Hill, Christopher L. "Revolution or Redress? The History of Fanon in Japan."
Review of African Political Economy 52:186 (Dec. 2025): 481-93.

Revolution or redress? The history of Fanon in Japan

Christopher L. Hill*

Department of Asian Languages and Cultures, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA

ABSTRACT

The reception of Fanon in Japan was framed by responses to the decolonisation of Africa and Asia, Japanese leftists' critique of capitalism and European colonialism, and reflections on Japan's past. The Algerian War, a reminder of Japan's history as the coloniser and 'civiliser' of Asia, brought Fanon to Japanese intellectuals' attention. Two competing claims on his work appeared in the 1960s. In one, Fanon was a theorist of insurrection; in the other, an analyst of the mechanisms of colonial domination. The two views emerged clearly in disputes over the translation of Fanon that reflected different goals for political practice. The complex history of Fanon in Japan, then, is an opportunity to reflect on the reception of his work elsewhere and Fanon's potential for political practice in a different geopolitical era.

KEYWORDS

Japan; imperialism; colonialism; decolonisation; Korea; Resident Koreans; Frantz Fanon; Suzuki Michihiko

When Fanon's writings became well known in Japan in the 1960s, two competing claims on his work appeared on the left. In one, Fanon was a theorist of insurrection; in the other, an analyst of the mechanisms of colonial domination. Their origins can be traced to Japanese intellectuals' responses to the Algerian War. The two views emerged clearly in disputes over the translation of Fanon in the late 1960s that reflected different goals for political practice. Each spoke in separate ways to the past

*Corresponding author email: hillcl@umich.edu

Accepted: 17 September 2025; published online: 3 December 2025

and present of Japan, which had been both object and subject of imperialism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The complex history of Fanon in Japan, then, is an opportunity to reflect on the reception of his work elsewhere and Fanon's potential for political practice in a different geopolitical era.

Imperialism, colonialism and Japan

Japan was coerced into opening relations with the United States and four European imperialist powers in the 1850s, leading to the fall of the Tokugawa state that had been in power since 1600 and the establishment of a reformist government in 1868. The new regime shortly annexed the Ryūkyū islands (Okinawa) to the south and Hokkaidō to the north, both of whose status had been ambiguous. A steady expansion of Japan's colonial empire began two decades later. It seized Taiwan in 1895 after a war with Ming China; asserted suzerainty over Korea after a war with Russia in 1905, annexing it in 1910; invaded Manchuria in 1931 and created a puppet state; went to war with Republican China in 1937; and invaded French Indochina in 1940 and the Philippines, Indonesia, Malaya, Burma and numerous Pacific islands in 1941. Labour migration to Japan from Okinawa and Korea became common, starting in the 1920s after the collapse of the sugar industry in the former and the appropriation of land in the latter. (Manchuria was also a destination.) Starting with the Russo-Japanese War, much of the expansion was a series of inter-imperial conflicts. According to the deformed pan-Asianism that took root in Japan in the 1930s, the empire protected Asia from foreign powers; Japan was leading the 'yellow race' to independence (Peattie 1989; Saaler 2007).

When the Japanese empire was dismantled in 1945 many of its territories were returned to their former imperial masters and another – Korea – was divided between two new ones. The nearly seven-year occupation that followed was led by an American general, Douglas MacArthur, whom the historian John Dower likened to an imperial viceroy for the way he imposed sweeping political, economic and social changes without meeting more than a handful of those whose fate was in his hands. The Occupation's ideological keywords were 'democratisation' and 'demilitarisation', the latter reflecting a myth crafted with Japanese political elites that the Asia–Pacific War had been the work of militarists who misled the people (Dower 1999). The agreed fiction, which cast the Japanese people as victims, was the beginning of wilful amnesia about the empire and war (Gluck 1993). The American decision to rehabilitate Japan as a Cold War ally further stilled questions about official and popular conduct before 1945. The treaty that ended the Occupation in 1952 made permanent the US military installations spread across mainland Japan and Okinawa. Former imperial subjects in Japan who chose not to repatriate were stripped of their citizenship and classified as 'third-party nationals'; their descendants too would be stateless. Koreans who remained came to be called *Zainichi chōsenjin* – 'Koreans residing in Japan' or 'Resident Koreans' (Lie 2008). At the end of the Occupation conservatives were firmly in power while the main forces on the left were the Japanese Communist Party (JCP), weakened by a Soviet-directed turn to rural insurrection in 1950; the Japanese Socialist Party; militant labour unions federated as the General Council

 https://roape.net doi: 10.62191/ROAPE-2025-0031

of Trade Unions of Japan; and the All Japan Federation of Student Self-Governing Associations (Zengakuren), formed by the JCP in 1947 but increasingly estranged from it. Many on the left espoused a Soviet-centred socialist cosmopolitanism.

From Algeria to Tokyo

Although the idea that Japan had been colonised by the United States grew on the left in the 1950s – arguably an extension of the 'victim narrative' about the Asia–Pacific War – the outbreak of the Algerian War in 1954 was a reminder of Japan's history as the coloniser and 'civiliser' of Asia (Conrad 2014; Udo 2016). News and opinion magazines such as *Asahi Journal* (*Asahi jaanaru*) and *World* (*Sekai*) followed the war closely. Intellectuals sympathised with the colonised but also reflected on the war's consequences for France, asking if the putsch in Algiers in May 1958 was a 'second Manchurian Incident' – the faked 'bandit' attack that was the Japanese Army's excuse for invasion – that would mean the ascendancy of the military in French politics as the earlier incident had meant for the Japanese (Mushakōji 1958). In May and June 1957 two representatives of the General Union of Algerian Muslim Students visited Tokyo at the invitation of Zengakuren, and in August 1958 the National Liberation Front (FLN) established a mission in Tokyo led by Abdelrahmane Kiouane and Abdelmalek Benhabyles to support its strategy of internationalising the independence struggle ('Arujeria no kiseki…' 1957; 'FLN, Tōkyō ni kyokutō daihyōbu' 1958). Working with the mission, students of French literature began translating publications critical of the war, including the 'Jean Muller dossier' and Henri Alleg's *The Question*, which exposed the French use of torture (Alleg 1958; Muller 1958). One of the translators, Suzuki Michihiko, had become sympathetic to the FLN while studying in Paris. Suzuki, later an eminent translator of Sartre and Proust, was introduced to Fanon when Benhabyles gave him a copy of *L'An V de la révolution algérienne* in 1960 (Suzuki 1968a, English title: *A Dying Colonialism*). Two years later Suzuki published a short introduction to Fanon's work focused on the insurrectionary strategy in *Les damnés de la terre* (Suzuki 1962a, *The Wretched of the Earth*).

As frequently happened elsewhere in the world, most readers learned about Fanon through Jean-Paul Sartre's preface for *Les damnés de la terre*, published in June 1962 in the monthly *Central Review* (*Chūō kōron*) with the title 'Europe Faces Its Vengeance' (Sartre 1962). One of the translators was Suzuki, who had finished his doctorate at the University of Tokyo and was teaching at Hitotsubashi University, both elite institutions. The other, Ebisaka Takeshi, would follow the same path a few years later. While Suzuki was introduced to Fanon by Benhabyles, Ebisaka said he bought *Les damnés de la terre* only for the preface, not reading the rest closely until he began working with Suzuki (Ebisaka 2006). In an explanatory note, the two observed that Sartre's audience was not Fanon's, likening the preface to *Listen, Yankee*, C. Wright Mills' 1960 book for American readers about the Cuban Revolution. Perhaps Sartre's most unique assertion, they said, was that anticolonialism had turned France from the subject of history into its object, leaving French people with a choice to rejoin history by supporting colonised peoples (Suzuki and Ebisaka 1962). What Fanon himself

said seems to have been of little interest to editors and publishers: no translation of *Les damnés de la terre* followed.

Efforts to introduce Fanon's work nonetheless mounted. Hotta Yoshie, a prominent internationalist in the postwar left, summarised the main points of *Les damnés de la terre* in an essay on the 1962 film *The Legion's Last Patrol*, about a French military mission during the Algerian War. Hotta remarked acerbically that Sartre's preface alone had been translated and criticised Japanese scholars of French literature for their indifference to timely issues such as French writing on the Algerian and Vietnamese wars (Hotta 1963).[1] Soon after, Hotta and Suzuki wrote a long examination of *Les damnés de la terre* that foregrounded Fanon's upbringing and experiences during the Second World War on the one hand and conditions in Algeria when he practised psychiatry in Blida on the other. They called *Les damnés de la terre* a 'formidable book' and noted parallels between Algeria and South Africa, Panama, Japanese-ruled Manchuria and Korea, and American-occupied Okinawa (Hotta and Suzuki 1964, 322). Meanwhile, passing references by leftist intellectuals showed increasing familiarity with Fanon's thought. In 1967 the new radical journal *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement* (*Sekai kakumei undō jōhō*),[2] created to publish translations of writing from and about world anticolonial and anticapitalist movements, printed a short introduction of *Les damnés de la terre* ending with the comment that Japanese translations of Fanon's works were 'awaited' (Henshūbu 1967, 27). A member of the group behind *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement* followed up with a review of the 1967 Penguin edition of Constance Farrington's English translation, presenting Fanon as a theorist of revolution alongside Che Guevara and Malcolm X and an inspiration for Black American revolutionaries such as Stokely Carmichael ('K' 1967).

Fanon as theorist of insurrection

Those who were clamouring for translations recognised the importance of Fanon for anticolonial thought and struggle. The dam broke and the contest over interpretation of Fanon began when *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement* published a translation of the first chapter of *Les damnés de la terre* ('De la violence' or 'On Violence') based on Farrington's English version in three instalments in March, May and July 1968 (Fanon 1968a, 1968b, 1968c). Writing for the journal's editors, film critic and freelance editor Matsuda Masao said that 'the necessities of our movement' demanded the examination of the entirety of Fanon's thought. Translating from English was not ideal, but 'Japan's carefree scholars of French literature' had 'cut class' for five years while talking the talk about translating Fanon from French. In light of the urgent need, the editors decided to deliver Fanon's thought to readers, beginning with his theory of violence, as 'intelligence on the revolution' (*kakumei jōhō*). Matsuda attacked the presentation of Fanon as an intellectual, a distortion that began with Sartre and his 'next-youngest brother' Francis Jeanson, who had written the preface for *Peau noire, masques blancs*, and continued with Japanese scholars. The Fanon of Suzuki and Ebisaka was a 'mirage', he said (Matsuda 1968, 58–59).

 https://roape.net doi: 10.62191/ROAPE-2025-0031

Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement formed in the maelstrom of Japanese New Left groups of the late 1960s. The first such group, the Revolutionary Communist League (Kakukyōdō), was created by Trotskyist dissidents from Zengakuren in 1956; it was followed by the Communist League (known as Bund), likewise formed by students who broke with Zengakuren in 1958. These and the many other groups that appeared, split and merged in the next decade shared opposition to the JCP and leaned toward a Tricontinental, Third-Worldist internationalism in contrast to the Bandung-style non-alignment and Afro-Asianism growing in the mainstream left since the 1950s. They competed with each other on matters of doctrine, sometimes violently (Kapur 2022; Hill 2024; Kohso 2024). *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement*, which was avowedly non-sectarian, grew out of an activist reading group on contemporary revolutionary movements that became increasingly concerned with problems beyond the grasp of orthodox theory, particularly colonialism and imperialism. The journal was launched in 1967 by Matsuda, Ōta Masakuni, Ōta Ryū, Sasaki Kōji and Yamaguchi Kenji (writing under the name Aoe Shun), and featured pieces gleaned from periodicals of the independent left from around the world. (The editors considered copyright an obstacle to revolution.) The journal gained sudden attention when it published a translation of Che Guevara's 'Message to the Tricontinental' on the creation of 'many Vietnams' a month after it appeared in English (Guevara 1967; Ōta M. 2003; Matsuda, Hirasawa and Yabu 2007). The editors' approach bridging theory and 'intelligence' reflected a conviction that theoretical and practical issues of revolution had to be grasped on a world scale via knowledge of developments elsewhere. Without such a perspective, the left condemned itself to 'one-country revolution' (Aoe 1967, 72). Introductions and editors' notes underlined the contemporaneity of popular struggle in Africa, the Americas, Europe and Asia, contributing to an internationalism grounded in commitment to revolution (Henshūbu 1968b; Ōta M. 1969). Considering Japan's history, it bears pointing out that such an internationalism ran the risk of implying that Japanese activists stood in the same position vis-á-vis capitalism and imperialism as peoples fighting their way out of colonial rule.

The group behind *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement* followed through on their commitment to introduce Fanon with translations of 'Racisme et culture', 'La mort de Lumumba' and 'Cette Afrique à venir', all from English (Fanon 1968h, 1968i, 'Racism and Culture'; Fanon 1968j, 'The Death of Lumumba'; and Fanon 1969, 'This Africa to Come'). They also reviewed the English editions of *L'An V de la révolution algérienne*, *Pour la révolution africaine* (*Toward the African Revolution*) and *Peau noire, masques blancs* (*Black Skin, White Masks*) (Ōta R. 1968a, 1968b; 'K' 1968). In the pages of *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement*, Fanon was surrounded by other key texts of anticolonial and Third Worldist thought, including, from Africa, pieces by Kwame Nkrumah, Oliver Tambo, Amílcar Cabral, Eduardo Mondlane and Agostinho Neto (Nkrumah 1968; Tambo 1968; Cabral 1969; Mondlane 1969; Neto 1969). The translations frequently were presented in special collections on anticolonial, anti-imperialist and antiracist movements in Africa, Latin America, the United States and Europe. Over time the group began to publish pieces about issues 'at our own feet' – Japanese colonialism

in Okinawa and Hokkaidō, followed by Taiwan and Korea, and then past and present resistance to colonialism in Japan and East Asia (Ōta M. 2003, 314). From the present perspective it may seem odd to frame the work of a canonised theorist as 'intelligence on the revolution'. In *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement*, however, Fanon appeared as a pamphleteer and propagandist in the most positive sense.

The Fanon whom *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement* gave readers was preeminently a theorist of insurrectionary violence, which frequently was called the 'nucleus' of his thought (Henshūbu 1968a, 46; Ōta M. 1968, 39). His views on national culture, the colonial bourgeoisie and other issues facing post-independence countries got comparatively little attention. The work that surrounded Fanon reinforced the emphasis on violence. The group behind *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement* was interested in Che Guevara's commitment to guerrilla warfare, not Fidel Castro's qualms about it; in the Black Panthers, not Students for a Democratic Society. Some of Farrington's translation choices in the first chapter of *Les damnés de la terre*, which passed into their anonymously translated Japanese version, lent violence an idealistic tone. To note only the treatment of Fanon's much-discussed phrase 'la violence désintoxique' ('violence disintoxicates'): in *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement* Farrington's 'violence is a cleansing force', which gave Fanon's clinical language a more general sense of ablution, became 'violence is a purifying force' (*bōryoku wa jōka ryoku de aru*), still farther from Fanon's implication that colonialism stupefies (Fanon 1967, 94, 1968c, 52, 2002, 90; see also Gibson 2007; Shatz 2024, 155).

The attention Fanon received in *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement* corresponded to a shift toward violent direct action in the Japanese New Left that began in autumn 1967 with demonstrations meant to block the government's cooperation in the Vietnam War. The idea that Fanon considered violence a 'purifying force' arguably served the goals of self-negation and self-revolution that became increasingly important in the radical left (Ando 2014). The dialectical quality of Fanon's theory – the violence of colonialism inspiring *contre-violence* ('counter-violence', in Farrington's phrase) that would lead to the birth of a new society – probably also appealed. The anonymous translators of Farrington rendered the phrase as 'violence as opposition' and 'opposing violence' (*taikō toshite no bōryoku*, *taikō suru bōryoku*) (Fanon 1967, 88, 1968c, 50, 51, 2002, 85). Activists described their strategy in a terminology that echoed Fanon's: their response to the overt and hidden violence of the state was 'oppositional violence' (*taikō bōryoku*) and 'anti-violence' (*han-* or *hantai bōryoku*) (Ando 2014, 74). The historiography of violence on the Japanese New Left in the late 1960s and early 1970s remains disputed. The common liberal view is that violent tactics against the state led almost inexorably to inter- and intra-factional violence and a collapse of the New Left in the early 1970s that weakened the left broadly (*ibid.*). A contrary argument, drawing on Jacques Rancière, is that violent direct action momentarily changed the terms of the political by delegitimating the state's response to protest, thereby opening the way for new political participation and tactics, including nonviolent ones (Marotti 2009). If so, the Fanon found in *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement* deserves some credit.

 https://roape.net doi: 10.62191/ROAPE-2025-0031

Fanon as analyst of colonial domination

Japanese scholars of French literature quickly responded to *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement*'s translations of Fanon and in the process produced a different view of Fanon focused on his analysis of colonial domination. While *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement* was still serialising its version of 'De la violence', Suzuki and Urano Kinuko, then a graduate student at Waseda University, published a translation of the chapter from French in the May and June 1968 issues of the literary journal *Misuzu* (Fanon 1968d, 1968e). The second translation avoided some issues introduced via Farrington in *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement*. To return to the earlier example, 'la violence désintoxique' here was 'violence has a detoxifying effect' (*bōryoku wa gedoku sayō o motsu*), a choice that captured Fanon's medical diction even though the suggestion that the colonised are doped was muted (Fanon 1968e, 61). The editors of *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement* said they welcomed the new translation but snidely asked whether their translation from English was the impetus. They continued to believe that publishing Fanon's thought expeditiously was their duty because no one knew when *Les damnés de la terre* would be translated in full (Henshūbu 1968a).

With the backing of the publisher of *Misuzu*, Suzuki, Ebisaka and other scholars of French literature began systematically translating Fanon's published work. Suzuki's and Urano's translation of 'De la violence' was reprinted in October 1968 in an anthology of writing on independence movements with a lengthy introduction by Hotta that characterised Fanon as a latter-day Bartolomé de las Casas (Fanon 1968f; Hotta 1968). Suzuki's group published complete translations of *Peau noire, masques blancs* and *Les damnés de la terre* in a *Fanon Anthology* in December 1968 (Fanon 1968g). A four-volume *Collected Works of Frantz Fanon* appeared between July 1969 and February 1970, giving readers translations of *L'An V de la révolution algérienne* and *Pour la révolution africaine* in addition to *Peau noire* and *Damnés* (Fanon 1969–70). Where *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement* surrounded Fanon with other radical thinkers, Misuzu's *Collected Works* encased him in the trappings of highbrow Japanese publishing. Each volume included the original preface by Jeanson, Sartre and others; translators' notes; an interpretive essay (*kaisetsu*); and a bulletin (*geppō*) with specially commissioned articles tucked inside the cover.

Suzuki, the leader of the group, was emblematic of a turn to Fanon to scrutinise Japan's colonial history and the treatment of former colonial subjects. Suzuki began making comparisons between France's attempts to subdue Algeria and Japan's colonial wars in East Asia in the interpretive essay he wrote for the translation of the Jean Muller dossier in 1958 (Suzuki 1958). A few years later he told Japanese readers that 'Algeria is not far' – for them, only as far away as Korea (Suzuki 1961). Suzuki's comparisons of Japan and France, and Korea and Algeria, provided geohistorical context but also were a moral analytic. In 1960 Suzuki took a first step into career-spanning work for Resident Korean rights when he joined a controversial appeal supporting Ri Chin-U, a Resident Korean man on trial for the rape and murder of two schoolgirls who became a radical cause célèbre (Lie 2008). After Algeria achieved independence Suzuki began writing about Japanese colonialism and its legacy, developing his own interpretation of 'ethnic responsibility' (*minzoku no sekinin*), a phrase used

since the late 1950s to bring Japan to account for its invasion of China and atrocities such as the Nanjing Massacre (Takeuchi 1960).[3] Suzuki said that he came to his own understanding of it through his experiences in France during the war with Algeria and Jeanson's writings about moral responsibility for French colonialism. In his view, arguments about 'ethnic responsibility' had to address the colonisation of Korea and postimperial Japan's treatment of Resident Koreans (Suzuki 1962b, 1963, 1965).

Suzuki's writings on Fanon reflect what he acknowledged was a long reckoning (Suzuki 1968a). Over several years Suzuki's observation in the joint introduction to Sartre's preface to *Les damnés de la terre*, that Sartre and Fanon wrote for different audiences, evolved into an argument that Fanon's thought did not apply to political circumstances in Japan. Suzuki complained that understanding of Fanon's work was 'schematic' because he was much discussed but little read, leading on the one hand to praise of 'leftwing terror' and on the other to the 'hysteric' idea that just talking about him could inspire violence (*ibid.*, 38). In response, Suzuki offered a view of Fanon that encompassed the arguments on national consciousness and national culture in *Les damnés de la terre*, not only the one on violence.[4] He insisted, however, that many of Fanon's ideas could be explained by his upbringing as an *évolué* or 'evolved' youth in Martinique – the term for assimilated Black people that he translated as *kaikamin*, or 'civilised person' – and the specific conditions of colonial Algeria. As an *évolué*, Suzuki said, Fanon suffered 'internalised violence' that meant he only could assert his selfhood through a *theory* of violence (*ibid.*, 39, 44). If Fanon's theory was therefore more psychological artefact than political strategy, Suzuki also said that his arguments on anticolonial struggle relied on a well-worn vocabulary. While valuable for having been written during an actual uprising, his attempts to generalise ideas inspired by Algeria only collapsed important differences between countries (Hotta and Suzuki 1964). In this biographical exegesis Fanon's relevance was bounded by his upbringing and his experiences in Algeria. Complaints in *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement* about French literature scholars' treatment of Fanon had a point: Suzuki's Fanon thus far was denatured and containerised.

Suzuki's views changed in the interpretive essay he wrote for the *Fanon Anthology* published in December 1968 (Fanon 1968g). Fanon's ideas were relevant to Japan, he said, but not in the way admirers thought. The reason for the turn in Suzuki's thinking was the 'Kim Hiro Incident' in February 1968, when a second-generation Resident Korean man killed two gangsters pressuring him to repay a loan and held 13 people hostage in an inn. Kim eloquently denounced discrimination against Resident Koreans in the national media, backed up by a 'defense group' formed by Suzuki and other intellectuals (Lie 2008). In the essay for the anthology, written while Kim was awaiting trial for murder, Suzuki acknowledged the reasons Fanon wrote about violence, from tactical considerations to the goal of overthrowing material and spiritual values in order to create a new human. With the latter in mind, Suzuki advanced an argument for making Fanon 'one's own' that riffed on a passage in *Les damnés de la terre* in which the construction of a bridge is a metaphor for post-independence reconstruction: 'Il faut que le citoyen s'approprie le pont. Alors seulement tout est possible' ('The citizen must make the bridge their own. Only then is everything possible') (Fanon 2002, 190). 'Fanon's philosophy … is a philosophy of making the bridge one's own', Suzuki said (Suzuki 1968b, 388–390).

 https://roape.net doi: 10.62191/ROAPE-2025-0031

How to do so? Suzuki reprised his biographical exegesis of *Les damnés de la terre* but, turning to address his readers, said there were obvious parallels in Japan. Among us there are *évolués* (*kaikamin*) whom we supposedly 'civilised' (*kaika shita*). They are the descendants of colonial subjects raised in Japan who, like Fanon and French, speak and write only the language of the other. Kim Hiro was the victim of crimes against him by Japanese culture, Suzuki declared: he was told to be Japanese but not allowed to be so, and considered a criminal because he was Korean. Kim's violence – 'Third World violence in Japan' – was a negation of the 'shameless' Japanese state and the prejudice of 'assimilation' and 'unity'. Japanese people cannot escape Kim's accusations, Suzuki said, but they can oppose the state that defined him as a criminal as a step toward recognising 'ethnic responsibility' for Japanese colonialism. Achieving such a 'revolution' would require that we 'make the bridge our own' (Suzuki 1968b, 393–396). That is: Suzuki asked Japanese readers of Fanon to recognise themselves in the position of the coloniser – not the colonised, as the rhetoric of the New Left could imply – and respond accordingly. This revolution would take place in Japan.

To the present

Suzuki's use of Fanon to support Resident Koreans in Japan was a contribution to the long-delayed, still incomplete de-imperialisation of the country (Avenell 2022). One has to acknowledge, however, that Suzuki's 'situational', Sartrean approach to Fanon shows none of the aspiration for systemic change on a world scale that made *Les damnés de la terre* inspiring and resounds in *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement*. The different approaches to Fanon that appeared in the 1960s advanced contrary views of how people in a highly developed country with a colonialist past could contribute to economic and political justice. The contributors to *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement* cannot simply be dismissed for not making Fanon their own, considering that they expanded their research to include Japanese colonialism and neo-colonialism. Nonetheless, in comparison to Suzuki, their internationalism can seem unself-reflective in its seeming assumption that all those committed to world revolution stood in the same position vis-à-vis capitalism and imperialism. Even as it evolved, however, the view of Fanon that Suzuki promoted remained biographically reductive in the parallels it drew between Fanon's and Kim's lives, while his argument for making Fanon one's own seemed to limit political practice to the recognition of 'ethnic responsibility' by Japanese people (Shin 2020). Suzuki's ethical calling to account left no room for addressing systemic and supranational sources of exploitation. Are relations of support and solidarity to be founded on commitment to a world movement or acknowledgement of one's position in the world, these two ways of approaching Fanon seem to ask each other. Or, put differently, are support and solidarity to be built from revolution, or redress? Are they really incompatible?

In Japan, interest in Fanon as a theorist of insurrectionary violence did not survive the bloody disintegration of the New Left in the early 1970s, which included the murder of opponents and compatriots. As an analyst of colonial domination,

however, Fanon's impact spread beyond activism for Resident Korean rights. Fanon's reflections on the topography of the colonial city in *Les damnés de la terre* informed critical work on American-occupied Okinawa, whose residents remain crowded onto land between US military bases even after the islands' 'return' to Japan in 1972 (Tanikawa 1970). Activists campaigning for the liberation of the so-called *burakumin* minority used *Peau noire, masques blancs* to dissect the psychological structure of discrimination (Seki 1970).[5] The academicisation of Fanon also began, but even in academic work, reflections on Japanese colonialism continued to inform some writing about him (Nakamura 1972). Fanon's impact on political practice in the 1970s is overshadowed by the attention he received beginning in the 1990s through the introduction of postcolonial theory, which is a touchstone for activism for the rights of Resident Koreans and other minorities and against the view that Japan's responsibility for colonialism has been settled (e.g. Yun and Kang 1992; Ukai 1999). In a longer historical perspective we can follow a genealogy from Japanese intellectuals' reactions to the Algerian War, through the battles over Fanon in the 1960s, to political practice today.

Japan's history as both object and subject of imperialism meant that Fanon's work could not simply be transposed into critical political practice there. His work's very heterogeneity, however, allowed the group behind *Intelligence on the World Revolutionary Movement* and Suzuki to seize on different aspects of it in the service of political goals – in shorthand, revolution and redress – that each responded to Japan's past and present. The competing readings of his work in Japan can inform assessments of Fanon on the hundredth anniversary of his birth for precisely this reason. Following Fanon's metaphor in *Les damnés de la terre*, that the people must make the bridge from anticolonial struggle to reconstruction their own, so too political practice is faced with spanning the gap – historical, geopolitical, geoeconomic – between Fanon's era and the present, when capitalism and racism collude in a transnational regime of poverty wages and catastrophic resource extraction. The bridges may be many and the destinations multiple.

Notes

1. On Hotta, see Hill 2024.
2. *Jōhō* in the journal's title also could be translated as 'information'; I thank David Rolston and William Baxter for making the case for 'intelligence'. The journal was one of the many *mini-komi* – 'mini' as opposed to 'mass' communication – published by New Left groups (Ando 2014).
3. *Minzoku* can also be translated as 'nation' or most accurately as *Volk*. *Minzoku sekinin* had been used before 1945 with a sense of mission as opposed to moral obligation.
4. Most clearly in the piece he wrote with Hotta; Suzuki wrote the final, most dense section (Hotta and Suzuki 1964).
5. The label refers to people who have historically experienced discrimination for participation in occupations considered unclean in Buddhism.

 https://roape.net doi: 10.62191/ROAPE-2025-0031

Acknowledgements

I thank Sabu Kohso for inspiration, Shatrunjay Mall and Dongkyu Yeom for research assistance, the journal's reviewers for their critique, and members of the Asian Languages and Cultures Colloquium at the University of Michigan for their comments.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Note on contributor

Christopher L. Hill is Professor of Modern Japanese Studies and Comparative Literature at the University of Michigan. He is the author of *National History and the World of Nations: Capital, State, and the Rhetoric of History and Figures of the World: The Naturalist Novel and Transnational Form*, and is completing *Facing South: Japanese Writers in the Bandung Moment*, about Japanese writers' work for the decolonisation of Asia and Africa.
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4680-6811

References

Author's note: Japanese and Korean names are in the customary order of family name followed by personal name (or, here, initial). I have left the titles of Fanon's works in French to avoid confusion with the English translations.

Alleg, H. 1958. *Jinmon*. Translated by Hasegawa Shirō. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō.
Ando, T. 2014. *Japan's New Left Movements: Legacies for Civil Society*. London: Routledge.
Aoe S. 1967. "Henshū kōki." *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 1: 72.
"Arujeria no kiseki – hōnichi ni gakusei kaihō no tatakai o kataru." 1957. *Akahata*, June 4: 3.
Avenell, S. 2022. *Asia and Postwar Japan: Deimperialisation, Civic Activism, and National Identity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center.
Cabral, A. 1969. "Ginia-Kapo Verde – gerira sen kara jinmin sensō e." *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 22: 58–70.
Conrad, S. 2014. "The Dialectics of Remembrance: Memories of Empire in Cold War Japan." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 56 (1): 4–33.
Dower, J. 1999. *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*. New York: Norton.
Ebisaka T. 2006. *Furantsu Fanon*. Rev. ed. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō.
Fanon, F. 1967. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by C. Farrington. London: Penguin.
Fanon, F. 1968a. "Bōryokuron (jō)." *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 10: 58–72.
Fanon, F. 1968b. "Bōryokuron (chū)." *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 11: 56–70.
Fanon, F. 1968c. "Bōryokuron (ge)." *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 12: 46–62.
Fanon, F. 1968d. "Bōryoku ni tsuite (1)." Translated by Suzuki M. *Misuzu* 10 (5): 31–53.
Fanon, F. 1968e. "Bōryoku ni tsuite (2)." Translated by Suzuki M. and Urano K. *Misuzu* 10 (6): 46–72.

Fanon, F. 1968f. “Bōryoku.” Translated by Suzuki M. In *Minzoku no dokuritsu*, edited by Y. Hotta, 46–104. Tokyo: Heibonsha.
Fanon, F. 1968g. *Furantsu Fanon shū*. Translated by Ebisaka T. et al. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō.
Fanon, F. 1968h. “Kokujin bunka ron (jō) – jinshu shugi ni kō shite.” Translated by Ōta M. *Eiga hyōron* 25 (7): 37–42.
Fanon, F. 1968i. “Kokujin bunka ron (ge).” Translated by Ōta M. *Eiga hyōron* 25 (10): 73–77.
Fanon, F. 1968j. “Rumumba no shi – Afurika kakumei ni mukatte dai-go shō.” *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 13: 71–75.
Fanon, F. 1969. “Waga Afurika wa tōjo suru – Afurika kakumei ni mukatte yori.” *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 17: 4–12.
Fanon, F. 1969–70. *Furantsu Fanon chosaku shū*. Translated by Suzuki M. et al., 4 vols. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō.
Fanon, F. 2002. *Les damnées de la terre*. Paris: La Découverte.
“FLN, Tōkyō ni kyokutō daihyōbu.” 1958. *Asahi Shinbun*, July 13, evening ed.: 1.
Gibson, N. 2007. “Relative Opacity: A New Translation of Fanon’s Wretched of the Earth – Mission Betrayed or Fulfilled?” *Social Identities* 13 (1): 69–95.
Gluck, C. 1993. “The Past in the Present.” In *Postwar Japan as History*, edited by A. Gordon, 64–95. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Guevara, E. 1967. “Vetonamu to jiyū no tame no sekai no tōsō.” *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 3: 61–73.
Henshūbu. 1967. “Shōkai: Furantsu Fanon, Les damnés de la terre (Chijō no, norowareta mono-tachi).” *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 3: 27.
Henshūbu. 1968a. “Henshūbu kaisetsu.” *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 12: 46.
Henshūbu. 1968b. “Tokushū ‘Afurika kakumei’ no tame ni.” *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 13: 2–3.
Hill, C. 2024. “Tokyo in Tashkent: The Afro-Asian Writers Association and Japanese Cold War Dissent.” *Past & Present* 265 (1): 202–234.
Hotta Y. 1963. “Furansu fuzai.” *Bungei* 2 (6): 174–179.
Hotta Y. 1968. “Dai-san sekai no eikō to hisan ni tsuite.” In *Minzoku no dokuritsu*, edited by Hotta Y., 5–43. Tokyo: Heibonsha.
Hotta Y. and Suzuki M. 1964. “Ajia, Afurika ni okeru bunka no mondai.” In *Gendai no geijutsu*, edited by Hotta Y., 291–322. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
‘K’. 1967. “Yōroppa sayoku no honshitsu tsuku – Furantsu Fanon Chijō no norowaretaru mono – Shokuminchi kaihō undō no koten.” *Tosho shinbun*, October 14: 3.
‘K’. 1968. “Furantsu Fanon cho Kuroi hifu, shiroi kamen – Yuiitsu no kaiketsu-tōsō – Tai hakujin rettōkan o tabae naosu.” *Tosho shinbun*, July 13: 6.
Kapur, N. 2022. “The Japanese Student Movement in the Cold War Crucible, 1945–1972.” *Japan Focus* 20 (14): 1–25.
Kohso, S. 2024. “Life of Militancy: Japan’s Long’ 68.” Ill Will, January 11. Accessed November 9, 2025. https://illwill.com/life-of-militancy.
Lie, J. 2008. *Zainichi (Koreans in Japan): Diasporic Nationalism and Postcolonial Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Marotti, W. 2009. “Japan 1968: The Performance of Violence and the Theater of Protest.” *American Historical Review* 114 (1): 97–135.
Matsuda M. 1968. “Henshūbu kaisetsu.” *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 10: 58–59.
Matsuda M., Hirasawa G. and Yabu S. 2007. “Shitō suru kakumei (dai-4 kai); 1960 nendai kara 70 nendai e.” *Gendai no riron* 7 (11): 213–222.
Mondlane, E. 1969. “Mozanbiiku kaihō sensen wa teikoku shugi ni haisen suru.” *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 22: 44–57.
Muller, J. 1958. *Taiyō no kage – Arujeria shussei heishi no shuki*. Translated by Suzuki M., Ninomiya T. and Kobayashi Y. Tokyo: Aoki Shoten.
Mushakōji K. 1958. “Saikin Furansu no shōjiken ni yosete.” *Shisō* 409: 1095–1102.
Nakamura T. 1972. “Fanon no seiji shisō (1) – Negurituudo to shokuminchi shinjō.” *Hōgaku shirin* 70 (1): 1–24.
Neto, A. 1969. “Angora ni okeru kakumei no naka no ningen.” *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 22: 44–57.
Nkrumah, K. 1968. “Yōkai burakku pawaa.” *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 8: 2–7.
Ōta M. 1968. “Yakusha maegaki.” *Eiga hyōron* 25 (7): 38–39.

 https://roape.net doi: 10.62191/ROAPE-2025-0031

Ōta M. 1969. “Henshū kōki.” *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 17: 72.
Ōta M. 2003. “Sekai kakumei undō jōhō.” In *Dai tenkan-ki – ‘rokujū-nendai’ no kōbō*, edited by Y. Kurihara, 312–316. Tokyo: Inpakuto Shuppankai.
Ōta R. 1968a. “Jinmin no naiteki kyōjinsa – Furantsu Fanon cho Horobiyuku shokuminchi shugi – Amerika kokujin seinen o misuru.” *Tosho shinbun*, January 20: 7.
Ōta R. 1968b. “Seijiteki yuigon o kizamu – Fanon cho ‘Afurika kakumei ni mukatte’.” *Tosho shinbun*, March 23: 7.
Peattie, M. 1989. “The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895–1945.” In *The Cambridge History of Japan*, edited by P. Duus, vol. 6, 217–270. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Saaler, S. 2007. “Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History: Overcoming the Nation, Creating a Region, Forging an Empire.” In *Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History: Colonialism, Regionalism and Borders*, edited by S. Saaler and J.V. Koschmann, 1–18. New York: Routledge.
Sartre, J.-P. 1962. “Fukushū sareta Yōroppa.” Translated by Suzuki M. and Ebisaka T. *Chūo kōron* 77 (7): 147–163.
Seki H. 1970. “Hikisakareta ai no hanashi – sabetsu, hisabetsu no kokoroteki kōzō (2).” *Buraku kaihō* 9: 151–165.
Shatz, A. 2024. *The Rebel’s Clinic: The Revolutionary Lives of Frantz Fanon*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
Shin J.-Y. 2020. “Dong-asia yeondaewa mujangtujaeng – dakyu ‘dong-asia ban-il mujangjeonseon’ e natanan pihae-gahae gwangyewahan-ilgan peulancheu panong-ui poglyeoglon suyong-eul jungsim-eulo.” *Seogdang nonchong* 77: 143–196.
Suzuki M. 1958. “Kaisetsu.” In *Taiyō no kage – Arujeria shussei heishi no shuki*, by J. Muller and Comité de résistance spirituelle, 222–241. Tokyo: Aoki Shoten.
Suzuki M. 1961. “Arujeria wa tōkunai.” *Tōkyō joshi daigakusei shinbun*, November 30: 2.
Suzuki M. 1962a. “Hishokuminsha no shisō – bunken kara mita Arujeria sensō.” *BOOKS* 145: 11–14.
Suzuki M. 1962b. “Fufukushū no kenri no kiroku.” *Nihon dokusho shinbun*, November 12: 1, 6.
Suzuki M. 1963. “Minzoku no sekinin ni tsuite.” *Ajia Afurika tsūshin* 12: 1–5, 11.
Suzuki M. 1965. “Minzoku no sekinin.” *Hitotsubashi shinbun*, December 15.
Suzuki M. 1968a. “Kuroi chishikijin to bōryoku – Furantsu Fanon ni tsuite.” *Tenbō* 111: 37–53.
Suzuki M. 1968b. “Hashi o wagamono ni suru shisō.” In *Furantsu Fanon shū*, 377–397. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō.
Suzuki M. and Ebisaka T. 1962. “Kaisetsu.” *Chūo kōron* 77 (7): 146–149.
Takeuchi M. 1960. “Shimeikan to kutsujokukan.” In *Sensō sekinin*, edited by Gendai no hakken henshū iinkai, Gendai no hakken, vol. 3, 131–193. Tokyo: Shunjusha.
Tanikawa K. 1970. *Okinawa – henkyō no jikan to kūkan*. Tokyo: Sanjūichi Shobō.
Tambo, O. 1968. “Oribaa Tambo no messeeji.” *Sekai kakumei undō jōhō* 11: 45–50.
Udo, S. 2016. “Présence maghrébine au Japon: Contextes historiques de traduction et d’interprétation.” *Expressions maghrébines* 15 (1): 187–197.
Ukai S. 1999. “Koroniarizumu to modaniti.” In *Tenkanki no bungaku*, edited by K. Mishima and Y. Kinoshita, 206–226. Kyoto: Mineruva Shobō.
Yun K. and Kang S. 1992. “Nashonarizumu no ryōgisei.” *Impakushon* 75: 36–61.