumental theory of the state" and in economic- and class-reductionism, although their political stance has already moved into line with Euro-communist or Euro-socialist policies. In these terms, marxist political science has not enough influence either on Japanese marxism or on the Japanese Association of Political Science.

4 Our Contributions to the Contemporary Debate on the State

We can summarize our arguments thus far as follows. (1) Some characteristics of pre-war Japanese marxism — for example, economic reductionism, Japanese particularism, the profound influence of Soviet-type socialism and close combination of the state theory with revolutionary strategy, etc. — subsisted stubbornly till the 1960s, in spite of transformation of the Japanese state-form conditioned by the so-called Post-war Reforms, the US-Japan Security Treaty and the profound socio-economic changes due to high economic growth. (2) In the

1970s, however, the introduction of the "Renaissance of marxist state theory", together with the political line of Euro-communism, has led to the current search for a new state theory, one which can analyse the Japanese state and its crisis in the conditions of advanced capitalism and provide politics for a democratic transformation of the Japanese state and society taking as the "anti-model" the existing socialist countries.

We insist upon the following points, based on the above summary and our analysis of recent developments in marxist state theories in Europe and America. (1) The importance of a global viewpoint, in both modern history and present situations, including the framework of the "World Capitalist System". (2) In this context, a consideration of the problem of policies of austerity for working classes in advanced countries, which aim at overcoming egoistic ethno-centrism and establishing new internationalism, in the light of present-day world-wide crisis-complexes. (3) Attaching importance to the "relational" approach in analyzing contemporary capitalist states, articulated understanding of class struggles and popular-democratic struggles, and an insistence upon the validity of the specific analysis of state forms within democratic state-type and the necessity of comparative analysis of the so-called neo-conservative governments which appeared at the end of the 1970s in the US, Great Britain, West Germany and Japan. (4) The necessity for critical analysis of the existing socialist states and of proposing the ideal and model of non-etatist democratic socialism. We shall now go on to discuss these points in more detail.

(1) Global Perspective, Standpoint of All Humanity, "Relativisation" of the State and its Re-absorption into Community

We can expect further development of the "Renaissance of marxist state theory" which made an important contribution towards overcoming the instrumental theory of state, if it will be *articulated with the theories of the World System and of Dependency of the Third World* which appeared at almost the same time. The states which the Renaissance has made its objects are generally speaking those of advanced capitalist countries which belong to the type of Western 'Nation State'. At present there are about 170 "states" or "political regimes" around the world of which about 160 are members of the United Nations. Of these, two thirds

are the so-called developing countries which are located in the third world and over a half began their state-building after 1945.

The formation of capitalism in West-European centres since broadly the 16th century has been creating a world structure consisting of '*centres—semi-peripheries—peripheries*', as the theory of world capitalist system insists, and the '*development of underdevelopment*' or '*dependent capitalist development*' has been produced and reproduced in the peripheries, as the dependency theories assert. In other words, whereas a very few 'nation states' in Western Europe and North America which were located in the centres could enjoy the liberal and/or democratic state-form with popular sovereignty hand in hand with the development of a market-capitalist economy, it was historically a long and difficult task for people in semi-peripheries and peripheries to build their own 'states', and even if they could build such 'states', it was impossible for them to implant and hold the liberal and/or democratic state forms of Western type because of the pressures from the centres and their own fragile social conditions. It is true that the structure of '*centres—semi-peripheries—peripheries*' was not necessarily static, and it is well known that transfer of hegemony within the centres occurred very often: for example, from Spain and Portugal to Holland, from Holland to Great Britain, from Great Britain to the U.S.A. But compared with the cases of transition from periphery to semi-periphery and from semi-periphery to centre before the 19th century, such a move or leap in the 20th century, above all after the second World War, has been much more difficult, as we well know.

The World System and the Lessons of the Modernization of Japan

Japan, as a country which began its state- and nation-building in the middle of the 19th century, has been compared with Russia, Germany and Italy, which had the same experiences at the same time. The capitalist development of Japan went into orbit at the beginning of the 20th century, and the Comintern defined her stage of development as 'medium developed country', that is, a 'semi-periphery', together with Central and Southern European countries. But when we take into account the position of the Asian area within the world system till the 19th century and the historical destiny of China and Korea (located, like Japan, in East Asia) thereafter, the Meiji Restoration of 1868 meant a drastic involvement into

the World System, then a rapid move from periphery to semi-periphery. This can be distinguished from the shift from semi-periphery to centre in Germany and Italy and more fruitfully compared with the Latin American countries during the first half of the 19th century. At the same time the strong impulse of semi-peripheral Japan who wished to join the centres was much strengthened by having colonised the neighbouring peripheral countries, whereas in Europe only a very few semi-peripheral countries, such as Germany, could move to the centre, because of strong pressure from the centre and mutual fierce competition, and in Latin America semiperipheral countries have continuously suffered from internal divisions and cleavages.

In the background of this strong impulse were, (1) *national ideological integration*, based on the Tennou System and the rise of nationalism, the central idea of which was Tennou-worship, mobilizing public education and curtailing of free speech, and (2) *strong militarization and capital accumulation by state intervention*, which was inspired by the slogan "rich country, strong military" and "make industry flourish".

The formation of socialist states in semi-periphery and periphery, which began with the Soviet Revolution of 1917, meant secession from the world capitalist system. This challenge to the system itself was made possible by utilizing oppositions and contradictions within 'centres' and 'peripheries', which led to the first World War. After the second World War, the socialist system which was formed under the hegemony of SU, has been opposed to the capitalist world system, and the movement and aspiration of independence and nation-building have arisen in the periphery of the capitalist world system. Against this the centres have built the imperialist alliance order under the hegemony of US. This order is based upon military alliances such as NATO and the US-Japan Security Treaty armed with nuclear weapons and upon international economic organizations such as IMF and GATT.

And Japan, after the failure of a leap into the centre, caused by the defeat in the second World War, has succeeded in the reconstruction of a capitalist economy 'from above' and has gained the democratic state-form, under the auspices of the occupation of the US army instead of the Tennou System, following the US policy of making Japan a bulwark

against communism in Asia. The heavy-industrialization and strong privately-initiated accumulation of Japanese capitalism have been made easier by the Renunciation of War clause of the 1947 Constitution and by 'light' armament under the auspices of the "US nuclear umbrella". Whereas the US has been burdened by the pressure of heavy military expenses and West European countries have been obliged by the pressure of increased social-welfare costs to slow down the growth rate, Japanese capitalism has made a big profit from exports, assisted by technological innovation and a high level of exploitation. It has promoted its relative status within the centre, now having become one of the top groups in the World Capitalist System and in the Nation State System which have enlarged enormously after the second World War.

The hop, step and jump of Japan after the middle of the 19th century, from periphery to semi-periphery, from semi-periphery to centre, is a unique phenomenon in modern world history and has been seen as the ideal model of modernization by some of Asia's 'peripheral' countries and NICs which achieved semi-peripheralization. We have to insist, however, that the rapid modernization of Japan has been made possible by the repression of neighbouring peoples and the sacrifices of its own workers and peasants. The Japanese experience is not the ideal model of modernization but the 'anti-model' in a sense, from which we have much to learn.

Standpoint of All Humanity, Universal Emancipation of All Mankind.

The problems and issues which we face now are global and concerned with all humanity. There is the threat of nuclear war on the one hand and a problem of massive starvation in developing countries, which have barely achieved national independence, on the other. Besides, there are crises of ecology, energy and population-growth.

It was assumed by Marx that the working classes were the "*Träger*" of universal emancipation of mankind because of their being of the "*Träger*" of the development of productive forces. Marxism in the late 20th century is not able optimistically to be blind to the fact that science and technology as a kind of productive force created nuclear weapons which can destroy all humanity ten times over and is destroying the ecological conditions of natural environments which are the basic

preconditions for supplying food and energy. It has also to look straight at the fact that the structure of development of productive forces all over the world has progressed toward expanding the differentials among nations, and the international nation state system has been formed with the hierarchic order of domination and subjugation. Of course, class antagonism resulting from private ownership of productive means is one of the factors of such a deformed development of productive forces, and therefore socialization of productive means is the common task of mankind.

The experiences of advanced capitalist countries, including Japan, show that mechanization and industrialization leading to robotization and ME (Micro-Electronics) are changing human relations, the situations of family and community, and even attitude of mind, and producing new diseases, new social problems, mental poverty and inequality. We have to analyse these problems and search for a new way of life from the viewpoint of a new internationalism, from the perspective of "all humanity" and "universal human emancipation".

Limits of the Nation State and "Re-absorption of State into Community"

We have to look squarely at the limits of the Nation State as a human community order. The violence which states monopolize has technical exactitude and massive destructive forces, ranging from the nuclear weapons of advanced countries to conventional weapons which proliferate in the third world.

We propose the ideal of the Japanese Constitution as having historical significance. "We, the Japanese people, desire peace for all time and are deeply conscious of high ideals controlling human relationship, and we have determined to preserve our security and existence, trusting in the justice and faith of the peace-loving peoples of the world. — We recognize that all peoples of the world have the right to live in peace, free from fear and want" (the Preface). "Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes. /In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea and air forces,

as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized" (Article 9). What is needed now for mankind is a search for the creation of democratic relationships among nations on the one hand, and the abolition of state violence on the other. We should return to Marx's idea, from "*Civil War in France*", that is, '*a Revolution against the State itself*' and '*the reabsorption of the State power by society*'. Does this perspective seem utopian? Against such an objection, we would point out the following, that we can see not only the factual delimitations of state sovereignty by multi-national companies and nuclear military alliances, which reflect socialization and globalization of capital, but also the growth of international anti-nuclear peace movements, global communications between cities and regions which belong to different countries, and activities of NGO and individuals which form non-state relationships, all these being created by the communication and information systems of world capitalism.

(2) *An Objection to Worship of Productive Forces and the 'Austerity' Policy of Working Classes in Advanced Countries*

Even if we look from the viewpoint of all humanity and the perspective of 're-absorption of state into community', this is not easy to realize and criticism will arise immediately to the effect that this viewpoint is utopian and lacks a class standpoint. What has been mentioned above is, so to speak, a long term strategy for all humanity. The present world situation is very serious. The military expenses of the world amount to 6500 billion dollars and the outlook for abolition of nuclear weapons, to say nothing of conventional weapons, is very gloomy. Starvation in the third world is grave. While people in advanced countries suffer from overabundance, vast numbers of people in the third world are on the brink of starvation. From the standpoint of all humanity, we have to propose a policy of '*the international transfer of wealth*'.

But it is also well known that assistance from capitalist-powers is very often combined with profit-making motives of multi-national enterprises and intentions of imperialist domination. Neither is assistance with no string attached to be expected from the existing socialist countries. Nowadays, the socialist system is tied up in complicating financial/

marketing linkages with the world capitalist system. We have to ask anew what it means that the working class is the "Träger" of the universal emancipation of all mankind?

Grounds of Marxist Austerity Policy

After the Oil Shock of 1973, or more accurately after the world economic crisis of 1974/75, advanced capitalist countries could not expect long term economic growth. The ruling strata have turned to the offensive under the pretext of financial crisis and have adopted policies of mass-unemployment, cutting of social benefits, repression of rights, etc. What we have to pay attention to is the fact that new-conservative offences of the post-welfare state are concentrated upon *social "peripheries"* such as foreign workers, the aged, women, youth etc. The 'centre—periphery' structure is reproduced within the nation state by the mediation of internationalization of labour forces and socialization of state. Above all, '*Gastarbeiter*' and minority workers occupy the lowest position in the internationalization of labour forces. The emerging trends of conservatization of working people and new '*Authoritarian Populism*' (*Stuart Hall*) in advanced countries are just the reverse side of the above phenomenon. The upper strata of working classes who can expect state benefits are being deprived of their militancy. They are given objectively the status of '*middle class*' *within the hierarchical stratification of the world*.

We dare pose the problem of *austerity* for working classes in the advanced countries acknowledging fully that the attack of capital is becoming stronger and stronger. It is the standpoint of the so-called "*international structural reform*". Working classes in the advanced countries should have policies of solidarity with the struggles towards self-reliance of the people of the third world and of transferring the productive forces of its own country for the benefit of "*have-nots*" both home and abroad. These policies may compel them to sacrifice their own interest according to circumstances, but this is one road by which the working class in advanced countries can be reborn as a universal class.

But the problem of austerity is not confined to the policy-problem of the day. It should be viewed from the above-mentioned standpoint of reconsidering the productive forces of mankind, of overcoming the

worship of productive forces. It is well-known that people are rethinking the meaning of material abundance, are having doubts about the unlimited plunder and exploitation of natural resources and against a rosy faith in the development of science and technology. The "*Grünen*" in West Germany are a political expression of such a trend. "*Diseases in advanced countries*" lie not only in the burden of welfare, and fiscal crisis, but also in human degeneration, suicide, divorce, collapse of family, mental illness, decline of school education, brutal crimes, an information glut, and difficulties of aged persons. It is a manifestation of the problematique of material 'abundance' that working classes in advanced countries have to tackle, as well as the realization of their class-interests such as wages, working conditions, the revitalization of "worker's culture". We do not agree with the standpoint of anti-scientificism and anti-technologism, but we should think restoring *the balance between human-being and nature*, and the way of being of *humanly controllable technology*. Thus we would also pose the problem of austeriy as an attempt to recover *the humanistic meaning of 'abundance'*.

(3) *Methods of Analysis of the Contemporary Capitalist State*

On the level of theory of capitalist state which is concerned directly with the Renaissance, we insist on the positive significance of Poulantzas' s '*relational*' theory of state opposing traditional instrumental theory, and also of Laclau & Jessop's statement of "*popular-democratic struggles*" distinguished from "class struggles".

The 'relational' theory of state is not fully developed yet. In our opinion, the distinction between *state power* and *class power* posed by Miliband has to be incorporated and interpreted in the context of 'relational' theory of state. The core question lies in how to explain the relationship between 'state power', that is, power of state apparatus in Miliband's sense and class political power, that is, power of dominant class or fraction of class which holds and control the state apparatus. In capitalist society where the political and the economic has relative autonomy each other, political power of the dominant class or fraction (the state power in Poulantzas's sense) ordinarily appears (*ersheint*) taking the autonomous form of power of state apparatus (the state power in Miliband's sense) by the mediation that representatives of the dominant

class or fraction occupy the major command posts of state institutions. Anyway, viewing the state as "*material condensate of class relationships*", Poulantzas's theory set the task of analysis of the power-relations of classes and of class struggles within state apparatuses, and explored the categories and concepts of analysis such as class fractions, power bloc, hegemonic class (fraction), repressive and ideological apparatuses.

Raising the question of 'popular-democratic struggles' by Laclau and Jessop supplements that of Poulantzas, incorporates nation, ethnicity, gender and "*officialdom and people*" into the range of state theory, and makes some suggestions as to how we can introduce the above-mentioned world-historical and global problems to state theory.

In addition to these, we would like to develop and verify some of the rather abstract and general theories of the Renaissance on the level of concrete analysis of contemporary capitalist states. *J. Hirsch's* West German state analysis, *B. Jessop's* British state analysis, *P. Birnbaum's* French state analysis and *A. Wolfe's* American state analysis, to take a only few examples, are very useful for us in analysing the contemporary Japanese state, but we hesitate very often to generalize such categories as Poulantzas's '*Authoritarian Statism*' and Hirsch's '*Fordist Security State*' because the former was too strongly coloured by French politics of Discardism and the latter reflected too much the characteristics of the SPD regime. However, this has been very useful, and indispensable to development of state theory, for it teaches us that there are various specifics among capitalist states and democratic state-forms. These specifics set the task of analysis of respective states from the following view-points, that is, (1) the historical pattern of political culture, national unification and national state building, the mode of modern bourgeois revolution, introduction of liberalism and democracy, and industrialization and the emergence of social problems and labour movement: in what intervals, and how, did these things occur?, (2) how these moments related to one another and to the world system and international relations.

It is necessary to create jointly the common indexes which make possible comparative analysis of OECD countries at least, as *G. Therborn* tried to compare democracies and welfare-states. On that occasion, the

relevance of marxist analysis would be assured by putting the emphasis on class analysis or analysis of class power relations. But there are some differences over the understanding of the meaning of 'class', for example, the dominant view in Japanese marxism includes white-collour workers and civil servants within the category of 'working class', whereas in France and Italy it does not. We have to start, therefore, from a discussion on the concept of 'class'. We have also to discuss *the nature of new conservatism* and new liberalism which can be seen in Reaganomics, Thatcherism and Nakasoneism, from the point of view of marxist state theory, just as there has been much debate upon the welfare-state and neo-corporatism. And when such respective and comparative analysis of contemporary states is able to develop concrete policies on '*re-absorption of state into community*', the 'Renaissance' of marxist state theory will be able to make contact with the movement aiming at changing the political-cum-social power-relationship.

(4) *Critical Analysis of Existing Socialist States*

As our last point, we should insist upon the importance of critical analysis of existing socialist states. The problem of socialist state implies theoretical problems, such as whether it is possible to grasp different types of state with the same theoretical framework, in other words, whether general state theory is possible which would apply to all historical stages, such as slavery, feudal system, capitalism and socialism. But much more important is this; the existing socialist states have assumed authoritarian repressive forms and are in fact now becoming a negative factor in the development of popular movements in advanced countries. We have to acknowledge the facts that socialist countries were born only in the periphery or semi-periphery of the world system, they have to survive in the severe conditions of laying siege to capitalist powers and the state of war. The abolition of the capitalist property relationship did not necessarily mean the immediate 'Aufheben' of commodity and money relations: there would need to be a long transition period, etc.

Nevertheless, we cannot overlook the facts that through their recent history the states became strong and gigantic, authoritarian regimes emerged and subsisted, there arose wars among socialist nations. From

a theoretical standpoint, the experiences of existing socialist countries show us again that the abolition of antagonistic class relations does not lead immediately to *a withering away of the state*, and stratified relationships based upon division of labour and unequal relationships among nations can be the basis for subsisting state domination. And it is these facts that teach us the necessity of *articulation of 'class struggles' and 'popular-democratic struggles'*.

The experiences of existing socialist countries force us to reconsider the problem of relationship between class and party, or more accurately, among socialist state, working class and marxist dominant party, in a word, *democracy or democratization in socialism*. On this point, we can learn much from the experiences of Yugoslavia, such as worker's self-management and decentralization and raise the issue of separation of powers in the socialist political system, the importance of people's rights and freedoms, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of expression. The same can be said a little differently of advanced capitalist countries. We should say that we have not only to defend but also *to develop the democratic institutions and rights* which have been achieved under the conditions of capitalist democracy, in order to strive for building "associational" and decentralized relationships among people, starting from and overcoming the present situation of the capitalist system, and set about our task of 're-absorbing state into community'.

We believe that such a direction should be the road towards a rebirth of the ideal of socialism, to show the possibilities of marxism to contemporary working class and people in advanced capitalist countries, and to contribute to the emancipation of all mankind, especially the people of the third world.

Paper presented to the Session 2
of the Theme I-1 at the 13th World
Congress of IPSA (July 1985, Paris)

'MARXIST DEBATES ON THE STATE
IN POST-WAR JAPAN'

<LIST OF CORRECTIONS>

page	line	misprint	correction
6	2	state- <u>from</u>	state- <u>form</u>
9	5	<u>Marxit</u>	<u>Marxist</u>
10	6	<u>Todyo</u>	<u>Tokyo</u>
10	10	<u>Vientnam</u>	<u>Vietnam</u>
10	12	<u>repidly</u>	<u>rapidly</u>
10	14	<u>agression</u>	<u>aggression</u>
11	19	<u>acientists</u>	<u>scientists</u>
12	19	<u>Christens</u>	<u>Christine</u>
13	14	<u>cansidered</u>	<u>considered</u>
13	23	<u>Ecconmics</u>	<u>Economics</u>
17	3	<u>American</u>	<u>American</u>
17	9	<u>America</u>	<u>America</u>
18	18	<u>modernaization</u>	<u>modernization</u>
19	30	<u>recongize</u>	<u>recognize</u>
24	6	<u>Frnace</u>	<u>France</u>
24	18	<u>poblem</u>	<u>problem</u>
25	24	<u>possibilities</u>	<u>possibilities</u>

<ADDRESSE OF PAPARGIVERS>

Prof. Fukuji TAGUCHI

Faculty of Law
Nagoya University
Chikusa, Nagoya,
Aichi 464, JAPAN

Prof. Tetsuro KATO

Faculty of Social Studies
Hitotsubashi University
Naka, Kunitachi,
Tokyo 186, JAPAN



一橋大学社会学部
東京都国立市(〒186)

HITOTSUBASHI UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF SOCIAL STUDIES

KUNITACHI
TOKYO 186, JAPAN
TEL: 0425 (72) 1101

様

1985年6月

前略、このたび、名古屋大学田口富久治教授と私との共同論文「戦後日本におけるマルクス主義国家論」を活字にしましたので、お届けいたします。この共同論文は、この7月にパリで開催される世界政治学会(International Political Science Association, IPSA)第13回世界大会の分科会報告として作成されたものです。短文のため、意をつくせないところもありますが、日本の「国家論ルネサンス」を願う立場からの、私たちの問題提起として、第1-3章の論争総括について、また第4章での積極的提言について、皆様からの御批判・御助言をいただけますと幸いです。

なお、私は、この共同論文をパリで報告し、また、これを機会にヨーロッパ諸国での福祉国家以降の国家=政治再編を調査研究するため、6月24日より9月21日まで日本を離れ、下記の英国エセックス大学をベースとして、フランス、西ドイツ、中欧、北欧諸国をまわってまいります。短期とはいえ、皆様には何かと御迷惑をおかけするかと存じますが、よろしく願い申しあげます。また、今夏ヨーロッパにこられる方は、ぜひ御一報ください。

草々

一橋大学社会学部 加藤 哲郎
(自宅: 〒186 国立市中2-1、RC301
Tel. 0425-76-3553)

※ ペーパーに、以下のような印刷ミスがありますので、御訂正願います。

page 6, line 2. state-from→state-form

p. 9, l. 5. (みだし) Marxit→Marxist

p. 10, l. 6. Todyo→Tokyo; l. 10. Vientnam→Vietnam;

l. 12. repidly→rapidly; l. 14. agression→aggression

p. 11, l. 19. acientists→scientists

p. 12, l. 19. Christens→Christene

p. 13, l. 14. cansidered→considered; l. 23. (イタリック) Econnmics→Economics

p. 17, l. 3. Amirican→American; l. 9. Amirica→America

p. 18, l. 18. modernaization→modernization

p. 19, l. 30. recongimize→recognize

p. 24, l. 6. Frnace→France; l. 18. poblem→problem

p. 25, l. 24. possibilities→possibilities

※ 6/24-9/20の間の連絡先は、以下のようになります。

Tetsuro KATO

c/o Department of Government

University of Essex

Tel. Colchester(0206)862286

Wivenhoe Park

Colchester CO4 3SQ

England, UK