Andō Reki
Osaka University

Toda Tōru's Anti-Marxist Turn

Toda Tōru, a Japanese leftist thinker and activist, was involved with the Japanese Communist Party, the New Left Movement, and Third Worldism during the 1960s and early 1970s. By 1980, however, he began to advocate for a radical critique of Marxism, adopting what he termed an "anti-Marxist" position. He argued that Marxism does not lead to emancipation but rather results in severe repression. He regarded Marxism primarily as a critique of capitalism, insufficient for challenging or overcoming the modern conditions of industry, state, and idealism. In response, Toda envisioned a non-Marxist revolution directed against modernity itself. This paper examines the influence of anti-Marxist currents in France on Toda's shift, particularly the criticism of Marxism that followed the French publication of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's *The Gulag Archipelago* in 1974. Additionally, the paper explores the impact of André Glucksmann, Michel Foucault, and Jean Baudrillard on Toda's attempts to develop an image of revolution distinct from Marxism.

KEYWORDS: Anti-Marxism—Toda Tōru—revolution—modernity—capitalism—political spirit

Criticism of Marxism has a long history in post-World War II discourse. It has arisen not only from conservative, reactionary or liberal forces, but also from within Marxism. Around the end of the 1970s, a leftist tendency emerged that was explicitly "anti-Marx." The focus of this paper is not the external criticism of Marxism, but rather the fact that Marxist intellectuals, such as those who belonged to a political party or were involved in social movements, began to take a critical view of themselves. The "Anti-Marxist" criticism can be understood as a form of self-criticism. In this context I take up Toda Tōru's theoretical turn to anti-Marx.[1] Who is Toda Tōru? Since he is largely unknown in the study of the history of Japanese thought, I will begin by describing who he is.

Toda is a figure who accompanied the left movement from the 1960s to 1970s, responding to shifts in its discourse and practices. Born in 1943, he entered Osaka City University in 1961 and joined the Japanese Communist Party (JCP) in 1962. He was expelled from the JCP for his belonging to a "Soviet faction" that supported Khrushchev's line of "peaceful coexistence". This was because Kenji Miyamoto (1908–2007) who held power in the JCP, favored the Chinese Communist Party in response to the Sino-Soviet controversy that arose in the wake of the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962 and the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1963. Toda then participated in the formation of the "Democratic Student League" (民主主義学生同盟) in 1963,

1. Nakamasa Masaki points to the de-Marxization as a trigger for the establishment of "contemporary thought" and "postmodernism" in Japan in the 1980s. See for an overview, Nakamasa 2006; 2017. What is interesting in relation to my paper is that Nakamasa points to Yoshimoto Takaaki as playing a "bridge role to postmodern thought" that aimed to dismantle "reason-centricity." See, Nakamasa 2006, 67. In order to understand "anti-Marxism" or the movement away from Marxism, it is necessary to conduct an analysis that takes into account the various stakes of thought since the 1960s.

a "structural reformist" group that was theoretically influenced by Palmiro Togliatti (1893–1964). He became an activist in the "Communist Workers' Party" (共産主義労働者党), which took the Democratic Students League as its student organization. During the 1970s, however, Toda's political orientation shifted towards the Third Worldism, driven by radicalism such as the upsurge of the student movement of 1968, the Cultural Revolution in China, the anti-war movement in Vietnam and the Sanrizuka struggle (三里塚闘争). As noted by Hidemi Suga, Toda is "a symbolic figure who combined the Sixty-eighth Student Uprising with Third Worldism."[2]

Toda remained politically active as a Marxist throughout the 1960s and until the mid–1970s. By the late 1970s, however, he had become a relentless critic of Marxism. He found hope for the preservation of Marxism in the New Left movement, and later in the Marxist revolutionary movement in the Third World. However, he came to realize that revolution and Marxism were incompatible in response to the problems of violence that arose. Thus, in order to break the link between Marxism and revolution, he tried to thoroughly criticize Marxism, which still had considerable power in the revolutionary and social movements of his time. He sharpened his criticism of Marx to the extent that he said, "Marxism has nothing essentially to do with revolution nor emancipation, or rather, it is opposed to them at the deepest level".[3]

In this paper I will clarify what Toda's anti-Marxist position is. To do so, this paper takes into account the French critique of Marxism, which had a strong influence on the anti-Marxist discourse in Japan. The anti-Marxist current of thought was not limited to Japan, but had a global reach. I will show how this critique influenced Toda's writing. My discussion of this current of thought in Japan will have a particular focus on the importation of ideas that were on the rise in France during the same period.

In 1983, Toda published a book entitled *Marx's Funeral* (『マルクス葬送』), which collected his criticisms of Marxism in the New Left-influenced magazines and other publications. What is noteworthy is that Toda embraced French theories as "anti-Marx". Focusing on four of his contemporaries who became major references in his debates—Alexandre

2. Suga, 2003, 110.

3. Nagasaki, Takano, Toda, Kasai, 1979, 180.

Solzhenitsyn, André Glucksmann, Michel Foucault, and Jean Baudrillard—I examine how Toda incorporates their arguments. By looking into Toda's arguments in the book, this paper aims to clarify one aspect of the turn that occurred within the leftist debate around 1980. How did criticism toward Marxism among left intellectuals was articulated, and what influence did French intellectuals have on this process?

What is anti-Marx?

What is the anti-Marx that this paper seeks to explore? What I am referring to as anti-Marx in the first place is the critical discourse directed against Marxism, which emerged since the 1970s.[4] How, then, does Toda's anti-Marxist discourse differ from other Marxist criticisms?

There have been various forms of criticism of Marxism. With the Russian Revolution and the resulting expansion of the socialist movement worldwide, the propaganda against Marxism began. It was based on the geopolitical and ideological opposition of the capitalist countries to the Soviet Union. Criticism from the left includes the anarchist denunciation of Marx and Marxism, which has continued since the controversy in the First International. Among these criticisms of Marxism, I focus on the criticism of Marxism by Marxists.

Marxist criticism of Marxism also has a long history. The most typical is that of Stalinism. Trotsky's position, for example, was to support the socialist state that followed the Russian Revolution, but to oppose its appropriation and deviation by Stalin. This perspective of the Left Opposition remained influential until the 1960s. It could also lead to a criticism of Lenin in the sense that the causes of Stalinism are to be traced to Leninism. Such criticism, however, does not fundamentally deny the validity of Marx's

4. Although this paper cannot adequately discuss the subject, it should be noted that the anti-Marxist thought was first strongly raised by some of the theorists of this Third Worldism. Typical examples are Ōta Ryu (1930–2009), Takenaka Rō (1928–1991), and Hiraoka Masaaki (1941–2009). They were inspired by the Third World to develop their criticism of Marx. Although their arguments cannot be summarized as one because of their different emphases, they take the subject of the revolution away from the workers, considering the Ainu and Ryukyu minorities, the urban underclass and the rural poor to be the subjects of the revolution.

own arguments; rather they merely affirm the orthodoxy of Marxism. It is simply a struggle for authenticity, for the true revolutionary position.

One of the principal arguments of anti-Marxism, as it is put forward by Toda, is to criticize Marx himself. It is not to exonerate Marx himself, as in the case of separating Marx and Marxism, or Marx and Engels, and criticizing the latter. Rather, Toda seeks to criticize Marx's fundamental claims and premises, as opposed to a view that regards the violence and domination caused by Marxism as a "betrayal" without recognizing Marx's own theory as the cause of it. While he admits that Marx and Marxism are not identical, he sees the difference as unimportant when one considers the crimes of Marxism in history. In other words, there is no such thing as a "true" or " impeccable" theory of Marxism. Rather, he sought to criticize Marxism in its entirety, attributing its significant historical failures directly to Marx.. The anti-Marxism therefore means criticizing Marx's theory of revolution, including his critique of capitalism.

Toda's anti-Marxism differs first from the Trotskyist view of betrayal in history and rejects any way of thinking that privileges Marx. He argues that Marxism is fundamentally anti-revolutionary and must therefore be abandoned. In contrast to the argument that various errors and failures have been caused by Marxism, which is a process of trial and error in the long process of revolution, and that the bad aspects of Marx and Marxism should be criticized while the good elements should be taken out and adopted, Toda insists on the need to criticize Marx fundamentally. He rejects the position of identifying the advantages and weaknesses of Marxism and improving it.[5]

Reflection on Marxism in the period leading up to to the 1980s

It is noteworthy that the "crisis of Marxism" in the "contemporary world" has been discussed since about 1978, if we examine the broader context in which critical views of Marxism were raised around 1980.[6] This crisis

5. Toda, 1983, 11.

6. For a discussion of these debates, see the features in magazines such as『現代思想』,『知識』,『現代の眼「第三文明」』) from the late 1970s to the mid–1980s. One example is the special feature "Is Marxism Over?" (「現代思想は終わったか」『現代思想』 1978. See also the discussion in Iwata et al. 1979.

seems to correspond to the following three issues. The First is how Marxism should respond to the emergence of new problems such as the transformation of the economic system (post-industrialization), ecology, ethnic issues and the residents' movement. Second, it had become clear that the basic formulas of Marxism did not correspond to reality, such as the realization of revolutions in non-advanced capitalist areas and the important role of the peasantry in these revolutions. Third, the Pol Pot genocide, the Sino-Vietnamese war and the refugee crisis had been once again called into question the socialist bloc itself. There were different responses to the crisis. However, they generally differ from Toda's perspective which advocates the abandonment of Marxism itself. While recognizing the limitations of Marxism, they still believe that Marxism could be modified and developed. In contrast Toda's critique is principled in that he rejects any pragmatic defense of Marx.

What, then, were the fundamental problems with Marx? The points of criticism will be discussed in the following sections of this paper. However, let us first review the context of the French critique of Marx, which Toda understood as a precedent for such a critique of Marxism. Using the rise of "anti-Marxism" in France as a mirror, I outline the discourse at issue in this paper.

However, considering the extent of its influence on Toda, it must be pointed out that the publication of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's *The Gulag Archipelago* played a significant role. Solzhenitsyn was expelled from the Soviet Union in 1974. *The Gulag Archipelago* was published in France in 1973, followed by a French edition in 1974. The book was influential in bringing the Soviet Gulag into mainstream political discourse.[7] The reaction to it accelerated the criticism of Marxism in France. One of the repercussions was the "New Philosophers" label staged by Bernard-Henri Lévy through television and the publishing media. If there was a family resemblance among them, it was in their rejection of Marxism. In general, they had nothing in common except their criticism of Marxist-influenced ideas, organizations and movements. Many of the key figures of the New Philosophers had been Maoist activists.

Their criticism of Marxism in the wake of *The Gulag Archipelago* is sometimes said to have something in common with the proponents of anti-Marx-

7. See Christofferson 2004.

ist thought in Japan.[8] In fact, the new philosophers were introduced with the label "anti-Marx," and it can be said that such a translation and introduction of French thought prepared the ground for Toda's ideological turn to be openly proposed.[9] Toda describes his reading of this book as a "contemporaneous experience" between Glucksmann and himself.[10] He states that it was through Solzhenitsyn's writings that he realized the need for a fundamental criticism of Marxism, an experience common to both France and Japan.[11] He believed that these contemporary experiences required anti-Marxist thinking.

Although Toda self-identifies as sharing an anti-Marxist position with the New Philosophers, he also shows a certain distance. Kasai Kiyoshi, an ally of Toda's who wrote *The Phenomenology of Terror* (1984) under the banner of "anti-Marxism," recognizes that anti-Marxism leads to mere liberalism and affirmation of the status quo.[12] It is not wrong to assume that Toda had a similar view. He separates Bernard-Henri Lévy and Glucksmann, giving special importance to the latter. Although there are few translations of their texts in Japan before 1979 and it is unclear how much he read them, Toda appreciates theorists who, while criticizing Marxism, also explored the possibility of a non-Marxist "revolution." While stating that he shares the same historical experience with the New Philosophers, he insists the need to consider what a non-Marxist "revolution" would be.

8. The literary magazine *Umi* (『海』), founded in 1969, introduced the "New Philosophers" in its September 1977 issue. In its November 1979 issue, there was a special feature on André Glucksmann and soon after, in February 1980, his major work, *The Master Thinkers* (translated by Yoshinari Nishinaga), was published by Chūōkōronsha. In 1981, Glucksmann's *La Cuisinière et le Mangeur d'Hommes : Réflexions sur l'État, le marxisme et les camps de concentration* (translated by Tamura Yoshio) was published by Shinchōsha.

9. The following magazine articles are just a few examples, Watanabe 1977 and Sugiyama 1977. Michel Foucault, Jean Baudrillard, Cornelius Castoriadis and Jean-François Lyotard were also introduced as "anti-Marx". In the dialogue between Takaaki Yoshimoto and Foucault, we can clearly see that "postmodernism" was accepted as "anti-Marx". This dialogue was first published in the magazine "Umi" and is included in Yoshimoto 1984.

10. Toda 1983, 101.

11. *The Gulag Archipelago* was translated into Japanese from 1975. It seems that Toda read Solzhenitsyn's "Gulag Archipelago" in 1979. Cf. Toda 1985, 378.

12. Toda 1983, 23.

Three marxisms in japan

Next, I will explain Toda's view of the situation of the Japanese left, which was the target of his anti-Marxist position. Toda recognized that the actual political forces were still under the strong political and theoretical influence of Marxism, even though the questioning of Marxism had begun. He advocated "anti-Marxism" based on this recognition of the situation.

In Japan, the "old" left forces include the Japan Socialist Party (JSP) and the Japanese Communist Party. Both parties had strong national movements after World War II. The left and right of the JSP reunited, and in response, the Democratic Party of Japan and the Liberal Party merged to form the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP). In Japan's postwar political system, known as the 55-Year Regime, the LDP maintained its position as the ruling party, while the opposition parties, the JCP and the JSP, held one-third of the seats in the Diet.

In contrast, with the formation of the Communist League in 1958, the leftist force known as the "New Left" began. The Communist League led the street struggles against the U.S.-Japan Joint Security Treaty in 1960, but was dismantled after its defeat. Various factions emerged from this dissolution. These factions, despite their twists and turns, had their own movements and organizations that occupied a certain position in the upsurge of the movement in the 1960s. However, the term "New Left" does not refer only to these partisan activists but to a variety of left movements outside the Communist Party, including party groups and the Beheiren (ベ平連 Citizens' League for Peace in Vietnam) and Zenkyōtō (全共闘, All-Campus Joint Struggle Committees) movements as well, in which non-factional actors were active.

The influence of Third Worldism since the 1970s cannot be overlooked either. Against the background of global attention to the Vietnamese revolutionary and anti-war movement, the Cultural Revolution in China and the guerrilla activities of Che Guevara, the theory of revolution in the developed Western countries and the view of historical development were criticized. This is related to the shift to a theory of minority struggle and anti-discrimination movement that Hidemi Suga found in the indictment

of New Left factions by the Overseas Chinese Youth Struggle Committee (華僑青年闘争委員会).[13]

Let us now look at Toda's views on the postwar left around 1980. Toda had been involved in activism from the JCP to the New Left Movement and Third Worldism. These three forces are distinguished as "Stalinism and Social Democracy," "New Left Marxism," and "Third Worldism."

As far as "Stalinism and Social Democracy" is concerned, Toda has in mind the JCP, which he describes as a social democracy with a Stalinist constitution. The late 1970s was a time when the failure of the socialist-communist common line of struggle between the JCP and the JSP, which had already failed at the national political level, became decisively clear. He also argues that the welfare state is losing its effectiveness against the background of the rising neoliberalism, which corresponds to Eurocommunism's abandonment of working-class politics. Although the JCP took a softer line in its politics and moved closer to social democracy, it maintained a system of democratic centralization and a ban on splinter activities within the party. It simply changed the dictatorship of the proletariat in its program by substituting a translation of "dictatorship" for "regency." For Toda, the rigid bureaucratic structure of the JCP, with its leader at the top, had not changed.

The JCP, which had been totally hostile to both the Chinese Communist Party and the Soviet Communist Party since the late 1960s, moved closer to Eurocommunism, which was called "Eurojaponais communism" in Japan after the mid–1970s. The point is that he regarded these changes in the JCP as the preservation of Stalinism. Moreover, contrary to the way it is generally regarded by the New Left, Toda argues that European social democracy is the orthodox heir of Marxism. It is an adaptation to the capitalism of the developed countries, based on nation-state workers' welfare with a rigid organizational structure. In contrast to the historical view of the New Left that social democracy is a counterrevolutionary reaction, Toda sees it as one of the revolutionary strategies adapted to advanced capitalist countries. On this basis, he criticizes the Stalinist character of the JCP.

Next, the issue of "New Left Marxism" and "Third Worldism" is connected to its "terrorism." Some of the major examples are the intraparty killings in the New Left. The problem is that the armed struggles that arose

13. SUGA 2018, 391–97.

at the end of the 1960s and after the 1970s did not lead to violent confrontation with the state, but to killing each other within the New Left. This includes, for example, the internal violence of the Central Core Faction (中核派), the Revolutionary Marxist Faction (革マル派), and the Liberation Faction (解放派), the Asama-Sansō incident of the United Red Army (連合赤軍), and internal violence. The Third World theory also leads to the same violence. Similarly, in his discussion of the Third World, Toda points out the connection between national liberation struggles and national violence, the primary example of which is Pol Pot's massacre in Cambodia. He is also concerned with the violence of national liberation struggles used to expand the sphere of influence of the Soviet Union, which led to wars between socialist countries, such as the Sino-Vietnamese War. The problem of violence in the Third World drives Toda to take a serious look at the situation where Marxist revolution and liberation led to the use of revolutionary violence on a large scale.

This critique of violence and terror leads to the question of the genesis of the Soviet concentration camps. Toda sees the violence embodied in the gulags of the Soviet Union and the violence in the Third World as the same problem caused by Marxism. Marxism leads to violence on various scales, from revolutionary factions and national liberation movements to socialist states. Such are the contradictions of Marxism as they have been exposed in the 1970s.

Toda's understanding of the Marxist forces of his time is as described above, but it is important to note that he argues that Marxism, such as social democracy, the New Left, and Third Worldism, remained influential in the late 1970s and around 1980. Under these circumstances, a criticism of the Old Left, the New Left and Third Worldism cannot be made without the criticism of Marxism itself. Toda sees these problems as a consequence of the revolutionary movement based on Marxism. When the ideological force of Marxism takes the form of the state or the party, revolutionary violence is exercised. The question of why the project of emancipation turns out to be the worst is his concern: "The grounds of Marxism's self-transformation into the opposite of 'revolution' and 'emancipation' must be revealed not as an accidental external factor, but as an internal consequence of its thought.[14]

14. Toda 1983, 15.

Critique of modernity, not capitalism

Then what does Marxism mean according to Toda? He summarizes it in three points: (1) industrialism, (2) statism, and (3) idealism. Toda claims that each of these is a product of the modern revolution, that is, the industrial revolution, the bourgeois revolution, and the idealist revolution. He states that the advantage of Marxism is that it has been able to synthesize these three elements.[15]

First, with regard to industrialism, Marx inherited the machine industry and universal transportation (the expanding division of labor) created by the industrial revolution as the material foundation of the new society. Toda criticizes the project of creating a communist society based on this industrial mode of production as unreasonable. The combination of the industrial mode of production with autonomous self-government ultimately leads either to collectivization centered on state power, to the approval of coordination through market mechanisms, or to a mixed economic system of market and planning, all of which lead to technocratic domination and ecological destruction.[16]

Second, statism is inherited from the modern bourgeois revolution. It is a form of governance based on the formation of nation-states and class conflicts within them. Toda says that Marxism is realized as the welfare state in developed capitalist countries and as one-country socialism in the Soviet Union and other socialist blocs. He also criticizes Marxism in the Third World as being useful only as a means of modernization and promotion of modern industry. According to him, Marxism is only useful in introducing the Western industrial model in underdeveloped states. He concludes that Marxism cannot achieve Engels-Lenin's contradictory "withering away of the state" but rather reinforces the same aspect of statism as the capitalist state.

Third, the "materialist inversion" of idealistic universality inherited from German Idealism is what synthesizes and rationalizes industrialism and statism.[17] It is based on a systematic knowledge that tries to explain everything in a sequential way. Knowledge, production and power are unified with a

15. Toda 1983, 16.
16. Toda 1983, 18.
17. Toda 1983, 16.

totality specific to Marxism, replacing idealistic universality with a material base. The "material base," as the inversion reveals, is nothing other than that of modern industry. Marxism is the dispositive that links the conditions of modern industry to the rule of state power and ideologically justifies it. The overthrow of the universality to which historical materialism adheres ultimately leads to the inheritance and affirmation of industrialization.[18]

Toda finds the specificity of Marxism in these three points, but what is problematized by this characterization? It is "modernity" or "the modern world"; more precisely, Marxism is seen as taking over the project of modernity. Modernity here is a contrasting concept to capitalism. While capitalism represents the capitalist mode of production, the social system of each country, and the system of global interconnections of capital, the modern world is structured by such capitalist production and transportation, but it is not so much a formation of capitalism as it is a historical formation through modernity.[19] The term "modernity" is used as a description of problems that cannot be solved by simply abolishing capitalism. Toda sees them as resulting from the industrialism, statism and idealism.

Marxism is indeed a critique of capitalism, but at the same time it is a continuation and development of the premises of modernity. Toda states, "The fact that Marx's critique of capitalism was only a critique of capitalism is grounds for the fact that Marxism had to turn into the opposite of revolution and emancipation."[20] Therefore, Marxist modern socialism was only socialism as "the negation of capitalism within the framework of modernity" or "the negation of capitalism from the standpoint of modernity," and in this sense it was the most coherent and complete form of moderni-

18. Toda 1983, 18.

19. The opposition of the modern world to the capitalist world is already evident in Toda's Third Worldism. Toda states in "Do You Know the South – Reflections on the Third World" included in his posthumous manuscripts that the "third world" is an attempt to overcome the "modern world" itself. He argues that Marxism's "principled analysis/critique of 'capitalism' as a modern civil society" does not systematize a critique of the modern world itself, but that it is necessary to bring the practical critique of the modern world in the Third World and its liberation and revolution to fruition in a "higher revitalization of the theoretical system" (Toda 1985, 142–3). The critique of modernity, which was to be incorporated into Marxism, is to be pursued without Marxism after reading Solzhenitsyn.

20. Toda 1983, 17.

ty.[21] Toda's point is not that the critique of capitalism itself is worthless. Rather, he emphasizes that Marxism, despite its harsh critique of capitalism, advances a more comprehensive project of modernity. In this respect, it is not useful as a critique of modernity itself. For Toda, Marxism is only a critique of capitalism, not of modernity itself. However, he believes that the problems of our time stem from the preconditions of modernity (industrialism, statism, and idealism). For him, what is needed is a critical thinking of modern presuppositions. The critique of modernity, not capitalism, is the perspective of Toda's criticism of Marxism.[22]

Toda's reading of French thought: an explanation of the emergence of the glug

The main points of Toda's critique of Marxism have been explained so far. What was his reception of the ideas of the French thinkers?

The decisive factor was the existence of forced labor camps in the Soviet Union. Toda claims that his reading of Solzhenitsyn's *The Gulag Archipelago* is the catalyst that steers him toward a full-scale criticism of Marxism. For him, the problem lies in the "history of the genesis of the Gulag Archipelago" as described by Solzhenitsyn, or the search for the conditions that would create camps.[23] Or, put more simply, the question is why Marxist revolutionary theory and practice created the Gulag.

So how does Toda understand the reason for this? His contention is that the camps are the result of the union of knowledge and state governance, which is inherent in Marxism. He argues that a certain form of unification

21. Toda 1983, 16.

22. Regarding this critique of modernity, it is necessary to point out the influence of Nagasaki Hiroshi. His first book, *Theory of Rebellion* (1969), summarizes the experience of the Anpo struggle (安保闘争) of 1960, while characterizing it as a "rebellion against modernity. Toda and Kiyoshi Kasai were strongly influenced by him in their critiques of Marxism. Nagasaki himself reconsiders Marxism in *Question of Revolution and Marxism* (1984). In addition, various aspects of the debate on "modernity" in a broader perspective need to be examined in detail, at least from the 1960s onward, and as pointed out in Nakamasa's books, there remains the task of examining the impact of the Zenkyōtō movement on the movement and its intellectuals. Toyama 2018 is excellent, tracking the afterlives of the Zenkyōtō movement in detail, but does not offer a close examination of its critique of modernity.

23. Toda 1983, 167.

of knowledge and power is the Gulag. He traces back to the emergence of ideas grounded in this relationship between knowledge and power that gave rise to the Gulag.

This question of the Gulag is taken up in the wake of Solzhenitsyn's discussion of "revolutionary justice." This is the tautological notion that "revolutionary justice is revolutionary and just because it is the justice of the revolution," a belief made possible by the proletarian state (proletarian dictatorship) and the certainty of science.[24] Solzhenitsyn argues that the statements in Lenin's letter asserting the need for a "defense of the revolution" against "counterrevolution" were enforced in the Soviet Union as Article 58, "Crimes of Counterrevolution," and enabled the Great Purges of the Stalin era and the repression of dissent in the communist bloc. Between 1918 and 1922, the All-Russian Emergency Committee sent large numbers of peasants, labor idlers, intellectuals, moderate leftists, anarchists, and rebels to Siberia to engage in forced labor. There was no penal code or system of criminal law during this period, and decisions on whom to arrest and dispose of were based solely on the "idea" of revolutionary justice. The provisions were broadly set out to be dealt with by any means possible, and could be applied in "various" ways based on "conscience" in defense of the revolution. This "dialectic of revolutionary justice," or the history of its conceptual development, is described as the "legalization of the law of lawlessness."[25]

Toda claims that such counterrevolutionary crime blocks the "revolution" against the Soviet state, and thus there is a perversion of the idea of revolution as a crime.[26] It was the notion of "revolutionary justice" that made this perversive reversion possible, criminalizing the revolution in order to defend it.

However, the argument goes on to say that the Gulag is not only a necessity for the defense of the revolution and its insistence, but also comes from a "myth of labor and production." He draws on Solzhenitsyn's words that "the theoretical justification would not have become so firm in these hectic years if it had not begun in the last century."[27] That is to say, the gulag system

24. Toda 1983, 167.
25. Toda 1983, 169.
26. Toda 1983, 169.
27. Toda 1983, 173.

already had its economic necessity and theoretical justification in Marx's own valuation of "labor" and "production."

As is well known, Marx's key theoretical premise is the labor theory of value. It holds that human labor produces value, or more precisely, that the value of various commodities is the labor time invested in them, according to socially necessary labor. Toda's criticism targets the logic by which production is privileged by assuming a link between labor and value. He argues that the Marxist state combines "labor-value theory" and "proletarian dictatorship" both in ideological-scientific discourse and in the discourse of the state, which he calls the "labor-value state."[28]

Toda describes this "labor-value state" as the "great confinement" of Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*, that is, the confinement or exclusion of the poor and the mad. Drawing on the analysis of the modern, established episteme, he argues that the "prison society" of modern civil society, with its surveillance and punishment in prisons, factories, schools, hospitals, and barracks, is equivalent to the "imprisonment society" in Soviet Society, in which labor and the cultivation of order are enforced by the state and its ideology.[29] Marxism does not escape the modern framework of labor, production, and prisonization.

Toda sees as peculiar to Marxism the enactment of the combined relationship between state and knowledge that makes possible the society in which the Soviet Union itself embodies the prison. The cause of the creation of the camps is to be found in the conjunction of Marxist knowledge and state governance. Those who are obstacles to labor and production, those who cannot contribute to the maintenance and development of the state, are placed in camps and subjected to labor. This valorization of labor and production stems from Marx's theory of the value of labor. This inherent relationship between knowledge and governance is understood by analogy to the exclusion of madness in modernity. Toda seems to have obtained from Foucault a view of Soviet society based on the gulag—the confinement of madness—as within the episteme of Western modernity.

28. Toda 1983, 176.
29. Toda 1983, 176.

Non-Marxist image of the revolution

Toda draws on Solzhenitsyn and Foucault to think about the Gulag. However, the influence of Solzhenitsyn's *The Gulag Archipelago* on Toda is not limited to why the camps came into existence. It also invokes him to think about the resistance to it; the non-Marxist resistant inside the camps.

Toda highly evaluates Glucksmann's critique of Marxism for emphasizing the resistance of non-Marxists inside the camps and for reflecting on his own complicity as a Marxist who had not criticized the camps.[30] Toda also shows a strong commitment to this resistant (or the dissident), as he tries to find a path to the revolutionary subject who resists the so-called revolutionary state of the Soviet Union. Here we can see that the figure of the resistant, as Toda imagines or holds as a privileged image, is raised. Taking up "the resistant in the camps" as his original image, he associates this "resistant" to the idea of "revolution."

In response to Glucksmann's position of "permanent resistant" and his break with "revolution," Toda agrees with a break with a revolution that aims at good power and state, but says "this is not the same as abandoning the vision of a 'revolution' that does not become 'power' nor 'state,' or that continues to go against them."[31] In this way, he argues that the guerrilla-like "permanent revolution" that continues to reject good governance is the contemporary task for thinking. He clearly emphasizes the importance of "the resistant," but still argues that it is necessary to think of a kind of "revolution" rather than taking resistance under liberal democracy for granted.

What, then, does "revolution" mean? If "revolution" exceeds the confine of Marxism but still claims to be something other than permanent "resistance," what image of "revolution" or idea of revolution is held here?

Toda's reference to Baudrillard is worth focusing on. According to him, Baudrillard has an aversion to the concept of "production" and emphasizes the Bataillean concept of consumption as "waste". Marxism, which bases itself on production and labor, fails to grasp the symbolic dimension of mass consumer society. We have already seen that Marxism gives rise to the state, which is constituted on the basis of the value of labor. In contrast, Toda

30. Toda 1983, 97.
31. Toda 1983, 105.

presents a view that superimposes the concept of consumption and mass uprising. He sees mass uprising as political consumption under modern conditions. What he means is that revolution is not a transition to a new, more advanced society, but rather a wasteful discharge of energy that has to do with the ontological potential of human being, which cannot be reduced to economic or social conditions.[32] It is not a revolution with the working class at its center, but miscellaneous, multiple mass uprisings. He also thinks highly of the emergence of a mass rebellion rather than a revolutionary path towards socialism. He writes, "If it is possible to consider the possibility of the 'revolutionary subject' within an imperialist country, it would not be in 'class formation' but in 'class dismantlement/de-classification,' and not in 'workers' revolution' but in 'revolution of the masses."[33] The subject of the revolution does not present itself in the formation of the working class as the proletariat, which is subsumed and formed by capital in the workplace, but rather emerges by breaking out of its social determinations and class consciousness. Toda's image of revolution is no longer bound to Marxism as a critique, or critical perfection, of capitalism. It is tied to the existence of non-Marxist, non-worker-centered masses. The revolution must not be a project of creating a new society. Rather, it is an anti-production, anti-industry, anti-government, anti-state mass practice of rebellion against it, be it socialist or liberal.

This orientation is also connected to his positive reference to Foucault's discussion of the Iranian Revolution. As is well known, the Iranian Revolution that occurred in 1978 was a revolution that brought about the collapse of the Pahlavi dynasty in Iran, making Islam the leading force with Ruhollah Khomeini as its leader. Foucault talks about the Iranian Revolution in an interview and publishes several articles in 1978–79 discussing the political spirituality at work there. Inspired by Foucault's idea of spirituality, Toda states, "The question of the primordiality and transcendence of human existence, which cannot help but produce the 'religious,' is ultimately the same as our question of 'emancipation.'"[34] He believes that the question of human

32. Toda 1983, 160.
33. Toda 1983, 89.
34. Toda 1983, 162.

spirituality, which lies at the root of religion, is the same as the question of emancipation. Thus, he proposes an "esoteric approach to revolution":

> It is the people and the universe of meaning of "revolution" lived as an uprising or insurrection, that have always brought about a break with the fate of "symbolization" and "statisation" that the discourse of "revolution" has suffered in "modernity" (including, of course, "Modern Socialism-Marxism (the state)"), and has fundamentally dissented it each time. How can we find a "phase of return" that nullify the "symbolization" and "statisation" forced by "modernity" while constantly returning to this primacy of "revolution"? It is at this point, of all places, that the esoteric question of "revolution" is raised.[35]

According to Toda, "there is a 'religious' world of 'revolution' that is lived in the popular dimension."[36] For Toda, Marxism or, more generally, modernity represses this religious nature and forces an order of utility defined by the present. In contrast, the unrealistic, religious spirituality within the people makes revolutionary action possible outside of the here and now.

This "primordial revolutionism and utopianism of the people" forms the basis of the revolution, and only by leaving the modern class movement based on trade unions and the party, the working class becomes the subject of the revolution.[37] The workers do not make the revolution; they cease to be the worker in the revolution. They become motivated by a primordial impulse that is different from the class consciousness. Toda sees these religious roots as political spirituality.

The influence of Baudrillard, which I discussed earlier, is also related to the spirituality that Toda evaluates here. For example, he states:

> The transcendence that continues to live as the negative in the 'fetishism of commodities'" may be considered as seeking a way to free itself from the spellbound of commodities through symbolic exchange (transportation). It would not be unfair to believe that the primordiality of human existence, which once made possible symbolic exchange with the spirit and death,

35. Toda 1983, 184.
36. Toda 1983, 186.
37. Toda 1983, 187.

> must one day achieve symbolic exchange with the 'revolution' that reverses the negative of transcendence in consumer society.[38]

Toda interprets political spirituality as belonging to the symbolic dimension as discussed by Baudrillard. Here, "symbolic" is the reverse side of the fetishism of the commodities, the operation of symbols that are clinging to materiality and utility but detached from them, i. e., the consumption and exchange of these symbols. Toda argues that the symbolic is the surplus of the world that cannot fully complete its reification.

There is a symbolic dimension that is different from necessity and utility in modern society, where commodification and symbolization have advanced. The desire for the symbolic cannot be erased, no matter how it prevails. Toda believes that there is an "ontological dimension to human desire," which can be freed from materialization and institutionalization through "revolution" as a practical act, through such waste and communication. He says that there is an impulse in the human collectivity that makes possible not only the exchange of goods, but also symbolic exchange. It is something that is hidden in the increasing commodification, but at the same time always remains within such commodities.

For Toda, the political spirituality is not to sublimate the popular uprising into a "state religion" of Marxist-Leninism, but to continue to seek the possibility of revolution in a kind of "curse on revolution." That means thoroughly cursing the incorporation of the collective spirituality in the uprising into the revolutionary project. The revolution is based on a kind of counter-revolution, that is, an opposition to the revolutionary image of Marxism.

Conclusion

The above discussion can be summed up as follows. Toda's "anti-Marx" is located within the problematic of "the crisis of Marxism in the contemporary world" shared by Marxists. However, unlike the theorists who advocated the critical development of Marxism, Toda reduced the causes of the terror caused by the project of emancipation to Marx's political and theoretical influence, criticized internally its core that took over

38. Toda 1983, 117.

modernization, and insisted that Marxism be abandoned. The reception of French thought of the same period played an important role in this process. Starting from Solzhenitsyn and Glucksmann's discussion of the Gulag, Toda interpreted Foucault and Baudrillard to understand the emergence of the "idea" leading to the terror, which is at the heart of Marxism, and their junction with the state and the science in its discourse. However, he argued that we should not abandon the idea of "revolution," but rather ask for a different, non-Marxist form of "revolution. The failure of the Marxist project of emancipation and the realization that was turned into a rather harsh oppression led Toda to "anti-Marx." In this way this paper has taken Toda as an example of the turn to "anti-Marx" that occurred in the 1980s.

How is it possible, then, to have a revolution that is neither Marxist nor an endorsement of liberal democracy? It is not a project to produce something, Toda argues, but as practiced by the collective spirituality of the masses who reject any good governance. His image of revolution is not scientific Marxist, but one that is driven by the spirituality of the people.

Is there a need to insist on "anti-Marxism" today? Of course not. The context in which Toda felt that the thinking and practice of a new revolution would not be possible without criticizing "Marxism," has completely disappeared. We are instead in a situation in which mass uprisings continue to occur only as uprisings.

The question of "revolution" posed by Toda remains important here, because we still do not know what a "revolution" outside the framework of Marxism would look like. Certainly, rebellions do occur. Globally, mass protests, direct actions, uprisings, and revolts continue to manifest in various ways in response to each other. However, we must positively evaluate Toda's insistence on questioning "revolution" rather than mere rebellion. Bourgeois revolutions repeat themselves, but the dream of Marxist revolutionary theory was a revolution divorced from that repetition. Rebellions and uprisings are always recurring in capitalism, but the revolution that Marxism sought was to end this repetition. From Toda's perspective, Marxism has nothing but "modernity" in common with capitalism. What then is "revolution" as rupture? This question remains unanswered.

References

Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr A・ソルジェニーツィン

1974 『収容所列島1』[The Gulag Archipelago 1] translated by Kimura Kou, (Tokyo: Shinchōsha).

1974 『収容所列島2』[The Gulag Archipelago 2] translated by Kimura Kou, (Tokyo: Shinchōsha).

Baudrillard, Jean ジャン・ボードリヤール

1979 『消費社会の神話と構造』[The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures] Translated by Imamura Hitoshi and Tsukahara Takashi, (Tokyo: Kinokuniyashoten).

Christofferson, Michael Scott

2004 *French Intellectuals Against the Left: The Antitotalitarian Moment of the 1970s.* (New York:. Berghahn Books).

Foucault, Michel ミシェル・フーコー

1975 『狂気の歴史：古典主義時代における』[History of Madness] Translated by Tamura Hajime, (Tokyo: Shinchōsha).

1977 『監獄の誕生：監視と処罰』[Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison] Translated by Tamura Hajime, (Tokyo: Shinchōsha).

Glucksmann, André アンドレ・グリュックスマン

1980 『思想の首領たち』[The Master Thinkers] Translated by Nishinaga Yoshinari, (Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha)

1981 『現代ヨーロッパの崩壊』[La cuisinière et le mangeur d'hommes: Essai sur l'État, le marxisme, et les camps de concentration], trans. by Tamura Hajime (Tokyo: Shinchōsha).

Iida Momo いいだもも

1979 「マルクスは死せり、マルクス万歳!」[Marx is Dead, Long Live Marx!],『現代の眼』20/8: 124–33.

Iida Momo いいだもも, Takeuchi Yoshirō 竹内芳郎

1981 「近代世界とマルクス主義」[The Modern World and Marxism],『流動』13/2: 14–30.

Iwata Hiroshi 岩田弘, Kikuchi Masanori 菊池昌典, Takeuchi Yoshirou 竹内芳郎, Hiromatsu Wataru 廣松渉

1979 「マルクス主義の理念と現在」[The Ideal and Present of Marxism],『第三文明』218: 38–60.

Kasai Kiyoshi 笠井潔

1984 『テロルの現象学』[Phenomenology of Terror] (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō).

1985 「戸田徹と第三世界革命論」[Toda Tōru and Third Worldism],『戸田徹遺稿集』, 336–48.

1990 『ユートピアの冒険』[Utopian Adventures] (Tokyo: Mainichi Newspapers).

Nagasaki Hiroshi 長崎浩
1969 『叛乱論』[Theory of Rebellion] (Tokyo: Gohdosyuppan).
1984 『革命の問いとマルクス主義―階級、自然、国家そしてコミューン』[The Question of Revolution and Marxism: Class, Nature, State, and Commune.] (Tokyo: Esueru Shuppankai).

Nagasaki Hiroshi 長崎浩, Takano Yōichi 高野庸一, Toda Tōru 戸田徹, Kasai Kiyoshi 笠井潔
1979 「全共闘解体以後一〇年」[Ten Years Since the Sisollution of Zenkyōtō], 『流動』11/11: 168–91.

Kosaka Suhei 小阪修平
1985 「戸田徹と「マルクス葬送」運動」[Tōru Toda and the "Marx's Funeral" Movement], in Toda 1985, 349–63.

Nijima Atsuyoshi 新島淳良
1981 「マルクスを超えて」[Beyond Marx],『流動』13/ 2: 58–67.

Ōta Ryu 太田竜
1981 「日本型マルクス主義を解体せよ!」[Dismantle Japanese Marxism!], in 『流動』13/2: 42–9.
1986 『マルクスを超えて』[Beyond Marx] (Tokyo: Futōsha).

Suga Hidemi 絓秀実
2006 『1968年』[The Year 1968] (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō).
2018 『増補版 革命的な、あまりに革命的な:「1968 年の革命」史論』[Revolutionary, All Too Revolutionary: The History of the "Revolution of 1968"] (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō).

Kan Takayuki 管孝行
1981 「マルクスの現代性とは何か :マルクス批判と反マルクス」[What is Marx's Contemporaneity? Critique of Marx and Anti-Marx.],『流動』13/2: 32–41.
1982 『マルクスと現代』[Marx Today] (Tokyo: Miraisha)

Takasawa Kōji 高沢皓司, Takagi Masayuki 高木正幸, Kurata Kazunari 蔵田計成
1981 『新左翼二十年史』[Twenty Years of the New Left] (Tokyo: Shinsensha)

Nakamasa Masaki 仲正昌樹
2017 『増補新版 ポスト・モダンの左旋回』[The Postmodern Turn to the Left, expanded and revised] (Tokyo: Sakuhinsha).
2006 『集中講義! 日本の現代思想 :ポストモダンとは何だったのか』[Intensive Lecture! Japanese Contemporary Thought: What Was Postmodernism?] (Tokyo: nhk Publisher).

Nagamine Kōzaburō 永峰幸三郎
1985 「関西時代の戸田徹」[Tōru Toda in his Kansai Period], in Toda 1985, 322–35.

Sugiyama Mitsunobu 杉山光信
1977 「マルクス主義は民衆の批判に応えられるか」[Can Marxism Respond to Criticism in the Name of the People?],『中央公論』92/10: 104–15.

TODA Tōru 戸田徹
1983 『マルクス葬送』[Marx's Funeral] (Tokyo: Gogatsusha).

TODA Tōru 戸田徹著
1985 『戸田徹遺稿集 彼方へ：霊の解放と革命の夢』[Tōru Toda's Posthumous Manuscripts. Beyond: The Liberation of Spirits and the Dream of Revolution] (Tokyo: Committee for the Compilation of Tōru Toda's Posthumous Manuscripts)

TOYAMA Kōichi 外山恒一
2018 『改訂版　全共闘以後』[After Zenkyōtō] (Tokyo: East Press).

WATANABE Kazutami 渡辺一民
1977 「全体主義を告発する新哲学者たち」[New Philosophers Accusing Totalitarianism] in『朝日ジャーナル』19/42: 104–15.

YOSHIMOTO Takaaki 吉本隆明
1984 『世界認識の方法』[Methods of Recognizing the World] (Tokyo: Chūōkōron).