

# Section 1 Economic Justice of Socialism

## Chapter 3

Socialism that advocates the public owning of lands and productive system on the pretext of justice and rights must have interests conformed the purpose of existing and evolution of society. So, economic justice of socialism entitled in this section should be interpreted as the same meaning of economic happiness by realization of socialism. One being contrary to justice cannot be said interests and one not bringing interests cannot be said justice. To do public management for interests of society and to make economic happiness of the whole society increase, socialism advocates the public owning of lands and productive system on the pretext of justice. The period of economic civil wars has changed the period of economic feudalism and economic feudalism shall change the period of economic nation-state. It is an evidence of these phenomena that labor system similar to forces is being estimated to appear.

Of course, it is a fact that present system of productions also has labor system similar to the certain degree of troops. Like individuals don't engage in entirely isolated producing like in the beginning of Industrial Revolution, labor system has gotten to accord with a collective order of machines because they are ones which should be operated in the way of working collectively. But in two critical points, today's forces of nation-state are different from them of aristocratic countries in the period of civil wars. –First, samurais (warriors) in the period of aristocratic countries had engaged in battles contracting their master with the relation between master and servant but today's forces of nation-state engage in battles as a system that are enlisted because of duty to the whole people or volunteering. Second, in the period of civil wars, battles had been done for only interests which would have belonged to monarchs and warriors and people of them had been mere tools to achieve their purpose but today's battles in the period of nation-state have been done for purpose and interests of states. In the present period of economic civil wars that people fight ordered by present economic nobles, the relationship between capitalists and their subjects is organized with contracts based on wages or annual salaries entirely like once the period of feudalism. And they force their subjects to obey like slaves with morals and to fight wars for only increasing wealth of economic nobles. Like the ex-nobles had had rights to drive out their subjects obeying them selfishly and to butcher them freely, today's nobles have had rights to discharge

their scholars or clerks who have not have loyalty long freely and to drive fifty or sixty thousands workers into death by starvation for their interests. Like the ex-nobles had had moral rights to expand their territories and to get powers towered other nobles although thousands had died, today's economic nobles have not taken responsibility for cutting a few thousands workers' arms and legs with swords of machines because of their greed and accumulations, or letting workers enter mines which doesn't have enough equipments and to kill them. Like at the period of civil wars, many feudal lords had held their own spheres of influence and devastated other territories and lives of people as result of fighting with each other, today's economic lords have been holding their own spheres of influence in the world of various industry and devastating other product activities and lives of workers as a result of confused economic fighting with each other. We must cease to compare socialistic labor like forces with today's forces in nation-state. Because there are two critical differences between labors and forces fundamentally. –First, today's forces in nation-state are enlisted and trained to drive out interests and rights of foreign countries, at least to compete with them but socialistic labors like forces engage in producing to do mutual aids with the whole world. Second, labors and forces are different in this point; today's forces in nation-state are organized by the classes of commanders who have absolute despotic powers and general soldiers who obey their orders absolutely like slaves and there is a great difference between their rewards like ones of masters and subjects. But in socialistic labors like forces, liberty and independence of everyone is secured fully. And in those labors, compulsory and commanding system is driven out perfectly and working is done by moral activities based on public duties and other many encouraged motives. Material rewards, however different importance of duties are, are the equal amount of money. In short, it can be said that in the socialistic labor system like forces, people, from young people gathered by the procedure of enlisting to manhood, organize great systematic combination and engage in producing based on select of occupation, freedom, and independence according to their nature.

This is a large-scale revolution in economic history. But when you see the political history that from the period ruled by Kokushis<sup>1</sup>(local governors) or lord clans, times entered the period of civil wars and after that through the period of feudalism times entered the period of today's nation-state which have national force system, you shall realize this; there is no reason why only the stream of economic history that had experienced rise and fall of economic lords in the period of economic civil wars and

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Kokushi' was a local governor who governed each area in Japan in the Heian period (794-1192). Central nobles were appointed to Kokushi.

entered economic feudalism that organized trusts can escape from revolution and don't have national forces of labors. But, like some people had regarded feudalism as the final stage of social system of human beings and hadn't hope for today's nation-state because of the meanest weak point of human beings being resigned with the status quo, frightened by this economic feudalism, those who are going with and drowning that stream bombard with very shameless blames at this 'labor system like forces' of socialists' ideals. They say this: are people lazy in their labors without encouraging egoism? Do people dislike physical labors? Is freedom of occupation secured in the socialistic structure? How is freedom of independence of everyone secured? Does socialism make the period of bureaucratic despotism realize? Is equal division to natural unequal human beings an unfair? Does socialism bring a decline of productions and lead the whole society to remarkable poverty? Criticisms are no end.

We shall reveal that socialism is advocated to achieve these all noble requests. If socialism is lack even one of these noble ones, its final end of social evolution would remain a fancy and its end would be only a damaged diamond. However, we sincerely request to critics for this: Be calm your hearts and present your innumerable criticisms against propositions of socialism to modern society before criticizing ones of socialism—Does modern society let motivation of encouraging people's egoism sprain and the whole society be lazy? —Does modern society let people dislike physical labors? —Is freedom of occupation secured in modern society? Is independence of individuals secured in modern society on earth? —Is modern society in the horrible period of bureaucratic despotism? —Does modern society do a fair division according to natural unequal? —Does modern society bring decline of productions by economic wars or strict collecting taxes and lead the whole society to remarkably poverty?

Perhaps they shall deny these questions. If so, there is a first consideration—is the theory of evolution fault and does human history remain the stage of economic aristocracy until the earth become extinct?

To explain the details of socialism and to answer to above innumerable criticisms, we refer to representative scholars. They are scholars of Rostrum Socialism<sup>2</sup> or National Socialism. We need to disclose the truth of Rostrum Socialism or National Socialism and to protect socialism from their deceptions. The real socialism should not be disgraced by these deceptions absolutely. Their standpoints are called 'Rostrum Socialism' or 'National Socialism' because they advocate their ideas at rostrums of universities or

---

<sup>2</sup> This can be said 'social reformism'.

adopted by government but these have no tendency of socialism. Nation is equal to government. Of course, holiness of rostrum should not be disgraced by injustice of the class of capitalists. But because any government practices what are convenient actions for the class of powers on the pretext of the nation and the class of capitalists uses the intelligentsias actually, rostrums of universities which should be holy and nations which are ethical system now are robbed by deceptive people who slander the truth and ignore the rights of nations. No! They are never socialists. But they know that present economic aristocratic countries should be maintained by solemn individualism, they only disobey international laws that they abuse the flag of socialism to abscond when they retreat. In our Japan, because socialism still remains the childish stage and the whole society sleeps very long time, it is time for capitalists to wield absolute powers. So, we don't say that those who are called 'Rostrum Socialism' or 'National Socialism' disobey international laws because of forcing to make a concession by powers of socialism<sup>3</sup>. However, for general professors of universities who only translate and report foreign scholar's opinions like translators, moderate or eclectic ones fit their poor brains. Also, they would think that advocating Rostrum Socialism or National Socialism brings them profits in the point of escaping aversions against socialism. On the other hand, because they abuse the flag of socialism and give the impression as if they were impartial and strict, they let socialists who don't realize the truth clearly waver in the suspicions and impression as if they were advocators of natural socialism. Especially, it is an object that keeps a strict watch because it promotes people in general to entrap socialism. Rostrum Socialism is not what is preached on the holy rostrums of universities but on the dirty ones to advocate capitalists. It can be named 'a capitalistic socialism'. National Socialism does not really advocate the rights belonging to a nation but the rights of the class of powers. It can be named 'a government socialism' which intends to make its bureaucrats maintain its power. Real Socialism never goes to the same ways foxes and the like go.

In the Section 4, *The so-called principle of restorative-revolutionaries*, and in the Section 5, *The enlightening movement of socialism*, we shall explain that National Socialism doesn't understand legal principles and nature of states. But in this section, we shall argue about economic justice of socialism, referring to representative scholars who advocate National Socialism without understanding economic happiness of socialism at all. We shall refer to two legal doctors—Dr. Kanai Noburu<sup>4</sup> of Tokyo

---

<sup>3</sup> It seems that Rostrum Socialism and the like are not cheap tricks of compromises by capitalism. Because in the then Japan, socialism were weak and couldn't afford to press capitalists for compromises.

<sup>4</sup> Kanai Noburu was a legal doctor, economist, and a scholar of social policy in nineteenth century. In Tokyo

Imperial University and Dr. Tajima Kinji <sup>5</sup> of Kyoto Imperial University—as representative scholars of National Socialism. We can almost understand their advocating through their works—the former, *Social Economics*, and the latter, *The Latest Theory of Economy*. However, we must pay attention to this; *The Latest Theory of Economy* has not a few sympathies to socialism but *Social Economics* is filled with quite a few hostile feeling to socialism. Of course, in the former volume, it has rude phrases such as, ‘Socialists Party established to interpret social problems originally but now existence of Socialists Party itself gets to be a social problem’, but they are less than those of *Social Economics*. In the introduction of *Social Economics*, Dr. Kanai argues about effects of economics as follows: It has an effect to correct extreme fault theories that stimulate ill wills and have fears of disturbing the public peace. It is a memorable thing that Social Democratic Party and followers in Germany and the like have done hateful actions using—no, abusing aspects that people in general are not well known this study. We can only correct this false studying economics accurately. And this whole volume is filled with feelings of fears and abhorrence against socialism. So, *The Latest Theory of Economy* is no match for *Social Economics*. But since Dr. Tajima takes a sympathetic and moderate attitude to socialism in his *The Latest theory of Economy*, the readers of this volume should react to his misunderstandings. In a point of influence to people in general, *The Latest theory of Economy* is not inferior to *Social Economics* which performs stimulating hatred to socialism as its duty. And since both volumes are stately and voluminous works which go through fifteen or sixteen editions, we must know that these volumes teach concepts of economics, misunderstandings and hatred against socialism and plant preoccupation to socialism at the same time to fifty or sixty thousands of public and private university students of the law and economics department. We believe tightly. When Socialists Party shall come to power by practical movements, it might follow National Socialism but now when pure economics of capitalists cannot be maintained, being left ones in the academic world as enemies of the truth and the only stronghold of economic aristocracy are those who disobey international laws abusing the flag of socialism.

First, we can know from a following sentence how Dr. Kanai’s *Social Economics* cannot understand even a basis of socialism. Dr. Kanai says this:

---

University, he made an effort to establish the Economics Department. He introduced the economic theories of German Neo Historic School in Japan and advocated the protection of workers by states.

<sup>5</sup> Tajima Kinji was a legal doctor and a economist in nineteenth century.

Debaters of socialism sometimes explain, 'Capitals originate from labors naturally, so all profits produced by labors should be rewards for workers'. But this is a very fault argument. Like these debaters, in a primitive society, it can be said that capitals originate from labors perfectly. From this point, can we conclude that labors are origins of capitals? No, so-called capitals in a primitive society had been consumed immediately the moment ones had been produced, so they were not capitals in the true sense of the word. As human beings have evaluated from that stage, those which are called capitals today, have gotten to be produced. This is an outline of the order that capitals increase. If so, it can be said that when capitals increase, supporting increase of capitals are not only labors but capitals themselves. If capitals didn't exist at all, labors would only be isolated and be useless to producing activities. After all, labors can be only useful when they combine capitals and capitals can only do active productions when they combine labors. There is an inseparable relationship between labors and capitals like two wheels of cars. In addition, like cars need for motive powers and roads to run, productions need for nature. If it can be said that capitals are produced from labors and all profits produced from productive activities can be divided to labors, it can be said that capitals enable to divide all profits to labors base on the same grounds and all profits must be distributed to capitalists. But since capitals are only useful combined with labors and at the same time labors are only useful combined with capitals, after all, it is sufficient for capitalists and workers to gain appropriate rewards.

Even in the primitive society, the origin of capitals is not only based on labors. It is true that labors are fathers to capitals but unless the mother, nature exists, capitals can never be produced. Hence, it is reasonable that lands' owners who supply natural materials must be divided enough rewards. Nevertheless distributing in modern economic society is not impartial, debaters of socialism intend to distribute all profits more impartially. In addition, capitals in today's society help labors and many of these acts as capitals in productions. Also, in modern society, capitals themselves produce new ones. Hence, it goes without saying that capitalists should be divided enough rewards. We should know from the above that arguments of socialists are fault.

These misunderstandings are not only seen to Dr. Kanai. Other arguments of harmonizing capitalists and workers such as arguments of Rostrum Socialism from the sociological points of view by the literary doctor, Takebe Tongo<sup>6</sup> are the same ones. However, these arguments don't understand the theory of socialism at all and we have

---

<sup>6</sup> Takebe Tongo was a doctor of literature and a sociologist in Japan. He was a teacher at Tokyo Imperial University and was a pioneer of sociology in Japan.

no choice but to say that they are ignorant to socialism, although theories of socialism are difficult to study because they are esoteric. Since Dr. Kanai have concerned in labor problems, people in general regard him as a socialists and he often defends himself being afraid of fear. But it is strong evidence to his defense that one who misunderstands socialism fundamentally is never a socialist. Though we feel discomfort to his understanding of socialism, we don't dare to reply his arguments with the form of 'a tooth for a tooth'. But if they want to criticize other arguments such as socialism, at least they must have an ability of understanding the words they use. –Though this claim is a really impolite one, it is an indispensable one for legal doctors of Imperial Universities.

When Dr. Kanai understands advocating of socialism, he criticizes, 'Debaters of socialism sometimes explain, 'Capitals originate from labors naturally, so all profits produced by labors should be rewards for workers'. But socialism has never advocated this claim. It is not advocating of socialism that current individuals who are working or the class of workers can monopolize all products produced from capitals which are accumulations of physical and spiritual labors of ancestors. Socialism denies plundering by capitalists all products produced from capitals which are accumulations of labors of ancestors, but on the other hand, it denies this advocating that monopolizing profits produced from past workings is the right of the working class as a result of current workings. Socialism intends to dispel the class in a society. You must know that it is fundamentally different from views of those who advocate harmony with the class of capitalists and workers, letting both classes antagonize. Arguments of harmony with capitalists and workers are based on recognizing that current class of capitalists and workers never disappear forever and disputes which class are permitted to plunder more social materials produced historically. Socialism intend to exterminate these two classes and advocates ownership of 'society' to products produced by intelligence which had been accumulated historically and social labors. So, if the class of being plundered and of monopolizing were exterminated as a result that socialism turned into reality, no class dares to plunder or monopolize social products on the pretext of harmony of capitalists and workers. Survivors of capitalists, children of landlords, helpless women, infants, handicapped people who cannot work, and the sick<sup>7</sup> can naturally claim society which owns every product to distribute profits, too. In this sense, as we previously stated, machines are lodged spirits of ancestors and work to receive loves of descendants. If so, it is fault that only the class of capitalists receive prejudiced loves of ancestors as

---

<sup>7</sup> This means the people who are affected incurable diseases.

they wish like today and only healthy people who can work monopolize profits by labors which include fruits of ancestors' labors and drive out unhappy and lovely children of ancestors who are worse physically and spiritually. Products in the period of social working should not be measured the distributing standard in the period of individual working. No! If one which are advocated for profits to distribute capitalists is called *capitalistism*, so-called socialism which Dr. Kanai and general debaters who advocate harmony of capitalists and workers understand, would be called *laborerism* because they understand that it only sets profits of the class of workers the final goal. Of course, socialism put itself the class of workers for the present relief and commanding the movements but you should not regard it as maintaining the class of workers. It only intends to realize classless and equal society. Since socialism regards the belonging subject of profits as a society, it has the name of 'social-ism'. One which maintains the current class opposition and position of the plundering class is never socialism.

Since Dr. Kanai is lacking in an ability of interpreting the letters, he interprets socialism which makes efforts to exterminate the classes as one intends to maintain the class of workers and make the position of the plundering class give to he working class. In addition, he is fully confused capitals and capitalists. He says: in modern society, capitals themselves produce new ones. Hence, it goes without saying that capitalists should be divided enough rewards. Because of these confusions in the most critical points, his *Social Economics* of one thousand pages comes to be useless one. Dr. Kanai, try reflecting on you. Am I, Kanai an economists or economics? If a Kanai Noburu is an economics, it would be that an economics talks, walks, makes a deep bow and cries, 'Long live the Emperor!' But it is unthinkable for economics to do act. If he doesn't be confused economists and economics, why does he shift from arguments of effects of capitals into arguments of plundering by capitalists and give them the rights of plundering? Socialism advocates capitalists useless but has never advocated capitals useless. It advocates landlords useless but has not advocated the nature useless. It advocates emancipation of workers but has not advocated living without doing any work. It is a contradictory and unthinkable argument that socialism has a hard time for public owning of useless capitals, advocating capitals useless. It is never socialism. Before landlords exists, the nature has exists. Even if landlords become extinct, the nature keeps on existing as the resources of productions. Socialism never claims to leave the earth and settle other planets.

After all, the reason why he does unintelligent arguments like these is his ignorance to socialism. Since socialism has discovered the traces of plundering by capitalists in the



historical study of economics and economic aristocratic countries plundering present society, it becomes revolutionary. ‘Capitals are the accumulations of plundering’. This word is the castle of socialism under the flag of revolution. If you want to return a blow to socialism, you must make this word the mark. But see his arguments about explanation of capitals. He says: so-called capitals in a primitive society had been consumed immediately the moment ones had been produced, so they were not capitals in the true sense of the word. As human beings have evaluated from that stage, those which are called capitals today, have gotten to be produced. This is an outline of the order that capitals increase. But it is too *summary* for his book of one thousand pages. And we cannot help being surprised that he calmly constructs his theory of the rights by enumerating innumerable contradictory theories of the rights from ancient times though socialism has a strict theory of the rights. ‘Ownership of a private citizen originates in the characters of human beings who puts their seals to properties—especially freights— of the outside world by their occupations and labors and are completely equipped with being consented in the form of law system by social nations’. Like this, theories of occupancy and of labor are mixed in his flat brain without opposing each other and it’s too *excellent* harmony between those theories (See the Section 5, *The enlightening movement of socialism*, about the relationship between capitals and labors).

By the way, in the back of *The Latest theory of Economy*, Dr. Tajima comments the summary of the theory of Karl Marx. Considering this point, it goes without saying that he doesn’t make a mistake like Dr. Kanai such as he understand socialism as a *laborerism* or is confused capitals with capitalists and lands with landlords. However, since he is also a National Socialist, he cannot avoid many of shallow thoughts by National Socialism. He drives out socialism from arguments of human characters and says:

Radical socialists hope this; socialism make egoism which is one of a motive power of commerce transform moral minds and let people engage in labors with their full strength in states which they create—that is, social states—and intends to distribute the rewards impartially according to their labors. But this theory hasn’t revealed the whole nature of human beings yet. Therefore, it goes without saying that it is extreme difficult to practice.

In *Social Economics*, Dr. Kanai also says this:

It is contradictory with progress of civilization until now to make lands and capitals which are necessities of productions share by society and distribute products according to only each labor. If we drove out egoism and only depended on public spirits, economic progress would stop entirely. And like progress of general society, a suspension in economy shall mean regression. So, society organized communism system shall soon fall the situation which cannot be helped or become despotic society unprecedented in human history.

Not only *The Latest theory of Economy and Social Economics*, we can find refutations to arguments of human nature which are mistakes of old school of economics in the opening pages of innumerable books of new school of economics. Of course, supposing human beings as 'homo economicus (those who pursues nothing but money)' like old school of economics had been broken down by socialists and literary men of intuitionism (such as Carlyle) without waiting for noble refutations now. If we suppose human beings as 'homo economicus', it goes without saying that we cannot explain human's prosperous activities to literature, history, arts, and sciences and also interpret economic phenomena which are targets of economics itself. If human beings are self-centered animals which pursue nothing but money, we cannot explain economic phenomena of transferring of money by charity, contribution, honor, love, seizing power, and other political actions and exchanges sufficiently. We praise that new school of economics sloughs off this prejudice, recognizes that human beings have other public spirit—that is, sociability—instinctively and studies economic activities based on public spirits. —But since they still go on inference, concluding that human self-centered can be explained by only money, there is little different between new school of economics and old school of one in the respect of not understanding human nature.

No, new school of economics is not far superior to old school of one because it doesn't understand economic activities based on public spirits sufficiently. Socialism expects to engage in productive activities based on prosperous public spirits. If you know that Japanese conscripted forces by conscription system have far more public spirits than Chinese mercenary soldiers, you can imagine that socialistic workers like conscripted forces shall engage in economic activities and produce excellent results in productive activities based on far more public spirits than today's workers. This shall be proved by the fact that in the Sino-Japanese War, Japanese forces were far more prosperous than

Chinese forces<sup>8</sup>. Because human beings don't intend to die by a private citizen's order, it is natural that today's workers like mercenary don't devote all their energies to work for profits of greedy capitalists. Nevertheless innumerable supervisors exist around workers like mercenaries, they watch for a chance to be lazy as if Chinese mercenaries ran away in all directions; nevertheless commanders were standing their back having sabers. Dr. Kanai and the like who jump to a conclusion that socialistic labor parties need to be supervised by innumerable bureaucrats and socialism shall practice unprecedented and horrible despotism in human history have only a shallow view that when military service by feudal lords was abolished and adopted conscription in the Meiji Restoration, people were anxious that conscripted forces were inferior to samurais' forces until they participated in the actual fighting in Southwestern War<sup>9</sup>. When our public spirits go forward driving out every other one, why do we need for any supervision? It is never rare for even in despotic forces that soldiers had kept on doing combats nevertheless all commanders of battalions had died of battles. Even in the situation of death which human beings intend to avoid most as animals which want to live, motivation of public spirits overcomes all other motivations. If so, it is unthinkable that human self-centered restraint public spirits when those who engage in working slight physical activities for four or five hours per day which they are aware that these workings are ones for peace, pleasures and society. Their thoughts who think public spirits as such weak ones are inferior to even baby's thoughts (at this point, we use the words of 'self-centered' and 'public spirits' as they use for a short while. Further, see the Section 3, *The theory of biological evolution and social philosophy*). –After all, living things request labors for four or five hours per day physiologically. An organism needs for organic activities. Like scholars cannot only indulge in reading books all day long without walking, students cannot endure studying English or mathematics without doing gymnastics or enjoying long-sustained games. Like babies always move their hands and feet in the cradles like automatic machines, human beings need for painless and tireless labors physiologically although they engage in spiritual works. Because of this, those who are taken in prisons by imprisonments today cannot endure not being any work, so they apply to engage in working for themselves. (So, Bellamy comically

---

<sup>8</sup> Japan had fought with China (the Qing dynasty) over the Korea in 1894-1895 (this is called the Sino-Japanese War). In general, it is said that Chinese forces have low fighting spirits.

<sup>9</sup> The Southwestern War was a rebellion to Meiji government by Saigō Takamori and so on in 1877 (Because they revolted this rebellion in southwest of the Kyushu, this one is called 'The Southwestern War'). Saigō was an influential man of the Meiji government, but he resigned from his post as a civil servant because of internal strife among the staffs of government. This rebellion was the most large-scale one but the power of government force exceeded the one of rebel armies and rebellion was suppressed finally. Therefore, his rebellion was great shocked to the Meiji government

described in his *Looking Backward* the system that lets special sluggards live alone to inflict pain of idle life on them under the situations suppressed this physiological requests). –However, an organism needs for organic activities but, on the other hand, it also needs for organic rests. To explain intelligibly the reason why wage slaves have to be lazy to economists who regard human nature as being lazy without much thoughts since today's them tend to be lazy, we demand them to imagine this: today's economists must live to study economics for twelve or thirteen hours per day without any rest for all the year round, nor having hopes, changes or pleasures—for example, the dull fate of repeating reading such as a Faucet's<sup>10</sup> booklet of economics infinitely to the end of their lives— from seven-year-old to going to graveyards through the period of old age. Still, don't economists cease to study economics and do they keep on having the belief that laziness is the human nature. This assumption can be only asked by those who have little common sense. But if legal doctors of universities being lack of this common sense construct criticisms against socialism, how do you think? Present workers do experience the facts like this absurd assumption. There are labors that only repeat to make steel plates beside machines roaring earsplitting noises from early morning to sunset. There are labors that only feed coal to the fire without rests even in the scorching heat of summer. Workers of every class repeat these unchangeable days and lead dull lives. Neither a worker is a stone not being organisms or the God being above organisms. Like scholars as organisms want to walk as organic activities, workers as organisms want organic rests. Nevertheless, if you regard those rests as laziness, you would regard workers as machines of inorganic substances. Besides, laziness itself has naturally followed with present social system. We don't work motivated by pains. Since future pleasures or spiritual ones overcome pains, we endure immediate pains or material ones. It is plain that those who meaninglessly engage in producing for profits belonging to others under the circumstances without any hope like today's wage slaves intend to be lazy to avoid immediate pains! If they notice that their labors make social happiness increase like in the period of socialism, their motivation of spiritual pleasure would suppress their self-centered although there are not a few pains in many aspects of labors according to the special situation. The truth of the matter is that there is no spiritual pleasure in the present society that physical labors are regarded as contemptible occupations of slaves. (Still, See the Section 2, *Ethical ideal of socialism*).

The word of 'labor' is included the contemptuous meaning. Because working class is occupied by slaves. Slaves are scorned but free people are respected. For example,

---

<sup>10</sup> Probably Faucet was Henry Faucet of British economist.

though performing military duties are regarded as holy from general public, it was badly scorned during it was occupied by slaves. After all, whether occupations are holy or not is decided by the situation of social system of each time. There is no relationship with the characters of occupations. So, we are not satisfied to advocate 'Wars are crimes but labors are holy' like general socialists. As long as we advocate it as an ideal, we may be permitted to advocate it. But labors are never holy today. Physical works are scorned as occupations of slaves, only gold is regarded as holy one. The value of Gold is not different with the individual who has one although it is one gotten by theft, by bribes, by frauds or by prostitutions. An absolute one which has an innate value and doesn't rise or fall value depending on the external circumstances is only holy. For example, monarchs who had had absolute and infinite rights had been holy. It is never holy because today's labors are ranked by relative conditions of sort of labors. The fact that today's labors are respected and scorned by relative conditions of 'physical' or 'spiritual' is an evidence that labors are not absolute or holy. Why physical labors are scorned is the same reason that slaves are scorned. Slaves are scorned but free people are respected. Hence, why spiritual labors are admired by everybody but physical labors are hated is because not whether the works are difficult or not or whether the works are respected or not but people want to be respected free people rather than be submitted slaves. This is a claim of thoughts of rights. –Although labors are holy, even holiness of labors must bow its head before the rights. –Because of this, socialism advocates overthrowing classes. Because spiritual labors are the flowers that plundering class had raise, they are in full bloom back of plundering class but because physical labors are expressed the class of slaves being submitted people, they are scorned. If discrimination of the class of slaves and free people is done away—in other words, all members of the whole society are made to be free people who love others based on equal rights and duties and they get to work based on rights and duties as free people, labors themselves would be holy as absolute ones without being ranked depending on the external circumstances. Nevertheless, why do they criticize socialism which intends to overthrow classes, 'human beings would avoid working' or 'socialism would bring a despotic bureaucracy'? Why labors are not holy is because their National Socialism maintains plunderers of the class of capitalists and slaves of the class of workers. –Rather, National Socialism makes people be lazy and avoid labors. Like the occupation of soldiers became honorable ones from contemptuous ones, make physical labors be classless and holy ones from submissive and hateful ones. Holiness of labors which take the honorable place of soldiers let workers engage in producing based on public spirits like soldiers demonstrate in battle fields.

However, socialism doesn't immediately advocate to 'change a self-centered which is one of motive power of economic activities into a moral spirit' like Dr. Tajima misunderstands. We reserve the word of 'immediately'. Why we advocate that is as follow; today's active self-centered is the instinct organized by the system of private ownership, so there is a enough reason as an ideal of social evolution that moral spirits which adapted communism would be instinct after the three or four generations pass since socialism realized (See the part which argues about becoming the instinct of moral spirits in the Section 3, *The theory of biological evolution and social philosophy*). Anyway, it is an undoubted fact that both a self-centered and a public spirit are pillars of social activities until social evolution shall reach that stage. So, socialism doesn't ignore the motivation of self-centered in the economic activities. But not ignoring the motivation of self-centered doesn't mean admitting self-centered as gaining money. That is why we said that a view of human nature of new schools of economics is little different a view of old schools of one. What they should do is to analyze the element in 'money' breaking away a dead-end of economics. In the first place, money is valued highly because gold of the substance of money is the material having shining and barbarians use gold in this sense. But we don't use gold as money in the sense of a brilliant material or a substitute of other materials. Gold represents the very value of lives. A piece of gold is included every prayer of human beings—peaceful lives, healing diseases, pleasures of families, education of children, rests of old age, dignity of men, holiness of chastity, independence of conscience, political freedom, public activities, knowledge, character power resources of honor and so on. However, if although socialism realizes and the value of life is not estimated by gold, you think gold still plays a roll now, you have only pitiful thinking power. Since society is not the system of power, no power can be bought. If plundering gold get not to be done on the pretext of politics, both gold which is needed to be politicians and politicians who buy eligible voters would disappear. When we do public activities, a private individual needs not make efforts as hard as one can like today and public organs would do with public properties. Properties which are used to present to individuals would disappear and that necessity would disappear, too. And bureaucracy would not have powers which invite bribes and is tempted despotism and slavery. Individuals need not sacrifice their independence of conscience by protections of nations and practice morals instinctively without threats or temptations. Intelligent scholars and eager statesmen would not make a display of themselves that they kneel on the ground before capitalists like pigs which are ignorant and dressed up beautifully and indecent men would not be able to do cruel actions that they buy innocent girls as sexual objects for their animal desires. The expense of

bringing up children would be paid from the public expenses and society would play a central roll of education. If you are taken ill, you can choose public hospitals and doctors. When you are old, you can receive pensions. To realize equal distribution, families would break away from despotism and submission which are produced from economic subordination and be tied up with pure loves of parents and mercy of parents and their children. Disquiet of lives would disappear perfectly. Remove all these elements including in gold today and think of the rests. Is money only a something which is emitting light? And we don't do repeated explanation like other socialists propose that handprints represent paper money, paper money represent gold and gold represent articles. Although a piece of paper which represents an article itself directly is regarded as money, enough satisfaction of life is gained from greatly extended public properties. So, we cannot imagine that the piece of paper has the value of life itself like today's money and gets an object of a scramble. What so-called economists should do is reflecting on them. The reason why we want money is because we want money itself or, because we want the money character of shining, or because we want the pleasure money has, or because we want general pleasures which can be bought by money, or because we want to feel our selves by receiving pleasures, or because we want to assert ourselves by it, or because we want other means to reach higher stage of ourselves? –stinginess and ornament are one of motivations of requiring money. Satisfaction of food and clothing are also one of those motivations. Yet the reason why we require money infinitely after we satisfied our wants is because we have buying powers honor and positions. And the reason why only one mineral has serious buying powers is only because our society has a social system which honor and positions are constructed by money. After socialism overthrew this social system by revolution, self-centered to honor and positions would be required by actions of self-centered to honor itself and positions themselves without mediation by money and would be stimulated motivations of active producing. If economists of new school use their brains a little, as economic competition is over, can they admit that samurais had wanted other honor, scholarship and the material arts as satisfactions of self-centered in spite of existing economic classes and regarded gaining gold as dirty? Socialists believe that socialistic labor system like conscripted forces expects prosperous activities by public spirits greatly and needs for incentive equipments of producing activities by self-centered to honor and positions until society reaches a certain stage.

The reason why socialism advocates equal distribution to everybody is of course to overthrow remarkable economic differentials which are causes of abusing powers, on

the other hand, it intends to defend the developments of individuality from that. If there were several classes of material rewards and people were ranked by those classes, individuals would not want honor and positions gained by the developments of individuality themselves but want occupations which can be gained more material rewards to gain honor and position quickly thus the developments of individuality would be secondary concerns. This gets to let individuality and tendencies of individuals distort and the developments of those prevent and thus present socialism intends to drive out the usual proposition of ranking rewards in proportion to labors. Now that things have come to this, those who criticize socialists shout arguments of inequality.

Dr. Tajima says this in his *The Latest theory of Economy*:

Human beings are primarily unequal. Every situation in society makes human beings more unequal. So, hoping for absolute economic equality is like hoping for being same looks with others or hoping for having same life span with others life span.

Human beings are primarily unequal. Intellectual powers, powers of virtue, or physical strength have a great difference among the people than looks. Hence, when human beings organize society, individuals can never maintain equal relationship with each other and wise men always lead stupid men. A man of virtue always makes a small-minded man obey and a strong man always controls a weak man. Thus, the martial relationship which wives obey their husbands, making much of monarchs and little of the people, discrimination of freemen and slaves, and discrimination of the rich and the poor are formed. Considering these, it is a natural result to generate social inequality.

Dr. Kanai says this in his *Social Economics*:

Socialism intends to abolish private property perfectly and to make people's pleasure and satisfaction of desire absolute equal.

We shall argue about distribution in socialism in following section. But we must reveal that equal division is never same mean with economic absolute equality. Sickly people make economic inequality because they more go to public hospital for treatment than others. Those who have make economic inequality because they more leave social schools to educate their children than others. Travelers, scholars, artists, and musicians make economic inequality because each person more uses railways, libraries, galleries



and concert halls than others. That is, unequal individuals receive economic profits by using public properties unequally as a result of making economic inequality. So if you require proper distribution according to individual inequality, socialism could satisfy your request by extending these properties greatly. –Socialism never forgets individual inequality. Equal distribution only means equality of private property which can be divided. Dr. Kanai and the like who tells a lie that socialism intends to make people's pleasure and satisfaction of desire absolute equal take very despicable manner as scholars. Equal division means distribution of equal buying powers. Economic articles which are bought unequal people using these buying powers unequally are never products of absolute equality. Hence, it goes without saying that socialism doesn't intend to give people absolute equal pleasures or to make satisfaction of desire absolute equal. Although you buy books and wine in the same price, those don't give you the same pleasures as economic articles. Either, books and wine are wanted everybody although those are the same prices. Dr. Kanai seems to think that it will be enough for him to extend fault theory of a certain strict principle.

But it is pity that Mr. Tajima Kinji, who became a legal doctor and a professor of Kyoto Imperial University by a special study of social problems, should calmly deduce every argument from the phrase 'human beings are primarily unequal' like spinning yarn. Of course, socialism admits that individual inequality do exists. But because of this, we are not hidden our consciences to compatriots as human beings on the pretext of individuality and don't hesitate to advocate equalitarianism. Equalitarianism! Of course, socialism is the only word for it and aims at existence and evolution of society as a final goal but because it strongly requires the social system which enables us to compete freely under the security of equality to realize those purposes, it inherits theory of freedom and equality clearly. However, socialists don't advocate theory of freedom and equality for freedom itself or equality itself like individualistic theory of those in the period of Revolution. Also, socialists don't advocate overthrowing inconvenient and unequal society (by individualistic theory of social contracts) as human beings are primarily free and equal. Because if human beings are primarily free and equal, there is no reason to organize inconvenient and unequal society on purpose and it is meaningless to advocate freedom and equality for freedom itself and equality itself, like Ferri<sup>11</sup> says that it is only a political self-satisfaction. But socialistic theory of freedom and equality is not permitted groundless conjectures of 'human beings are primarily unequal' like Dr. Tajima and the like says. Because it is said that primitive societies

---

<sup>11</sup> He was Enrico Ferri, who was a scholar of criminal law in 19th century Italy.

were peace owing to primitive equality which was based on instinctive sociality according to scientific inference to primitive societies. –That is, socialistic theory of equality doesn't regard human beings as primarily equal or unequal existences like controversialists who advocate conjectures what they want. And it requires to drive out class inequality for social existence and evolution and to make people act freely under the security of equality. So, when we advocate equality, we don't reach an unscientific conclusion which biology doesn't permit that though human beings are unequal in the point such as height, physique, power, character, or hobby, we are not different in the point that human beings are different from other animals because we are the same in the point of inferring, talking, or having reason. Also, when we recognize individual inequality, we don't respect the phrase 'A gap between the lowest person and the highest is larger than a gap between the highest animal and the lowest person' like scientific authority and use this argument a foundation of our arguments. Because the abilities such as inferring, talking, or having reason are not only ones which human beings have but other animals have to some degree. It is the principle of biological evolution that we cannot place only us on the heaven which is completely separated from other animals according to that argument. Like that, we cannot classify black dogs into cats, red dogs into foxes, large-sized Western dogs into horses, or small-sized Japanese dogs into sheep according to the classification of biology which classifies similar species into same species. If you don't classify high animals into human beings or low people into high animals, you must not insist that barbarians like high animals are far different from human beings. That is, socialistic theory of freedom and equality doesn't advocate that it is right because human beings are primarily equal or criticized the theory because human beings are primarily unequal. Justice is the wrapped word from outside to show that society suits the conditions of existence and evolution of itself and its content is different according to demands of geography or the times. Anyone seems to know that slavery had been justice in ancient times because it had been suited for its purpose of existence and evolution and the theory of regarding monarchs as all-powerful men and aristocratic despotism had not been criticized in the medieval times. However, contents of justice change continually and never stop. If you know that although ancient slavery or monarchial and aristocratic despotism had been justice, they are not regarded as justice today, why can you ignore historical evolution of justice like Dr. Tajima's coagulated dogma 'human beings are primarily unequal'. We don't regard Dr. Tajima's argument 'when human beings organize society, individuals can never maintain equal relationship with each other and wise men always lead stupid men. A man of virtue always makes a small-minded man obey and a strong man always controls a weak man'

as untrue. But his conclusion 'thus, the martial relationship which wives obey their husbands, making much of monarchs and little of the people, discrimination of freemen and slaves, and discrimination of the rich and the poor are formed. Considering these, it is a natural result to generate social inequality' from above presupposition clearly reveals his ignorance to social evolution. If they think that above presupposition only leads to this conclusion like he concludes, National Socialists must advocate this; human beings are primarily equal. Also, social history never evolves and justice is changeless forever. So, we must amend today's civil law to make families objects of patriarchs' absolute ownership before the Roman law and to make the Japanese Emperor and the nobility patriarchs having the powers of life and death to its territories and people as their owning ones and prisoners of wars and debtors must be put in iron chains and be slaves. Nothing can be done about remarkable disparity in wealth since it is the result from human nature that human beings are primarily unequal or the wise providence of nature. So, arguments about harmony between capitals and labors, protection of workers, or National Socialism itself are an empty theories being incompatible with the theory of inequality.

See the trails of social evolution. Society makes justice evolve according to social evolution. The stream of the river would become deep and wide according to its stream and a large river of history would flow out from the spring of instinctive sociality limited primitive societies into be vigorous flow of development of social consciousness. –This is socialistic view of equality of human beings. Restriction of the patriarchal rights, independence of women, emancipation of slaves, and the big fall of the French Revolution which had overthrown kings and nobles—receiving swells of these big falls, socialism become the large stream of social consciousness to intend to fall vigorously from very high bluff! When the stream of social consciousness falls into the Lake Ontario from Niagara Falls, reaches vigorously the surface of the lake like mirrors, and makes the view of equality of human beings develop on the whole earth—here social evolution which socialists advocate and free activities under the security of equality which individualists had been having ideals would be realized. If we who have 6,000 years history cannot understand above arguments which is about to be a large stream, our civilization are inferior to uncivilized villages in the South Pacific which only have oral folklore and legends such as the ancestors had battled against fierce animals as a history! (No, in the Oriental barbarians' village<sup>12</sup>, the stream ranging 2,500 years<sup>13</sup> being based on the view of equality are hidden by the theory of the Japanese

---

<sup>12</sup> Kita humbly expressed Japan like that.

<sup>13</sup> It is said that Japanese history has begun from 660 B. C (the Christian era) in Japanese myth.

constitution, so a view of equality has not developed a bit yet. She only has ‘*Kojiki*’ and ‘*Nihon Shoki*’<sup>14</sup> which were written based on oral legends like in the South Pacific. See the Section 4, *The so-called principle of restorative-revolutionaries*). –So, we advocate the theory of freedom and equality in this sense; Like once human beings had adopted patriarchal despotism, monarchal one, or slavery to realize the ideal of social evolution, we shall drive out inequality which was justice at one time and advocate equality as justice since consciousness as compatriots gets to be remarkably keen by social evolution and make future society evolve by equal uniting and free activities.

Like plundering rights by wars and private ownership system of lands based on occupation had been regarded justice until society has evolved to some extent, patriarchs, nobles, slaves had enough suited social purpose until society has evolved to some extent, too. So, needless to say, it is a fault dogmatism of individualism that we criticize against past inequality based on present theory of freedom and equality. Though some present socialists still succeed to advocate these arguments, it is because they still have that dogmatism but because of this, socialistic truth must not be hidden. There is no reason that resisting future social evolution even today is good because inequality had been justice once until society had evolved to some extent. And it is still more insignificant to intend to oppress the theory of equality yet after gotten to be remarkably keen consciousness as compatriots cannot endure harsh disparity among the classes. Hence, National Socialism has no truth. We must not be particular to judge past events good or evil by the yardstick of present justice or to advocate. It is groundless and unscientific conclusion to advocate whether human beings are primarily equal or not. Because if you advocate that human beings are primarily unequal, you would be refuted ‘human beings had not been primarily unequal’ because human beings are originated with only one existence. And if you advocate that human beings are primarily equal, you might argue that every animal and plant is equal because all creatures have been evolving from single-celled animals and could not help arguing this problem in a philosophical field of discrimination finally. We advocate *socialism*. It is enough for us to take means suiting ideals of social evolution. So, we don’t advocate whether we are primarily equal or not but overthrow this unequal society for the ideal of social evolution and organize new society based on equality and freedom. That is, we require that material protections for ideals of social evolution must be given us uniformly without disputing whether we human beings had been primarily free and equal or we had had remarkably different. –Understand clearly that socialistic theory of

---

<sup>14</sup> Both are books of Japanese history from 7 century B.C to 8 century A.D

freedom and equality is based on this truth. If Dr. Tajima and all National Socialists don't misunderstand socialistic theory of equality as 'that human beings are the same and not different' but understand equality of material protections, and if they understand that equality of material protections which are realizing in today's laws to some extent intends to give beautiful women, ugly-looking women, old people of eighty-year-old, infants who died in three years, and so on equal material protections from fears or threats to their lives, they would understand their criticism 'hoping for absolute economic equality is like hoping for being same looks with others or hoping for having same life span with others life span' as missing their aims which we cannot help laughing. Socialism is equalitarianism. But to develop individuality without obstacles, it only practices equalitarianism in the direction of materials. (About theory of equality, furthermore see the Section 2, *Ethical ideal of socialism*, and the Section 3, *The theory of biological evolution and social philosophy*).

We shall not hurt intelligence of Dr. Tajima on purpose. Since he who is one of influential people of present scholars' class happens to advocate dogmatic theory of inequality because socialism is regarded as mobocracy which it makes individual personality melt in the equality of poor, not having hobbies and lower people and socialism at one time had done be like this actually. One journalist<sup>15</sup> who wrote one book to *Interpretation Method of Social Problems* of Mr. Abe Isoh<sup>16</sup> and challenged a glorious debate to him belongs to these kinds of groups. Because he gave evidences to prove how much have human beings inequality in aspects of knowledge, morality, character, writing and so on, theory of inequality had powerful evidences.

Socialists of capitalists harp on these dogmatic theory of inequality since they intend to maintain this economic aristocracy. See the below paragraph how disgrace on Dr. Tajima his *The Latest theory of Economy* for those advocates;

It is enough profitable at all for present workers to be able to receive wages of fixed amounts habitually without running a risk in a management like managers. I surely think it is natural that French economist Émile Chevalier<sup>17</sup> says about a wage system, 'A wage system is a peculiar kind of association. One of it is outside of dangers from business and it previously determines rewards and time of receiving them.' Also, we

---

<sup>15</sup> Perhaps he was Yano Fumio.

<sup>16</sup> Abe Isoh was a Japanese socialist in 19-20 century.

<sup>17</sup> He was a French economist but his detail is not clear.

cannot help agreeing a harsh statement of Mr. Cernuschi<sup>18</sup>, 'Reforming a wage system is to wish regression of civilization'. It is a natural tendency that human beings have been distinguished managers and workers. Socialistic theory which advocates human beings are equal is not suitable in real world. Try thinking that; if workers drive out their managers in unison and organize producers' cooperatives, how about that? Since some workers have talents as managers, the others don't have talents as managers, if talented them mainly engage in managements, how can their corporations compete in the markets of the world and beat other rivals. Although managers can be driven out only the country with the help of that sovereignty, as they explain, and all domestic enterprises can be managed by producers' cooperatives, the other countries still have shrewd managers and when they manage their company with their workers, the country would always face business depression. It is the same that a weak republic is behind to a powerful despotic country in military and diplomacy. So, I cannot agree socialistic ideas that they advocate to apply their producers' cooperatives to all industries and to drive out present wage system and managers from society. I must acknowledge myself not a revolutionary of a wage system but a reformer of it.

If the above arguments are written for spreading anti-socialistic feelings rashly like Dr. Kanai, his *The Latest theory of Economy* would be pitifully foolish volume for us and we should doubt his ability of interpreting letters as a legal doctor of Imperial University. But as he isn't a scholar like a simple translator and isn't satisfied to make use of foreign scholars' theories, 'So-and-so says...' like us at all, we believe that he only cites the phrases of Émile Chevalier as a reference to various sources. However, what an imprudent action that he proves Chevalier's theory which advocates a wage system as a kind of association is right for his responsibility! Productions based on associations are called socialistic producing system because they are results of realization of socialism to some extent. So, if a wage system has already been a kind of producers' cooperatives Chevalier says, we would have to say that modern societies have already been a utopia of socialism. If so, it would be all right that all Socialists Parties in the world break up and his *The Latest theory of Economy* which has a hard time disposing Socialists Parties from society burns up. And producers' cooperatives would have to give their members voices in them and to be administered by a council system like republics. But in present systems, economic nobles decide everything being related to producing listening to plans of their subjects, so workers only have voices whether wages are good

---

<sup>18</sup> He was a French economist but his detail is not clear.

or not. Who and what languages can name these ones as associations? It can never be named the nation which takes somebody's lives based on interest of one person or deprives somebody of freedom of living and business as republics. Like that, despotic monarchy of producing which drives out wage slaves from the factory based on capitalists' rights and makes them lose their livelihoods in the future should have the name accepted today which is entirely different from republics of producing –a system of capitalists or a wage system. Why are they confused as the above-mentioned which might overturn thoughts of economics fundamentally working hard? If they don't name the nation when sovereignty had not belonged to states but monarchs or feudal lords and they had been the main constituents of belonging profits which had been gained by their rules, as a republic, why can they compare today's productions which productions have been belonged to economic patriarchal monarchs and dealt with their workers as the objects of their rights for their purpose and interests, with producers' cooperatives which can be called republics of producing? It goes without saying that productive system of socialism is entirely different from present producers' cooperatives, but suppose one scholar thinks, 'we can realize socialism using producers' cooperatives without taking political revolution'<sup>19</sup>, we must say that it is the greatest imprudent as a scholar like calling horses deer. Producers' cooperatives are no other than these. Also, a wage system is no other than this. Chevalier and Dr. Tajima don't use languages of human beings' world.

However, it can be thought those who are confused these wage systems with producers' cooperatives intend to argue that profits of united productions do not only belong to one capitalist but workers and as a result, they can gain high wages. Of course, it is unreasonable for a wage fund<sup>20</sup> to exist in the world like old school of economics thinks as a hypothesis. An argument that wages always rise and fall from a certain price to a certain price according to increase and decrease of population of demanders (that is, workers) to that fund doesn't accomplish as an argument. Hence, it goes without saying that Lassalle's 'ironclad rule of wages' constructed on the wage fund should be revise entirely. Of course, we don't deny it is true in one aspect that the explanation that wages paid to workers by entrepreneurs are payments in advance from ones of workers which shall be divided future productions and wages are paid from productions. But it is in *one* aspect, not every aspect. Because when entrepreneurs cannot gain profits from their productions, wages paid to workers are never from

---

<sup>19</sup> It is a standpoint of reformism.

<sup>20</sup> Wage fund was the theory which J. S. Mill advocated.

productions, this explanation is no better than a hypothesis. However, we don't assert these minor points about this and that. The question is not an aspect of being paid wages but being decided it by contracts. When entrepreneurs contracts with workers about wages, they 'demand' the bodies of workers expecting that they shall be able to pay wages to workers from profits of productions in the future and workers in the market are compelled to 'supply' their bodies because of pressure of hunger and overpopulation. —That is, workers, on the pretext of selling 'labors' (as if prostitutes who sell their bodies themselves say that they only sell 'sexual desires'), put their bodies under the law of demand and supply and take the slave trades. Once they slaves are bought and put in iron chain of contracts, they can require no claim to distribute profits of productions. Although wages are paid from capitals which entrepreneurs have already had, wages are paid in advance expecting to gain from future productions or wages are paid from saves of other capitalists because of miscalculations, it is beyond the God's understanding because prices of slaves have already been decided in the markets. Thinking nothing that suppliers have already been decided the prices in the markets as economic articles, new school of economists regard entrepreneurs demanding workers expecting to pay wages from the future productions as unerring judgments conveniently and say, 'A wage system is a peculiar kind of producers' cooperatives and it is a convenient system that workers can have a share in the profits of future productions previously'. What a fanciful argument! In this point, new school of economists who call them scientific scholars or empiricists are absorbed in worse fanciful arguments than old school of ones. 'One of it is outside of dangers from business and it previously determines rewards and time of receiving them'. Or 'it is enough profitable at all for present workers to be able to receive wages of fixed amounts habitually without running a risk in a management like managers'. If so, appearing unemployed people is the result that they have avoided the risk in a management and received wages of previously fixed amounts!

An advocate of economic aristocracy by Dr. Tajima is based on the dogmatic theory of inequality as we've said above—distinction between entrepreneurs and workers is the result of unequal human nature and nature and although enterprises are managed by producers' cooperatives of workers, those who have the ability of managements engage in business of managements and others engage in physical business. So, it is impossible to construct equal labor organizations and entrepreneurs are immortal—however, on the other hand, this argument is doubted the ability of interpreting letters. Though socialism intends to drive out today's entrepreneurs, it doesn't ignore those who have the ability of managements by dogmatic theory of equality. We don't deny at all like



excellent National Socialist Dr. Ely to regard entrepreneurs as important captains in industries but we don't admit that ship-owners in industries must be captains in industries at the same time like he says. Jurisprudentially speaking, driving out today's entrepreneurs who manage enterprises as subjects belonging to their profits for their purpose is not the same to drive out those who have the ability of managing enterprises as organs of nations for purpose of nations and profits belonging to nations. Repeatedly speaking, ship-owners in industries and entrepreneurs being subjects of profits would be states and some national would be workers using muscle, the others would be workers using their ability. Moreover repeatedly speaking, socialism advocates overthrowing present economic aristocracy which entrepreneurs makes nations exist as subjects belonging to their profits for their purpose like past patriarchal monarchs in the past period and putting those who have the ability of managements in charge the organs of managements of business as if today's bureaucrats of central governments and local ones work for states and profits belonging to states as national organs. That is, like Dr. Ely says, although those who have the ability of managements engage in managements of business in producers' cooperatives of workers, those managers are organs of cooperatives which are entirely different from so-called entrepreneurs' and they are only other kinds of workers. There is no reason that lords who are subjects of sovereignty have to coincide with those who have the ability of exercising sovereignty exactly. Like that, there is no reason that entrepreneurs who are subjects of profits have to coincide with those who have the ability of managements. In this point, we must also ask Dr. Tajima to reflect on himself like Dr. Kanai, 'Am I Tajima Kinji an economist or economics?' Are those who are rotten a central brain by dogmatic theory of inequality hidden wisdom from sight with a cover at this?

Dr. Tajima advocates economic aristocracy thoroughly. He willfully argues the profits of despotic powers without reserve. He says: although all domestic enterprises can be managed by producers' cooperatives, the other countries still have shrewd managers and when they manage their company with their workers, the country would always face business depression. It is the same that a weak republic is behind to a powerful despotic country in military and diplomacy. It is true. Hence, it is true that only one producer's cooperative of a country would defeat by other competitors in the markets which make other wage slaves work hard and cut down the cost of productions because it makes working hours proper and workers live noble lives. However, therefore, we are exercising international movements of socialism because it is a disturbance for national industries of socialism that industries of capitalists in foreign countries continue to existing like when socialism would be realized driving out the way of managements by

producers' cooperatives, states would intend to absorb all their domestic industries. If he is a doctor who studies social problems specially, this is not a point for him to finish without paying attention. Everybody knows that Mr. Yano Fumio's<sup>21</sup> *The New Society* has a halfway content because he had paid a special attention about this point. Though its content is halfway, Mr. Yano's argument, 'It is not necessarily impossible to realize socialism in only one nation to some extent. And socialistic industries can compete with economic developed countries if that domestic capitals and labors can unite each other' is more than denying his groundless inference. Because it is a principle of economics that cooperative activities by large capitals are much more powerful than competition by small and independent capitals and systematic labors in a body have a much higher productivity than destructive labors canceling out each other. If we practice international competition like this, socialistic countries would win the competition like our Japan, which beat powerful Russia<sup>22</sup> after becoming a united nation-state in spite of having broken<sup>23</sup> domestic order by foreign countries once. But his fundamental thoughts which praise present despotic countries of productions with the word 'powerful despotic countries' must not be missed.

If the word of 'despotic countries' means the principality by national organs which use sovereignty of nations despotically for purpose and interests of nations, it is undoubted facts that an agility with despotism and a secretive method bring profits to nations in extremely severe competition of war or diplomacy. But we name the nations when monarchs who had been the subjects of sovereignty had dealt with nations as the objects of them for purpose and interests of them as despotic countries, it goes without saying that the subjects of belonging to profits by despotic powers are monarchs, not nations (See the paragraph that I have classified nations with the aspects of the subjects and the aspects of the objects in the Section 4, *The so-called principle of restorative-revolutionaries*). Hence, if capitalists exercise the rights of producing for purpose and interests of group in present capitalists' system what Dr. Tajima calls powerful despotic countries as organs of those producers' cooperatives, profits from those despotic productions, although those are despotism, should be distributed to members producing in those groups as a natural rights. But this is never suitable for present situation. Actually, capitalists exercise their rights of producing for their purpose and interests as their sovereignty like past patriarchal monarchs and members of those groups who are their subjects or servants by annual salaries or monthly

---

<sup>21</sup> Yano Fumio was a novelist, statesman, and journalist in 19-20 century of Japan.

<sup>22</sup> It points that Japan beat Russia in the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905).

<sup>23</sup> It points to have being in disorder of Japan as a result of compelling to open its country.

salaries only exist as the objects of rights under the purpose of capitalists. Therefore, under the powerful despotic countries like these, having powerful states or producers' cooperatives are profitable for monarchs or capitalists and they are profits belonging to them who are the subjects of rights that monarchs or capitalists make themselves more strong using powerful state or producers' cooperatives. In this situation, it is a different case that others happened to get those profits. In Britain, according to statistics in 1895, 8 billion and 500 million yen in revenue of 13 billion and 500 million yen belong to economic monarchs who are only one eighth of total number of population and it is said that because they have the rights of gaining those profits as despotic monarchs in despotic countries. Great Britain whose members of seven eighth of total number of population exist as the objects of those monarchs for their purpose and interests and suffer from starving is never a powerful state. Statisticians who play a cruel prank calculate that wealth of Chicago city in America is estimated an average income of ten thousand yen per person and five or six thousand yen per family. But America filled with unemployment people and criminals is never a powerful state and powerful people in her are only fifty of sixty economic despotic monarchs. Although the gold emperor Iwasaki<sup>24</sup> climbs the roof of his palace and say, 'I am rich. Why are not the people rich', the Great Japanese Empire is never powerful state organized with wage slaves and serfs and powerful one in her is only an Iwasaki. Although innumerable economic patriarchal monarchs become more powerful since Japan won in the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War, and expanded its profit line<sup>25</sup> and its sphere of foreign trades, there is another question whether the people and the state are powerful. Imagine the disgraceful behavior that a giant armed the army having sixteen corps and the navy having battleships of a few hundred thousand tons is reduced to a skeleton and pilfers to poor people and implores the rich on his knees to give charities of taxes. Now the Great Japanese Empire has been deprived its personality which is the subjects of the rights belonging to profits and been only as the objects of rights for economic patriarchal monarchs.

It is true that economic despotic monarchs would be powerful. But is the Great Japanese Empire powerful state even this?

Perhaps Dr. Tajima would not use the word 'powerful despotic countries' in this sense but to compare with naming socialistic system of producing as a 'weak republic'. Ah, a

---

<sup>24</sup> Iwasaki was a founder of the Mitsui combine.

<sup>25</sup> It means one's sphere of influence. At that time, Japan regarded the Korean Peninsula as one's sphere of influence.

weak republic! Why is a republic assumed weak? However, the word 'weak' is a matter of life or death for socialism. Not only him, but magnificent scholars always advocate an entirely reversed falsehood, 'Realization of socialism makes productive activities decrease'. In *Social Economics*, Dr. Kanai also advocates this:

If we force to practice socialism, we inevitably need for very many bureaucrats who supervise productive activities and not only education and support of descendents engaging in all producing but also general consumption. But, anything else, what we should fear than above-mentioned is that upper bureaucrats who undertakes the responsibility of direct and supervise have infinite powers and get the position being able to practice the power continually. In this way, we don't only get to groan under tyranny unparalleled anywhere from ancient times. Under this situation, the result of producing is never more than the result under the present system in spite of endless interference and supervision. No, one would be less than now. Because, as we have already known by experiences, it is generally true that productivity is very low or bad in the places where no activities or very little ones based on self-centered has existed.

This is the dilemma against socialism. Two swords whether you choose the poverty of the whole society or the rule of despotic states intends to cut off retreat of socialism which advocates making the whole society rich and establishing freedom and independence of individuals. However, he only swings the sword to attack the air. –Socialism believes firmly that it can realize amazing development of the whole society and independence of individuals. We don't believe admirable Dr. Kanai as a scholar like a translator. But it is a so-called individualism that misunderstands socialism as the theory of despotic states by rule of despotic bureaucrats and strongly advocates individuals' authority. (About great meanings of individualism, see the following Section 3, *The theory of biological evolution and social philosophy*). One-side socialism that tends to be misunderstood was the production more than one thousand years ago which was born before Plato had been born. The fact that one-side socialism had made bureaucrats supervise the chastity of women reveals how it had permitted the interference of bureaucrats. Present scientific socialism is never the ancient principle of restoration which is unconsciously connected with simple instinctive sociality like these. It is a quite another ideal from one-side socialism receiving noble awaking of individualism until the 19 century and constructed on the sociality and the certain self-knowledge of individuals. I shall explain this spirits in the Section 3, *The theory of biological evolution and social philosophy*. And we have already explained that the

argument, 'productive activities shall decrease without supervision by bureaucrats' is based on the unconscious dogmatism about the human nature. But although socialism has realized, it is not that even a slight supervisor is entirely unnecessary. Only it should be sufficient to remember that supervisors in socialistic society are quite different from today's bureaucrats. Today's bureaucrats take in important charge of oppress the weak classes who take defiant attitudes for protecting those in power and as a result that they put under the perishable system by economic temptations and belong to the ruling class, they have arrogances by despotism and servile spirits. Thinking that bureaucrats like this shall still exist when socialism has realized is the same to say 'Though the sun has risen, foxes have not hidden yet'. Though today's bureaucrats are only artists prostrating themselves on the ground before their superiors, they seize their powers like the emperor to the common people because society is covered with this remarkable economic difference and the darkness of the class system of powers. When the supervisors shall be recommended, they are never chosen, like today's bureaucrats, by connections of wives, formal examinations, curriculum vitae certified payments of 'monthly tuitions'<sup>26</sup>, or the way of hunting for government posts which political parties contend with but by elections. And if the elections are like the proposition of Bellamy, not the electing way of the Roman Emperor in her later years which are elected among the servicemen, which elects the supervisors of labor system like forces among the outside people who has retired from workings, what despotism has existed? Today's position of judges shall be an honorary post of those who have noble characters and be a supervisor abusing powers for freedom and independence of individuals. And if soldiers in workings, their supervisors, and important organs corresponding today's entrepreneurs are equally distributed profits of productions and they are on an equal footing, why can the class of bureaucrats who behave despotically and have servile spirits appear in the world? Because of this, in Germany which has not be like France yet which had perfectly overthrown one-side socialism from ancient times, that is the advocating theory of despotic states by individualistic revolution, an individual authority is strongly advocated for interests of society on the pretext of democracy and a 'social democracy' is advocated to drive away floating ice of advocating theory of despotic states which flowed putting relics of the Medieval times on it. Why socialism advocates democracy at the same times is because it requires that individual authority must not be disgraced by others' will on the pretext of society. Why do we think that producing activities can be taken in charge by today's bureaucrats? –No! Who advocate taking

---

<sup>26</sup> Perhaps it means bribery.

today's despotic bureaucrats who regard states as almighty in charge of producing and interfering them with producing are the very so-called National Socialism like Dr. Kanai says! Rather, one of swords<sup>27</sup> of dilemma Dr. Kanai uses deeply pierces the hearts of National Socialists themselves!

In this way, we come back the arguments of Dr. Kanai, 'socialism makes producing decrease', or the argument of the weak republics Dr. Tajima says. These are quite reversed false. Socialism is a policy not to decrease productions but to increase productions. It is a policy not to make a nation be a weak republic but to make a nation be a powerful industrial republic. Whenever we saw that not only above two doctors but those who are worth being enough respected adamantly advocate these quite reversed misunderstandings, we thought why they state these criticisms. But we couldn't find the reason except for thoughtlessness or the lack of consideration which we had refuted yet. If another reason which we had not refuted yet exists, it might be that when they saw that utopian socialists and some today's socialists are determined to argue inequality of distribution, they concluded that socialism would only realize equal honest poverty without considering efficiency of producing.

But we shall declare this; scientific socialism never puts emphasis on the theory of distribution. You might think it strange, but we shall emphasize this point especially. Some utopian socialists seemed to have thought that it was enough bring down the position of upper classes by the rule of dogmatic theory of equality. Also, even socialists cannot avoid misunderstanding the core of socialism as the theory of distribution because motivations which led to the discovering of socialism are the unreasoning and unfairness of distribution in modern society. But the truth of socialism is not the theory of distribution but the theory of producing—that is, public owning of lands and productive organs and public managing those ones are the core of socialism. Actually, Socialists Parties have never dispersed by innumerable theory of distribution and have united by the theory of producing and have not jolted. Of course, the word 'distribution' smells the private ownership system. If distributed allotments belong to the right of each individual as a private property, it is natural not to regard this nuance as unjust. But those who are at a loss what to do except for inferring everything by standard ones of modern society like them cannot imagine existence of greatly expanded public properties from the word 'distribution' at once and understand this by unscientific observation of private ownership system. Even those who don't have no idea except for unsocial thoughts who think present public properties as an oasis of the deserts in

---

<sup>27</sup> It points of criticism that socialism shall realize bureaucratic despotism.

private ownership system and that it is inevitable to exist iron nets in libraries or iron fences in parks never require to distribute battleships or barracks. This is because present people don't think about military affairs like past Daimyōs and they regard military affairs as ones which should be managed by nations. Like that, if it clearly gets to understand that productive affairs are also never left to a private citizen, people would not view large factories than barracks and large shipyards constructing even battleships by the distributing standard of private ownership system as present. And if so, most of social properties should exist as common properties and parts of distribution shall be purchasing powers to satisfy tendency of individualities according to the degree of daily lives and social evolution. It would be clear that they are never distribution in present times—in the sense including all such as honors, powers, lives, and loves. Hence, socialists' propositions about distribution are different according to them. Saint-Simon advocated 'ranking distribution in proportion to labor powers'. Louis Blanc regarded 'producing according to ability and consuming according to necessity' as the best ideal. Today's socialists advocate 'equal distribution to everybody'. Of course, Blanc's ideal 'producing according to ability and consuming according to necessity' is also our ideal and shall realize in the near future. But unless productive activities increase more and moral evolution reaches higher stage, these ideal communists society can be realized. Hence, scientific socialism cannot help stopping realizing 'equal distribution to everybody' according to present degree, so it cannot help waiting the coming evolution. Of course, suppose that socialism is realized at once in present Japan, it might be possible to adopt Simon's proposition for a while to some extent like one states in *The New Society* because her producing does not enough develop. But these can never be expected to realize today (See the Section 5, *The enlightening movement of socialism*). Besides, it cannot give a definition of the limits of individuals' labor engaged in producing activities on a production. And we cannot know how much effects of knowledge accumulated historically are included in it. Productions are the harmoniously inseparable, social, and historical results, so ranking those to distribute according to individuals in present days, means the succession of the way of distribution in the period of individual producing in the period of social producing and it would be contrary to today's justice. We advocate that various propositions about the theory of distribution evolve according to the situations of times. Distribution connects with producing. An organism of society varies the justice of the way of distribution according to quantity of producing which are materials for surviving and evolution. Cannibals who are the most lack of producing regard even flesh of compatriots as materials which should be distributed and kill each other for surviving their society. Like that, private

ownership system thus far distributes plundered ones between the societies or the classes by the form of wars or laws. In the communists societies of primitive villages based on primitive equality, distribution could not be practiced before until they could have surpluses of primitive productions by primitive communism. Communistic distribution which shall realize in the future cannot be practiced before until it can have surpluses of communistic producing based on infinite inventions. Socialistic equal distribution for everybody which is a point of passage realizing communistic distribution makes everybody be concerned with equal distribution and must realize great productions making surpluses which eliminate collision of economic greed by labor system like forces. Once, Mencius said this:

Human beings cannot live a single day without water or fire. But when you knock on the doors of others' houses in the evening and ask them to give this important water or fire, everybody would give you them pleasantly because they have ones enough and to spare. If so, the saints must always have the ideal of making staple food such as beans and grain richer like water or fire for ruling over the whole country. If beans and grain gets to be rich like water or fire, the people would be very well-mannered naturally and why do those who fail in their duties appear?

This would be the truth in the period of communism of primitive villages which have small populations but rich plains ruling Yao or Shun<sup>28</sup>. It goes without saying that his theory had been regarded as utopia because he had advocated those in the period simple agricultural producing like cultivating wastelands with spades which had adopted private ownership system and appeared plundering classes like monarchs or nobles (on the socialism of Mencius, we shall explain in the Section 5, *The enlightening movement of socialism*). However, today, machines which can produce articles much more than populations are invented one after another again. If the classes of economic nobles don't monopolize markets with these machines like today and engage in productive activities by the way of destroying each other, the theory of distribution would be interpreted by itself according to evolution of producing. –Hence, we have a peaceful ideal that our society would evolve and reach classless pure communistic society which shall realize equal distribution to everybody. Today's socialists get out of dead end of past utopian socialism like Confucius who said, 'you should not fear shortages but inequality' and do their best realizing public owning of lands and productive organs because they know

---

<sup>28</sup> Yao and Shun were the legendary monarchs in ancient China. They had been known to monarchs having governed wisely, so they had been regarded as ideal monarchs.



that everything is only interpreted by realizing great producing. Why some scholars say the world realized socialism as a weak republic is because they identify present socialism with utopian socialism and interpret it 'not doing new attempts positively, or putting up with equal honest poverty'. Socialism doesn't require making poor distribution equal but having the ideal of being satisfied to use rich public properties in partnership according to difference of individuals. Socialism doesn't reduce the position of upper class lower but makes the position of lower class evolve. Speeches and behaviors of those who criticize socialism are false extremely.

If so, how can we do great productions which can give the whole society happy life like ones of today's upper class? We shall answer to this question; we only obey the stream of historical progress. Like we have stated the history of economic aristocratic countries that these have traced from the period of economic local clans to the period of economic civil wars and reached the period of economic feudalism, now stream of economic history progresses vigorously and are flowing the period of Trusts. Like those who had suffered from the disturbances of war in the period of civil wars have been pleased with aristocracy of feudalism, all present economists praise the great productions of trusts. Of course, it is natural and there is no reason that separated capitals are more economical than united capitals or labors breaking each other can produce more than ones in partnership. It is an undoubted fact that economic feudalism brings those economic lords and society interests because of not existing economic wars like in the period of civil wars and realizes the great productions. However make best efforts American judges to oppress trusts, and however fear workers and small-scale capitalists their tyranny and make efforts to prevent those, the great stream of history cannot be prevented with a wood fence or a lump of stone. Now the whole world is almost covering with trusts. Since Oil traders of North America had practiced destructive competitions, oils are put in warehouses meaninglessly and traders suffered a disastrous loss the degree that they were not taken notice although they flowed on the ground but when Standard Oil Trust was organized in 1882, it is said that they economized their 60 percent cost of production and got dividends of about six hundred million yen in total in these days. See the facts how Carnegie Steelmaking Trust which are organized by combination of capitals of 4 billion yen drive other European capitalists not combining out of the Chinese market. Glucose Sugar Manufacture has combined with the same trades in the whole America and National Biscuit Company has combined with the 90 percent of the same large trades in the whole America. It is said that even greengrocer's has gotten be trusts in London. However trusts have their own way, socialism never swims against the historical progress and looks back on the last century of separating

small-scale capitals. It succeeds to progress of trusts and promotes greater combinations. Great combinations of capitalists of trusts are only the great ones among the capitalists although they make destructive competitions among the trades quit and economize vast costs of advertisements and wastes by each destructive action. On the contrary, we don't know how capitals and labors are wasted because today's trusts struggle with labor unions which are the other great combinations—This is why now trusts are not still perfect union between labors and capitals and they block producing by great wastes. Great combinations of trusts only progress in the dark.

Because they can view the relationship between demand and supply statistically like having a bird's-eye view quitting economic confused fights, we can get to escape from suffering great panics every ten year like before. But because those managements are based on foolishness and arrogance of despotic powers, they lose sight of lights to view the relationship between demand and supply. Also, because they economic lords practice the exaction of their taxes, society is exhausted its purchasing powers and falls into overproduction. Because of this, we don't know how society wastes its capitals and labor powers—this is why now trusts are not still perfect union between consumption and production and they block producing by great wastes. Though great combinations of trusts need not innumerable small merchants and get great interests by avoiding wasting labor powers with discharging workers rather than by employing people for destruction other trades or closing down their low profitable factories, economized workers cannot easily find new jobs and it is not only meaningless savings. Some people keep alive on social charity, the other are idle until they are demanded again, and some are criminals and threaten society. We don't know how much society is received wastes of labors—this is why now trusts are not still perfect union in everything and they block producing by great wastes. In the world of trusts, public spirits which is one of two motivations in economic activities doesn't work oppressed by individuals' contracts and self-centered which is other of two motivations in economic activities isn't stimulated at all because of despair by remarkable disparities among the classes—this is why now trusts are not union which can unite the whole society and they cannot practice great producing which can make the whole society rich. Socialism can be thought that it changes trusts which wastes these capitals and labors into social managements and removes the defects of these wastes. The period of economic civil wars changes into the period of economic feudalism and the period of economic feudalism changes into the period of economic nation-state. Socialism doesn't practice exaction which makes purchasing powers exhaust because it practices productive activities for society. And it doesn't fall into overproduction by foolishness of despotism, discharge workers

irresponsibly, close factories, and waste capitals and labors by struggle between workers and capitalists. It promotes self-centered to honor and positions which reach by development of individuality done freely by equal distribution and stimulates public spirits greatly which are conscious of profits to belonging to society and make efforts. Though economists praise great producing of trusts as their pens break or their tongues rot, why they misunderstand socialism which can realize great productions and say, 'socialism make productions decrease', or 'socialistic society is the weak republic'? If they think making individuals' self-centered control social economic resources as wise system, why don't they permit certain Mr. Okra<sup>29</sup> to put sand in shells or to mix stone in bullets of guns as a factory manager<sup>30</sup>? If they think today's system of selling government posts which makes the right of producing which is the resource of life of a nation exist as individuals' properties as established economic system, why don't they make our country be like China or Korea which regards the sovereignty as the right of property rights for interests of the Emperor and buys government posts.

But don't misunderstand. It is irrelevant that economic feudalism of trusts changes into socialistic economic nation-state and that there is no room to exist small entrepreneurs and small capitalists in the period of trusts. Though statistics clearly reveals that combinations of large-scale entrepreneurs annex and overwhelm the trades of small entrepreneurs, on the other hand, small entrepreneurs who are in trusts debts appear at the same time. Also, it is a fact that small entrepreneurs like handicraft people who deal with repairing art objects which cannot produce on large scales exist out of sphere of influence of trusts. Even spiritual workers who are employed by a monthly salary or an annual salary or physical workers who live in wages can become small capitalists buying stocks of trusts in certain aspect. Hence, we can know that jumping to a conclusion that trusts remove the room of existing small entrepreneurs and remarkable class differences in society exist because all stocks of trust are monopolized by the class of gold nobles like some socialists who have superficial views is dogmatism. But these small plunders of small can exist because they can avoid eyes of gold Daimyōs like moles as if bandits had existed in forests or gamblers<sup>31</sup> in towns because government and punishments hadn't enough spread in feudalism. Showing the possibility of becoming small capitalists as stock holders of trusts is the same that not

---

<sup>29</sup> Certain Mr. Okra was Okra Kihachiro. He played an active role as a merchant of weapons in the last days of the Tokugawa Shogunate and organized Okura Gumi (Okura Group) after the Meiji Restoration.

<sup>30</sup> Kita means that if present economic system is good and capitalists are permitted to gain profits by dishonest means, we must permit those who make military articles to gain profits by dishonest means.

<sup>31</sup> Original Japanese word of 'gamblers' is 'bakuto'. It includes meaning of 'Yakuza (Japanese mafia)'.

only serfs but samurai class which had served class of nobles and been members of plundering classes even in feudalism. If you understand that human political history don't stop the stage of feudalism because bandits had been in forests or gamblers in towns even in feudalism or because not only the class of nobles and serfs but samurai class had existed and stood between the class of nobles and serfs, we shall conclude this; Those Rostrum Socialists advocate to make some socialists who have superficial views be in great difficulty that there is room to exist small entrepreneurs and capitalists even in economic feudalism but they commit a blunder forgetting progress of economic history in reverse. Why? In the volumes of Dr. Kanai and Tajima, criticism from these points of view are not found but many of people who call themselves Rostrum Socialists make efforts to argue these points especially and try to resist against pure socialism. Professor of Kyoto Imperial University, a legal doctor, Kuwata Kumazo<sup>32</sup>, a bachelor of laws, Kawakami Hajime<sup>33</sup> who comments on socialism in the *Yomiuri Shinbun* (a daily paper of *Yomiuri*) wielding a flowing, elegant style under the pen name of Senzan bansui rou shujin (a master of boundless and vast regions), and one journalist who challenged to have a dispute to Abe Isoh, a writer of *Interpretation Method of Social Problems* are typical examples. Socialism isn't satisfied with modern situation that small plunderers like small entrepreneurs has still existed out of influence of economic lords but advocates that it admits existence of small entrepreneurs but doesn't permit them to plunder in the future. Also, socialism isn't satisfied with the situation that spiritual or physical workers get the stocks of trusts but are in subordinate positions under economic nobles as small plunderers of small capitalists in certain aspect. Keeping on existing small capitalists in the future is only one of facts and there is another question that an economic class nation shall change into economic nation-states as a result of historical progress. Rostrum Socialists put on a basis of thoughts to maintain economic aristocracy because they cannot see through the future as a result of progression of economic history. Pure socialism has an ideal of realizing economic democratic countries according to the stream of economic history. And today's thought of rights doesn't permit to advocate ownership by strong powers or isn't the justice of individuals' distributions to individuals' labors. See the fact that even today's various

---

<sup>32</sup> Kuwata Kumazo was a legal scholar and sociologist in 19-20 century of Japan. He tackled labor problems and participated in organizing the Social Policy Society. And he participated in investigation by the Department of Agriculture and Commerce as a specialist.

Still, strictly speaking, He was a professor of Chuou University.

<sup>33</sup> Kawakami Hajime was a famous economist in 19-20 century of Japan. At first, he was not a socialist but he was greatly interested in a problem of poverty, so he gradually approached Marxism. In 1932, he joined Communist Party of Japan but was arrested because of this (Communist Party was forbidden to organization at that time of Japan).

laws reveal through admitting nations as the highest owner that society is a producer of all wealth and an owner of them. In today which thought of rights has evolved the stage of approving nations as the highest owner and improved the ideal of justice, why do they still try to block economic revolution because socialistic society has room of existing small plunderers like small entrepreneurs and capitalists.

This is the problem which I have said to be settled beforehand; is the theory of evolution fault and has human history stopped the stage of economic aristocracy and never changed until the earth gets cold?

The false about socialism which *Social economics* and *The Latest theory of Economy* spread never limited the points above-mentioned. But we pointed above two scholars especially and overthrew them because we admitted that their positions and honor of their volumes make those imprudent slanders shine and believed that their arguments influenced to people in general much worse than pure economics of capitalists because they stole and wore a mask of socialists like chimera. And from above explanation, we believe that we could reveal that their arguments has no real socialistic tendency and are only 'socialism of government' or 'socialism of capitalists' and we could show to some extent how the real meaning of pure socialism in economic aspect is, when we refute their arguments. –Real socialism doesn't intend to change the position of the plunderers' class as chimerical socialists misunderstand but sweep away classes perfectly and make society gain social profits by social rights. Real socialism isn't so ignorant to human nature that chimerical socialists advocate modern society which oppresses economic activities. It expects to promote economic activities amazingly with stimulating public spirits prosperously and making self-centered display without obstacles. Real socialism doesn't maintain separation of class and make people despise workings like chimerical socialism but put labors themselves on the outside condition and make them absolute holy. It doesn't intend to maintain today's class inequality by dogmatic theory of inequality and to swim against the tide of history. It intends to be adapted social evolution which got sharp about consciousness of compatriots, not to block development of individuality for social evolution, and thus it attempts equal protections of materials. Real socialism don't praise despotism for purpose of a private citizen like chimerical socialism and make today's bureaucrats engage in producing based on despotism. It receives awaking of individualism and makes only a few and equal supervisors gain a position of organs of society by wise way of election. Real socialism isn't satisfied with equal honest poverty by weak productions or don't think that theory of distribution is important as chimerical socialists misunderstand. It

understands that everything is only realized by great productions, makes trusts evolve more, removes all wastes including trusts, and makes combinations among the capitalists expand great combinations of the whole society. It intends to change producing rights which are the rights of private citizens into public rights for purpose and interests of nations and make the whole society amazing rich by competing with development of individuality and powerful motivations of public spirits. Its richness is not blocked by indiscreet self-centered actions, and there is no crime, no reckless enterprise, no class conflict, and no bankruptcy of panic in socialistic society. Inventions produce new ones, machines make new ones, and capitals which keep on accumulating keep on accumulating new ones because freedom of competition which is started from equal departures removed economic temptations and knowledge are spread extensively without oversights in socialistic society. Wealth increases one after another and increases infinitely and unlimitedly at a speed which we cannot imagine in today—pure socialism which advocates social rights and interests regards this social evolution as a fundamental reason. They rostrum socialists who disgrace rights of nations and holiness of rostrum recklessly for government and capitalists and cry strangely like chimera have no thoughts which can name socialism. For chimerical socialism, economic aristocracy is maintained until human history has ended—the earth has gotten cold. Real socialism infers by strict scientific foundations on the theory of evolution, is conscious of an ideal of social evolution clearly, and makes efforts. Never confuse dirty lumps covered with beautiful clothes with real socialism.

But it is obvious another question whether social evolution pursues by way of National Socialism until utopia of socialism is realized because socialism cannot win at one effort in the class conflict against the class of capitalists (See the follow Section 5, *The enlightening movement of socialism*).

**(Section 1 Economic Justice of Socialism End)**