

Section 3 The theory of biological evolution and social philosophy

Chapter 5

Today, criticism from philosophical grounds to socialism insists that since socialism intends to destroy the struggle for existence, it is a utopia being contrary to the principle of the theory of biological evolution. This is a serious criticism for socialism.

If every foundation of scientific philosophy lies on the theory of biological evolution and a fundamental principle of theory of biological evolution lies on the theory of the struggle for existence, it shall go without saying that even socialism cannot be an exception of this. But today's theory of biological evolution has only discovered the fact that living things generate by evolution, which misunderstands the positions of human beings in the world of organism and does unparalleled incoherent explanations through in all ages by the theory of the struggle for existence, which is interpreted by individualism, using as its reason. Because of this, those who accept the theory of biological evolution criticize based on the theory of the struggle for existence that socialism is a utopia, unscientific one, or intends to plan an impossibility of stopping the social advances. Socialists avoid the theory of biological evolution, constructs the weak theory that supposing socialism destroys the struggle for existence, other competitions of honors and morals would still exist and by that they only narrowly counter to these criticism. We believe that; if socialism contradicts with the theory of biological evolution, it would be only a unscientific utopia. Although it calls itself a *scientific* socialism, it is can be composed of a *science* in economics, ethics, history and so on, but, seeing from a view of a social philosophy which is the foundation of sciences, it is only a utopia how we say. Socialism constructs its theory by an ideal of social evolution of species of human beings. If so, socialism cannot escape from the struggle for existence, the principle of biological evolution including living things of human beings, and if socialism rashly abuses sciences themselves without powerful grounds driving out these principles, it cannot escape from criticism that it is a unscientific in every point. –Scientific socialism must be construct by strict scientific theories in every point.

However, today's theory of biological evolution which scientists adopt don't have any theory except for contradictive and confused ones as we must invade the territory of

biology and develop a system excessively; causes of contradiction and confusion are pursued those points that it interprets the facts of evolution of living things by dogmatic thoughts of individualism and identifies the positions of human beings in the world of organism with the ones of other animals. So, we must refer to the theory of biological evolution.

Here we shall take up Mr. Oka Asajiro¹, a professor of Tokyo Higher Normal School and a doctor of science as a representative scholar of these theory of biological evolution and criticize his criticism of socialism in his *A lecture of the theory of evolution*. Though we regret that a scholar like him who pursues the truth criticize socialism, the responsibility doesn't rest with him; the responsibility rests with the very Darwin that made theory of biological evolution do religion of animals and reported the theory of the struggle for existence which was interpreted by individualism. He only reported those mistakes as a person who publicizes the theory of biological evolution. But why we pointed him especially is because his voluminous work *A lecture of the theory of evolution* which was written for the sake of spreading the theory of biological evolution to the general public disturbs a publicity of the theory of social evolution in final pages filled with dark and spreads lies about socialism very strongly. And in the all pages filled with dark, theory of biological evolution by religion of animals and of the struggle for existence by individualism are showed perfectly. He advocates the theory of criminal law which advocates to select by capital punishments. He advocates the theory of social circulation which ignores the historical evolution and the meaning of revolution. He advocates the positive theory of reverence for the Emperor and anti-foreign sentiment which insist on competing to slaughter with each other. He advocates the theory of the struggle for existence by individualism that developments of races and prosperity of states are only based on competitions among the inside individuals of races and states. He advocates the theory of population which don't understand increase of population with reproduction to maintain our species. He advocates national science like newts that wars among the different races or different states never become extinct and it is a utopia that the world shall be united one society as a result of social evolution. No! Through all pages of *A lecture of the theory of evolution*, he doesn't decide the unite of the struggle for existence when he mentions the theory of biological evolution which is chaotic and lack system treading the beaten track. He doesn't understand the purpose of the struggle for existence, misunderstands rivals in the struggle for existence and

¹ Oka Asajiro was a biologist in 19-20th century of Japan. He got good results about studies of leeches, ascidians and so on, and wrote the popular book on theory of biological evolution and contributed to spread that theory.

doesn't know that contents of the struggle for existence can evolve according to the class of living things. And he doesn't notice the position of the struggle for food and for love in the theory of biological evolution or consider today's position and future evolution of species of human beings. Hence, let us quote his criticism to socialism:

Though everybody must admit that present social systems are not absolutely perfect, when we argue the problem how we reform those ones, it is unprofitable at all unless we always think those based on the theory of biological evolution steadily. Why many reformers of societies have only told ones like dreams of fools is because those; they don't enough think how human beings are and misunderstand human beings noble recklessly. And they don't notice the fact that competitions are only causes of progress and if we live in the world, we cannot avoid competitions.

I have explained that results of competitions among the different species are results of rise and fall of each specie and the results of competitions among the same species lead them reforms and progress. These can apply to human relationship. Struggles for existence among the different races get the causes of rise and fall of each race and struggles for existence among the same races get the causes of reforms and progress of those races. Since a large number of races exist confronting each other, we cannot only avoid competitions among the different races but abolish competitions among the individuals in the same races. Living things which are distributed covering a wide range and are a large number of individuals are always divided some varieties and finally struggle with each other. Since human beings are put on situations just like those, it is inevitable to fight against the different races by one ways. Hence, every race must intend to make themselves reform and progress simply, since races who were retarded advances are not promising to win other ones in competitions among the races at all. To do that, it is necessary to compete inside individuals of the races.

Though there are many examples historically that people had not been satisfied with their social situations and practiced great revolution, they had only attributed all guilt to social systems, forgotten how human beings had been, and thought that their society would have gotten the gold world if only institutions were reformed. After revolution, though they felt pleasant seeing that those who had seized powers before fallen low for some time, but there is no interesting one except for those ones. The world has been still a degenerate age as usual and competitions has been violent as usual. Today's some socialists sometimes advocate unusual ideas of reforms, but if those ideas are realized as they advocate, they must invite the results above-mentioned. Competitions never become extinct unless human beings exist and pain of lives doesn't change forever

unless competitions become extinct.

As I have already explained, the purpose of education is maintaining and prosperity of their own races. Seeing from the theory of evolution, social reforms should be the purpose to maintain and prosper their own races, too. Though some people intend to abolish war entirely or have a idea that the whole world shall be one state if civilizations advance, these ones cannot be realize biologically at all. It is inevitable to happen a kinds of war among the different races as long as groups conflicting interests with each other stands side by side. Of course, it is clear that all people in the world cannot stand the positions not conflicting interests with each other. As it is said, 'without hostile nations or foreign threats, states shall fall at once', states are united because hostile nations or foreign threats. Even if one race defeats other races and occupies the whole world, once interests are different according to places, battles shall happen here and there and united states shall divide some states. If you see that even when assemblymen elected each place of only one prefecture gather the prefectural assembly, they violently argue because of a clash of regional interests, it goes without saying that the world shall be one nation and wars shall become extinct.

As long as some races face each other, each race must make efforts to maintain and prosper themselves, but without progressing by the speed not defeating other races, we cannot hope their own maintaining and prosperity, so we have no choice but to compete among the individuals to progress quickly. If so, we present human beings must make up our minds to progress at all times by competitions with fellows not to be ruin by hostile races. If we dislike competitions with fellows, we shall defeated by hostile races because of making slow progress of the whole races.

Though today's social systems have many points to be reformed, we cannot entirely avoid competitions how social systems are reformed. If only one race shut themselves up in the places where have no connection with other races and can live, they could live without violent competitions, but since their progress are very slow, when they connect with other races afterward, they would be ruined by other races like ostriches² in New Zealand. Some people³ argue this; since pain of lives results from violent competitions, violent competitions result from increase of population. Hence, we need to restrict the number of childbirth. Considering from my above-mentioned, this can never be said a wise policy. What is required from present societies would not be abolishing competitions but rather reforming the system which can disturb natural selection. Saying from the viewpoint of existence of races, what is needed most is that; decreasing

² The word in Japanese original text means 'ostriches'. But ostriches should only inhabit in Africa. Though a question remains, I translated literally.

³ Perhaps it points Malthus and Malthusian.

the system if possible that makes those who have inferior abilities and health exist artificially and loads of the whole race heavy, making the system which those who have superior abilities and health can work mainly in every aspect perfect if possible, and adopting the ways that the whole races can progress quickly, as a result of competitions among the individuals. There is nothing for it to try to win the competitions as much as possible understanding the struggle for existence.

Fault arguments based on armchair theories that advocate humanitarianism, respecting the human rights, or personalities have often appeared. The argument that capital punishment should be abolished is a kind of examples. Seeing from viewpoint of maintaining races, it is not only a entirely groundless theory but also clearly harmful. Like grass in the garden would die without cutting down, it is necessary to remove harmful elements for reforms of races . If we abolish this institution, we cannot achieve substances of reforms perfectly. Saying from a viewpoint of maintaining races, it is far profitable that capital punishment is made prosper still more and criminals who don't mend their ways although they are punished again and again should be removed unsparingly.

It goes without saying that these violent languages like demons are based on lacks of knowledge about jurisprudence, history, national science, and sociology, because the theory of biological evolution itself has not been systemized after all—that is, at first, it includes human position in the world of organism to the same class of other animals. Darwin turned over in his mind in the edition of *On the Origin of Species*⁴ that his theory shall extremely run counter to Christian faith and avoided explaining about the position of human beings. Like that, since today's scholars of the theory of biological evolution are busy to overthrow the dogmatism that Christianity had thought that 'human beings are the sons of the God' and don't have to spare to determine the human position accurately. They go beyond the point which should stop by the swing law of the pendulum and go to the contrary extreme point of the same dogmatism that 'human beings are one of animals'. But pendulum doesn't keep on moving forever. We must make pendulum stop the right point.

If ,as today's scholars imagine, our God, organism having evolved much higher than us human beings, lives in the other planet, if our planet has evolved like the other planet, and if evolution don't have a limit and human beings are not limits of evolution, we human beings are transitional livings which take the middle position between the God whose stage is what we shall reach in the future and animals whose stage is what

⁴ Accurately speaking, the name of his volume is *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*.

we had evolved past. If, today, we human beings excavate fossils of our ancestors when they had just evolved from apes and name them ‘anthropoid apes’, as anthropoid apes had become extinct, after we would become extinct, archeologists of the God who shall be descendents of human beings evolved from us would name ‘*anthropomorphic god*’s—that is, we are half-god and half-animal (I shall explain in detail about this point when I explain an ideal of social evolution). They scholars of theory of biological evolution say this; we human beings have evolved from anthropoid apes, anthropoid apes from four-footed animals, four-footed animals from birds and reptiles which have the amazing forms, and reptiles from fishes which had had entirely different forms from today’s ones. Human beings experience the process of one billion evolution from fishes to today’s human beings in nine month of unborn children. If so, nevertheless they have showed their reasoning powers boldly looking back the past, why don’t their reasoning powers entirely work in the point of future progress of human future evolution? This is a great laughing matter, isn’t it? –Theory of biological evolution until today is organized by dogmatism regarding human beings as a conclusive point of evolution. From the period of Darwin, theory of biological evolution has proved by other sciences that human beings has been animals to overthrow Christian faith which had advocated that human beings had been the sons of the God and compared human skeletons, muscles, internal organs, brains, and processes of breeding with other animals’ ones. In the point that it argues that Christian dogmas are not worth commenting on scientifically, it is faultless to criticize. It goes without saying that we don’t deny that it is unscientific to regard human beings as the sons of the God perfectly and to put on the heaven which are completely separated other animals. But, nevertheless human skeletons, muscles, internal organs, brains, and processes of breeding are never the completely same with other animals, though they mention that human beings are the completely same with other animals, they are not careful in territories of scientific studies more than Christianity which they abuse, ‘Christian dogmas are not worth commenting on scientifically’. If regarding human beings as the perfectly sons of the God is unscientific, regarding human beings as the perfectly same with other animals is also unscientific. –Human beings are a kind of animals. But like the mammals belong to different classes from birds or fishes in species of animals, we belong to the class of ‘human beings’ which is entirely different from other animals. A primary mistake which today’s theory of biological evolution has is putting human beings on the same class with other animals. If Christianity which is collapsed by their attacks is only a superstition, their theory of biological evolution is a clear superstition, too. As a superstitious religion which had been the core of societies until the societies had evolved the certain stages had finally

slaughtered innumerable scientists and disturbed social evolution, the theory of biological evolution which had overthrown a superstitious religion and contributed to social evolution has gotten animals' superstitious religion and disturbed social evolution today. Now, biologists advocating the theory of biological evolution of animals' religion have been pure Roman Catholic⁵ priests in thoughts world and societies. Like Darwin had criticized by believers of superstitious religion, it is inevitable as the usual state of social evolution that philosophy and religion of socialism have been oppressed by believers of animals' religion.

To include the class of human beings with the class of other animals, today's scholars of theory of biological evolution identify human struggles for existence with other animals' struggles for existence, use the word 'the survival of the fittest' not distinguishing the fit as animals with as human beings. And they deduce the word 'the survival of the fittest' from the dogmatic and horrible word 'the law of the jungle'. If the law of the jungle means that cows are weak because of bitten by a mosquito or human beings are weak because of bitten by a flea, though it is abnormal, these are true biologically. But those who argue like these establish many of standards of strength by claws and fangs. Needless to say, the word of the survival of the fittest or the law of the jungle only explains actual phenomena, so its content is empty. That is, the survival of the fittest only means 'the fittest species in their circumstances can survive as the fit', so if the circumstances are different, the fittest or the strongest are different. And circumstances are different according to each class of each living species. Han Yu⁶ said, 'even jiaolongs (imaginary animals like dragons) would be humiliated by ants or mole crickets, when they go ashore', and it most clearly explains the fact that superiors, the fit, or the strongest are different according to circumstances. Though lions survive as the fit or the strongest only in the circumstance of tropical deserts, in the circumstance of ice and snow of North Pole, obedient reindeer survive as by far the fit or the strong than lions. Though eagles get the fit or the strong in the circumstances of the vast heaven, they cannot help being the unfit or the weak than swallows or sparrows in the circumstances of openings under the eaves. In the circumstances of inside of the ground, horses are the unfit than moles and in the circumstances of inside of the mud, sea breems are by far the unfit than loaches. In the circumstances of inside of the rotten filths, earthworms adjust themselves their surroundings than socialists and maggots

⁵ In Japanese original text, this part is written 'Rōmakyō', not the word, 'Kirisutokyō', which means 'Christianity'. Thinking from referring to the Inquisition, he would have keep Roman Catholic priests in the medieval age in mind.

⁶ He was a poet and writer in Tang dynasty of China (768~824). He led the Revival Movement of Ancient writings in China and respected Confucianism (especially, he was famous for spreading Mencius' thoughts).

exist in the edges of receptacles for manure as the fit than biologists. –If today’s biologists advocating the theory of biological evolution know these facts, why don’t they hesitate to think the fittest of human beings whose circumstances are entirely different on the analogy of the other animals’ fittest? If they are not mentally deranged or don’t say that sea breams should be suffocated throwing in the mud because loaches are the fit inside the mud, horses should be buried alive in the holes because moles are the fit inside the ground, or human beings can only be the fit or the strong by living like earthworms or maggots, why do they identify human beings whose circumstances are different from other animals’ ones with other animals’ ones in a lump and confuse the human circumstances with the circumstances of four-footed animals which live by claws and fangs. If we compare the survivors in the circumstances of four-footed animals with the human survivors like theory of biological evolution, moralists and intellectuals would be the unfit in the struggle for existence because moralists don’t have fangs and intellectuals don’t have claws, and the most brutal and cruelest people must be regarded as the fit or the strong. So the Mr. Oka’s theory of criminal jurisprudence advocating selection by capital punishments is quite impossible.

As human struggle for existence weeds out immoral people by capital punishments, the contents are filled with the concepts of the moral fit or strong. As an order of explanations, at first, we shall argue about the fact that today’s theory of biological evolution doesn’t determine the unit of struggle for existence.

We believe that today’s theory of biological evolution determines the unite of the struggle for existence by dogmatic preoccupations of individualism. We search for socialism to struggle for existence for each species which theory of biological evolution had discovered—that is, the fact of struggle for existence for each society which aims at social existence and evolution. In this explanation, it needs to be decided the definition of an individual composed the unite of struggle for existence. We want to believe the definition adopted among the biologists; it is the definition of ‘the class of an individual’ taught by Haeckel⁷ (he was a scholar who most strongly insisted that socialism contradicted with the theory of biological evolution and his speech on the mass meeting of biologists in Munch organizes the main points of Dr. Oka’s criticism to socialism). Before the period of inventing microscopes, when we had argued about ‘individual organisms’, we had had no choice but to define ‘what are in pieces and spaces exist among the middle’ or ‘ones brought up from one ovum’. But these definitions cannot explain the splits of single-celled animals like amoebas because they don’t grow from

⁷ He was a zoologist in 19th century of Germany.

one ovum and cannot decide what living things of budding⁸ which are organized by individual living things breeding by the forms like woods are one individual organism, fragments of an individual organism, or groups of individuals because they don't have spaces among the middle. So, these definitions are extremely unclear. The concepts of 'having spaces among the middle' or 'one ovum' as definitions of individuals had gotten not to be able to use as a hypothesis after microscopes have invented and gotten to abandoned. If we use the concept of 'the class of an individual', we can think single-celled animals which spilt from other single-celled animals of independent individuals as innumerable individuals. And we can think them generating by cell divisions as individuals having the spaces among the middle from a point that they used to be parts of the initial individual. That is, single-celled animals generated by cell divisions are individuals in a point of being single-celled and original single-celled animals which make other single-celled be elements of themselves having spaces among the middle can be thought as extension of individuals. Living things of budding don't get elements having spaces among the middle but are independent individuals sticking with each other and their originals get big as individuals like woods get big. And since higher organism like human beings are also divided both sexes for the purpose of reproductions, we are individuals as men, women, parents, children, brothers, or sisters, and we are elements of huge individuals of societies having spaces among the middle. An organic conception of society or nation which is advocated as the truth in today has generated from these points (this explanation is important when we explain a theory of existing national personality in the Section 4, *The so-called principle of restorative-revolutionaries*). Since Dr. Oka has not explained about individuals organized the unite of struggle for existence in his *A lecture of the theory of evolution*, it is unavoidable that he has gotten to drive out socialism by the theory of biological evolution, but we have no choice to understand strange that Haeckel who taught us the concept of 'the class of an individual' stated, 'if we support the theory of struggle for existence, we cannot maintain socialism' in the mass meeting. The unite of struggle for existence through the world of organism is not only the small class as they interpret by individualism. One organism (to take instances of human beings, each individual) gets the unite of struggle for existence and at the same time one species (to take instances of human beings, each society) gets the unite of struggle for existence. And individuals have the consciousness as individuals. –When individuals feel themselves as individuals, these consciousnesses are called selfishness or individuality. When societies feel themselves as a individual, these consciousnesses are called public spirits

⁸ Hydras are one of these examples.

or sociality. Because individuals are elements of societies having spaces among the middle, and because societies are individuals summed up individuals of their elements, members of individuals and societies become the same. That is, by the class of an individual, one individual have a consciousness as a individual and have a consciousness of an individual in a society as a element of society.

Furthermore, namely, when our consciousnesses work as individuals, people act as individuals and when they work as societies, people act as members of societies, so we have selfishness and public spirits and have individuality and sociality. –Public spirits or sociality are when the huge individuals' selfishness of societies are felt by individuals as elements of societies, and selfishness which are felt by individuals of elements as a small individuals is also social selfishness in a point that the small individuals are elements of societies. Hence, there is no reason to call 'selfishness' or 'altruistic spirits' comparing with their spirits, and rather it is much proper to call 'the big self' or 'the small self'. If today's biologists advocating theory of biological evolution are not short of these scientific knowledge about individuals, it is entirely incomprehensive that they only admit the small self of individual selfishness, forget the big self of social selfishness, only think struggle for existence among the individuals and that struggle for existence is done by individual selfishness, and forget the struggle for existence among the societies and sociality and public spirits play important parts in the struggle for existence among the societies. Individual selfishness is equal to social selfishness and it is impossible to weigh the importance of the two. But since one of these selfishness is individuals', the other of these is societies', especially human beings have been superior to other animals by social unities and have compete with other groups assembled social units by the units of social units, human beings had needed more social selfishness, which are especially called public spirits, sociality, moral instincts, mind of the God and so on, and their selfishness had gotten to be put especially important positions. Many of living things which live by themselves like carnivorous animals keep their positions by struggle for existence based on selfishness as a animal and living things which live by groups improve their positions by struggle for existence by the units of societies based on social selfishness. Though Hobbes or Spinoza, when biology had not developed enough, had held dogmatic individualism by vague thoughts such as 'spaces' or 'ovum' without observing individuals by microscopes, they should not be blamed. But why have the very biologists still inherited those dogmatism, only advocated individual struggle for existence like those who are almost ignorant about a concept of individuals, and forgotten struggle for existence by sociality?

Today's biologists regard jewels they have as tiles. Don't they notice that gospels

which theory of biological evolution gave human beings have no equal any moral theory or religion? The theory of struggle for existence sounded like a demon's voice by Darwin has been led to discovering the principles of mutual aid in the period of Kropotkin. That is, this is the struggle for existence by units of societies which are the higher class of individuals and gave vague moral consciences from old times clear scientific bases. Ancient people had recognized this by speculative observations and recognizing social instinct intuitively. For example, Aristotle had said, 'man is by nature a political animal', and, 'one who is outside a state is the God or an animal'. Since Aristotle had always discovered societies as forms of political system, he had defined that man had made by nature a political system and a animal which lives in common and argued states based on this definition. And he had reached the conclusion that human beings can be human beings only if human beings have existed in *our* societies in philosophical history for the first time through understanding 'one who is outside a state is the God, or an animal'. When Cicero had said, 'bees don't form groups for making beehives but only form groups and work in common when they make their beehives since they have habits of making beehives. But human beings by nature form societies and work in common for common purposes since we have those natural habits', he had left an axiom which Kropotkin explained by biology in ancient Rome. This social selfishness had been most required in ancient times which keen competitions by the units of societies had been done and individual selfishness which should have been important alike had been oppressed entirely. So, when competitions by the units of societies had gone calm, just at the moment individual selfishness had gathered strength. Because of this, individualism had appeared in the later years of Greece and Rome and when competitions by the units of societies which had been done under the unification of Christianity in the medieval times, freedom of thoughts and religious faith and political and economic independence had realized. Individual freedom and independence had been required impartially and thoughts of individualism had gotten boundless great rivers. They had cleaned the whole world of Europe and their big waves had affected until the half of 19th century. Hence, it is not strange at all that parties of Hobbes and Rousseau who had been floating on the great rivers of individualism had not understood that human beings had been social existence; one imagined the natural situation of before contracts and expressed those as 'war of all against all', the other expressed those that everybody had freedom and independence like the God and constructed the theory of social contract on those hypothesizes.

But what a strange that the very biologists who have explained the facts that not only human beings but also many animals don't live one by one but form social groups by

biology have still kept holding legs of those who had died by drowning and kept drowning in the stream of individualism! Although *On the Origin of Species* of Darwin written in the half of 19th century had been affected by one-side individualism, decided the unit of struggle for existence as individuals people or animals, and because of this, the theory of struggle for existence had been led to direction contradicted with moral requests, we cannot request him to construct the facts which he had discovered as proper theory, since he had been busy to break a past creation myth of Christianity as a discoverer of the biological evolution. Why individualism had gotten not to maintain today at all is as follows; first, in a theoretical point, it puts entirely incoherent arguments—for example Hobbes concluded, ‘man by nature often deceives other man’, while he made a contradictory statement ‘men formed their societies by contracts’, and Rousseau said, ‘men have the sovereignty of freedom and independence by nature’, while he said that tyrannical and unreasonable societies ‘had been organized by contracts’—on its fundamental thought. Second, biological studies have revealed the fact that human beings had not existed one by one in fact. And today’s social sciences like politics or economics reveal that human beings had never formed societies by contracts. Biology has discovered the facts that human beings has existed forming societies because they are social animals like other animals has formed social groups, been awake from speculative dogmatism, and rebuilt scientific system fundamentally. And the explanations that human beings have not done ‘war of all against all’ or been free and independent existences like the God but been social existences as social animals combines with the explanation of evolution that great individuals which have tight social combinations has beaten other lonely individuals in the struggle for existence by the units of great individuals which are based on social selfishness—mutual aid. These conclusions made individualistic sciences be worthless. We can say this about economics which explain ‘it is much more productive that capitals and labors break and ruin with each other than work in common’ from an assumption that people have been independent and societies have only had individual selfishness and politics which explain ‘unions or groups like states or societies are unavoidable evils’ from an conclusion that people had existed as free and independent individuals before contracted; these conclusions have been reversed by the facts biology had discovered that why human beings had gotten the positions of champions to everything is because they had practice social selfishness—that is, mutual aid—as social organisms fundamentally. It is a common principle through the organic world that forming groups have a great power. –That is, plant-eating animals which do struggle for existence by the units of noble individuals based on mutual aid have beaten carnivorous animals

whose units have been based on lower individuals being independent and spread on the earth. If today's biologists, not only Dr. Oka, advocating theory of biological evolution understand that struggle for existence is seen only among the individuals or individual animals, they would not be able to understand why plant-eating animals, which individuals are much weaker than carnivorous animals, have beaten carnivorous animals. And they would not be able to explain innumerable phenomena that wild horses are never attacked by other carnivorous animals unless they break their groups and so on. If the facts are as they understand, it is logical that human beings not having fangs or claws would have become extinct in ancient primitive ages, isn't it? No! even barbarous cannibals don't get flesh they eat by struggle among the individuals (but by struggle among the societies)⁹ and they at least have communities they work in common as the units of struggle for existence for the purpose of battles. And we can say that even carnivorous animals, though their units of struggle for existence are small, understand common aid of warming themselves with their partners and children as mutual aid. The higher living things are, the higher the class of individuals are. In the stages of high grade animals like birds or mammals, they have done struggle for existence by the high grade units of vast and strong social groups which types of groups can be seen like societies of human beings. And struggle for existence by these high grade units of individuals have been done by those individuals' selfishness, that is, social selfishness—furthermore, that is, only mutual aid among the elements and only living things which can have the biggest individuals¹⁰ and practice the strongest mutual aid can survive in the world under the struggle for existence as the strongest winners. Human beings are one of the clearest instances in the winners. Biologists must think back on their preciousness; theory of struggle for existence by the units of societies or the survival of the fittest based on mutual aid are the much noble Gospel than Christ's or Buddha's. Because theory of biological evolution have reversed demon's knowledge by this Gospel fundamentally, the crown of 'socialism' is put on not only politics and economics but ethics, pedagogy, and psychology and history of human thoughts have begun to flow for the entirely new brilliant world! Exactly, theory of biological evolution had broken out the unprecedented great revolution in the philosophical world. Why we flatter ourselves as ones who construct socialism on the theory of biological evolution and intend to practice the large-scale revolution like theory of evolution is because we only have intentions to realize what biologists had practice in the world of thoughts in real societies. Although we are oppressed by

⁹ The word in the parentheses is extant in the original Japanese text but I added for making means clear.

¹⁰ This doesn't mean each living things but groups like societies.

biologists who interpret theory of biological evolution based on individualistic dogmatic assumptions, we cannot help being pleasant that the facts of biological evolution can be only explained by socialism.

Let us negate Dr. Oka's illusion and make him lead to right way. We don't believe that he doesn't reach to think struggle for existence by the high grade units more than individuals because he often refers to competitions among the races or states. But since he was careless that he didn't decide even a definition of individuals which were fundamental points when we decide the unit of struggle for existence, he seem not to understand at all that the unit of competitions expands according to evolution of species. That is, he doesn't understand that 'the unit of struggle for existence in lower animals is the lowest class of individuals and their struggle are competitions among the individuals. But with organic grade is high, the unit of competitions gets higher grade' and their struggle evolve struggles for existence based on mutual aid among the elements which regard great individuals of societies as final goals. Like that, he seem not to understand 'theory of social evolution' at all that this evolution of units, especially human beings (in the way of historical progress as human beings), expands more and more according to evolution of species. In this way, he sneers historical revolution insensitively, makes light of the theory of the World Federation of Nations which would be realized by future revolution, and becomes an ignorant and cruel admirer on imperialism.

The general public shall not require the biologist Dr. Oka historical knowledge. However, we suspect that a biologist of him advocating theory of biological evolution makes light of historical evolution as if he adopted the theory of universal circulation. Is the theory of circulation incompatible with the theory of evolution¹¹? If he believes the theory of biological evolution and also believes the theory of social evolution which regards human history as a trace of evolution of one species of human beings, it is a unworthy of a biologist advocating theory of evolution that he understands historical revolutions as repetitions of riots generated from a mere kind of fancy. This is a pure theory of circulation. And since he regards present geographically limited societies—states— as the unit of struggle for existence as, concludes that gaps of races which have generated on the way of today's evolution never become extinct in the struggle for existence, and so that he thinks everything statically, his thoughts are more and more incompatible with his theory of evolution. If he reflects on the traces of human

¹¹ Though its meaning is not clear, according to Kita, theory of universal circulation seemed to be incompatible with theory of evolution. Perhaps he would have thought that theory of universal circulation interpreted world's movement as a cycle, but theory of evolution interpreted it as a straight line.

evolution that human beings had lived in halfway up mountains, marshes, or mountain rivers having made fifty or sixty or a few hundred small groups and had no connection or battled with other small groups in primitive ages, after that small city-states which had had limited territories and limited populations had been born having annexed other villages in historic times little by little, and after many kinds of conquests or splits that large states like today's which have had fifty or sixty or a few hundred million people have gotten to confront with each other, he must follow up the principles which had led today's large states to the stages like today and infer that today's states would evolve more large in the future. We have no choice but to conclude that he doesn't understand the theory of biological evolution, since he tries to oppose socialism which makes efforts expecting future evolution of human societies at once from present competitions among the states or races based on today's discriminations.

We shall explain about competitions among the states of imperialism. But it is very pity that Dr. Oka has confirmed imperialism from his standpoint in biology—that is, nevertheless he is a scholar who undertakes the responsibility to instruct the general public, rather he follows the general public. Of course, as he says, we have struggle for existence among the varieties¹² as a biological fact and we don't deny that many things are settled by battles in those competitions. But this¹³ results from not understanding that the contents of competitions evolve according to evolving the class of species as above-mentioned. Though animals have done struggle for existence among the varieties by fangs and claws, they are mere facts, and it is irrelevant whether competitions among the varieties in the class of other species of human beings must be done by the same way or not. And although in the past and present times, human struggles for existence among the races or states have been done by battles, the initial struggles had been only done by those ways, and it is irrelevant whether the contents of human struggles for existence evolve according to evolving human beings and superiority or inferiority gets to be decided by other ways or not. The theory of abolishing wars of socialism thinks that human beings would not need wars because they would be perfect winners against other species as the units of struggle for existence from one reason why species would expand the unit of competitions according to evolution. And with this, socialism intends to make the World Federal Assembly decide about competitions among the states by discussions from other reason that contents of competitions of species would evolve according to evolution until the units of human beings (which we shall explain) would reach those stages.

¹² Organisms are divided by the classification of species, subspecies, variety. Variety is the lowest classification. Namely, competitions among the varieties mean ones among the individuals.

¹³ It means concluding that competitions are only seen the stage of individuals from above-mentioned

If you don't do slovenly infer to compare oratories of rural gentlemen in a prefectural assembly to piles of corpses or rivers of blood in international wars to infer from conflict of interests, like Dr. Oka, that wars are immoral but infer that today's conflict of interests among the states are not decided by wars like today but get to be decided by resolutions of the World Federal Assembly like conflict of interests among the regions are not decided by wars like past times but got to be decided by majority of a prefectural assembly, you would not commit a blunder to drive out socialism by the theory of biological evolution. Dr. Oka ignores the historical evolution and makes socialism and imperialism which are incompatible with each other be mixed just like he makes theory of evolution and theory of circulation which stab to death with each other. The theory of abolishing wars of socialism expects to be realized by the construction of the World Federation of Nations but the final goal of imperialism is to realize the peace that one state which is ruled by one race annexes, oppresses other races and states and makes other race and states not be able to rival. This is what people who had been led by many heroes had practiced and what the German emperor who was arrogant once had dreamed (it is said that the German emperor has abandoned imperialism to unify the world already, because other states¹⁴ and Social Democratic Party in his country are powerful). However, a Dr. Oka criticizes to an ideal of universal peace by socialism, 'Even if one race defeats other races and occupies the whole world, once interests are different according to places, battles shall happen here and there and united states shall divide some states'. What a wild argument! This is a assertion of imperialism and an empty theory what socialism strongly drives out. Of course, history doesn't repeat itself like he who has a thought like theory of circulation says. Hence, although states are divided after unified by conquests, these situations are not the same of the past ones; they confront with other ones by larger units than past ones or divide themselves small units to make themselves be larger units. No one is meaningless in history. In this point, it is true that competitions among the states until today had made societies evolve by conquests or annexation—that is, they had made the class of individuals be high by what sociologists call 'assimilating actions' and evolve great states like today. So, we strongly recognize that imperialism is the journey of social evolution which was the most powerful historically. But differentiating actions exist with assimilating actions. Since evolution of competitions among the states which had been forced to assimilated by outside forces had been disturbed assimilating actions by other way of evolution, differentiating actions, and differentiating actions had been oppressed by

¹⁴ They point Great Powers such as Britain, French, Russia, and so on. Especially, he would have keep Britain in mind, since Britain was only a powerful state than German at that time.

forced to assimilate from outside, the speed of social evolution had been very slow. –The World Federation of Nations socialism advocates intends to make global assimilating actions act on the differentiated developments of states and races. Hence, socialism drives out those who threaten their own countries' independence and doesn't permit invasions which are done to force their assimilating actions to influence on other states. –In this point, socialism recognizes states and consequently competitions among the states. Though we respect not only Darwin who advocated theory of biological evolution but a great contribution of Marx¹⁵ who advocated theory of social evolution, we don't regard their words as the articles of faith as modern people evolved than them. we receive class competitions and states competitions as they are; because classes cross societies and states run through societies¹⁶. But don't overlook that assimilating actions would get to drive out remarkable gaps among the classes gradually, as a result conflicts in small countries would become extinct by historical evolution—that is, the class of individuals, the units of competitions, would be made to be high and to evolve—and contents of those competitions would evolve. The theory of the World Federation of Nations by socialism intends to make the unit of these competitions evolve to world unit and the contents of state competitions evolve to resolutions of the Federal Assembly. Though class conflicts had been always done by rebellions or assassinations because they had not had political organs to settle those struggles, they have made their contents evolve and gotten to resort voting to settle those struggles. Like that, the theory of the World Federation of Nations is advocated to settle state competitions by voting in the future, though present competitions among the states have been done by the way of diplomatic scheming and slaughters of wars because they have not had political organs to settle those competitions. Of course, you would not be able to imagine that interests in the Federal Assembly get to reach consensuses in a short time after socialism shall be realized, even if assimilating actions are practiced in state competitions like practiced in class competitions, become extinct state competitions like class competitions, states evolve more, competitions among the Federations perfectly become extinct, human beings reach a utopia of one united state¹⁷, and they get to make their societies evolve by assimilating actions which regard the whole human beings as compatriots and differentiating actions of individuals developing without obstacles. Because socialism is not a fancy of utopian world conquests like imperialism. If Dr. Oka wants to give hot arguments in a prefectural

¹⁵ Perhaps, Marx's theory of social evolution means what he advocated that societies would shift from capitalism to socialism, and to communism finally (it is irrelevant whether this can be called 'theory of social evolution' or not).

¹⁶ Meaning of this sentence is not clear because expressions of Japanese original text is unclear.

¹⁷ It means the World Federation of Nations.

assembly as an example, he must never compare international wars to them but to speeches or discusses by representative of every country in the Federal Assembly. If he wants to conclude that wars are immoral from conflict of interests, he must demonstrate as a presupposition that firing guns or drawing swords are often seen in a prefectural assembly. On earth, scientists must restrain themselves from play with similes or metaphors.

When you stop to think about it, many of those who advocate theory of competitions among the races by their way of cruel and ignorant talking are biased that civilians are by nature different from barbarians. If Dr. Oka has this preoccupation, this is a serious problem and we cannot help concluding that he advocates a creation myth which had been overthrown by Darwin. Many of today's biologists advocating theory of biological evolution, though we shall explain, especially inherits a creation myth unconsciously and form the pivots of their thoughts. Civilized people have not been civilians since the beginning of creation. Barbarians have not been created as barbarians who have been ordered to be barbarians as long as they live until the earth has died. Even barbarians would develop as enough as civilians if they are brought up in the air of civilized countries and even what is called civilians would be barbarians perfectly if they are put in villages of barbarians. 'Human beings can be human beings only if human beings have existed in *our* societies'. As we stated on the arguments of ethics in the previous section, human beings can be wolves depending on their environments. If so, we would be able to imagine easily that people shall be made as civilians when their social circumstances are civilized societies but they shall be made as barbarians when their social circumstances are barbarous ones. We have only been civilized people since we are brought up in civilized societies, absorb and learn knowledge which have been collected until today from the primitive age which is reckoned a hundred thousand years by 20 years old¹⁸. Barbarians have had no knowledge until they die and have only always repeated barbarous lives because they have remained the stage of hominids by their surrounding circumstances or they have surrounded social circumstances having evolved the different directions from ours. Though we don't understand how long it had taken to discover uses of fire, we have already watched amazing combustion by oil and emission of light by electricity when we have suckled, haven't we? Though we don't understand when the decimal system had been invented and how this invention had put human knowledge in order, we have known higher mathematics than that when we have been 5 or 6 years old, haven't we? Though we human beings known the facts that our earth had been revolving around the sun rotating on its axis and it had been

¹⁸ Japanese civil law treated and treats those who got 20 years old as adults (article 4).

spherical only five or six hundred years ago, that is, 99,500 years later from the primitive age, we have already understood not only those facts but those reason clearly when we have been schoolchildren of 12 or 13 years old. Since the great steamship which had taken captain Columbus and fireman Watt on board and filled with social and historical had set sail to make a world tour taking Darwin, the theory of biological evolution had been discovered. And we have argue about this amazing knowledge in this volume, haven't we? –Civilized people are formed as civilized people not only physical inheritance as civilized people but social inheritance of civilized knowledge. We civilized people have not been by nature civilized people but been formed civilized people by put on societies which have inherited these historical knowledge and receiving these knowledge. See the innumerable examples in even Benjamin Kid's, *Social Evolution*, who can be called a representative scholar interpreting theory of evolution by individualism that even children in barbarians' villages can develop almost as equal as civilized people if they are brought up under the civilized education. We don't make light of the difference of inheritance by differentiated developments of races until today since we had discovered the fact, 'human beings can be human beings only if human beings have existed in *our* societies'. But if someone thinks that everything is based on physical inheritance, forgets social inheritance—that is, historical accumulations of knowledge, and intends to produce counterevidence such as 'one natives in the South Seas get headaches when they intend to count more than ten', we shall answer this respecting them greatly; those examples occur because they get old and get weak the central nerve system, and it is the same that wide barbarous elders¹⁹ have not had a opportunity to understand right knowledge until they die, however they are taught that their theory of struggle for existence based on faith of animals' religions are wrong. No! Inheritance itself is an instinct which inherits knowledge of species by the theory of biological evolution.

But needless to say, barbarians like today have not existed on the earth as materials for scientists forever. We have an ideal as socialists that all human beings are compatriots and knowledge by those consciousnesses based on the monism of human beings. However, we admit that racism has existed as it is. –Don't misunderstand. Though we advocate making lower races cease to exist, those ways don't take the form of race competitions such as expulsion or slaughters like so far but take the form that barbarians themselves evolve the stage of civilization or they shall not be able to maintain their present states as barbarians by the cruel law of struggle for existence. We advocate socialism based on the law and ideal of social evolution independently from

¹⁹ It means biologists.

humanitarianism that engages people's sympathy shedding tears. One of the way of evolution is the struggle for existence. Like, on the way of social evolution, innumerable individuals who don't have moral of mutual aid have been selected as the unfit, it is avoidable that races who cannot progress going side by side with progress of civilization have had no choice but to become extinct. The great societies of human beings have been one great individuals above geographic small societies. Like small societies have been able to evolve by selecting individuals who had been worse in the points of truth, virtue, and beauty²⁰, it is avoidable that races who are worse in the points of truth, virtue, and beauty are selected, when great societies evolve. –But it is quite irrelevant that whether those who cannot progress the stage of civilization become extinct as barbarians or civilized people have the right to oppress and ruin barbarians. The contents of struggle for existence evolve according to historical progress of human races like they evolve by evolution of species' class. Though individuals who hadn't had morals of mutual aid had been selected by capital punishments, now they have become extinct by other ways of competitions because of having evolved from the past. Like that, struggle for existence among the races shall not done by expulsion or slaughters but by the ways which don't contradict with today's ideals of justice. Don't shudder at the name of 'ruin'. If those who are lack of sociality as individuals and races are not selected, why can 'anthropomorphic gods' evolve the higher stage. Although races or nations are the individuals as small societies and their unfit members as their elements are selected, if individuals, other elements, evolve as the fit, it is not ruin but evolution as long as we see them as individuals of societies which make them be their members. Like that, even though races who cannot go with evolution become extinct but other races evolve and reach in the territory of the God, it is never ruin but delightful evolution from the viewpoint of the great individuals based on the monism of human beings. –For those who advocate humanitarianism of individualism, these conclusions shall sound cruelly. Yes, they are cruel. The cruel law of struggle for existence cruelly selects those who are unfit in the circumstance as 'anthropomorphic gods'—namely, those who don't have truth, virtue, or beauty. In this way, even socialism, like Christianity had dared to sacrifice crusades under the name of Christ, shall bury fifty or sixty thousand unfit people to worship 'the God' on the innumerable dead bodies of individuals and races. However, as we shall explain following paragraphs, individuals never die. Though the great individuals of unified human beings select their members of unfit elements, they can live by other elements and they evolve for the infinite heaven. That is, those who don't have truth, virtue, and beauty become extinct by having them with their evolution and those who

²⁰ Truth in recognition, virtue in ethics, and beauty in aesthetics are regarded as universal values.

have not had them forever can live by other elements who have them and evolve based on them. But because of jumping to a conclusion at once that this struggle for existence is killing with each other, the theory of criminal laws which advocates selections by capital punishments like Dr. Oka says has appeared and theory of struggle for existence is advocated as ignorant and cruel theory of race competitions. After had entered historic age, we human beings had been making the contents of struggle for existence evolve, accordingly, the contents of justice. If, nevertheless today's social consciousness gets extremely keen and we have justice having evolved the degree of not being able to endure to make compatriots be in great difficulty, some scholars still advocate ignorant and cruel theory of race competitions and think that we don't mind oppressing miserable them, we shall ask them actually; though human beings have experienced the age of fishes and animals in nine month of unborn children, and become human beings, since they have revived the primitive age in their childhood, and so abortions are the same of fishing and hunting animals, they should be excluded from the theory of criminal laws which advocates selections by capital punishments, shouldn't they? Why don't you kill barbarians who you bear and have on your lap rather than barbarians who live in the distant tropics which we have to go by warships? Even extremely barbarians are not killed. Still less, why do we kill with each other by reason of being different from skin color simply?

Even the theory of criminal laws which advocates selections by capital punishments cannot avoid a fault. If we argue, like Dr. Oka and scholars of the criminal law who interpret punishing powers of states based on the theory of struggle for existence, 'those who are hopeless to be penitent should be sentenced capital punishments for races' improvement', we are put in the situation that states cannot punish those who killed their old parents who are hopeless to recover with poison because of that logic. If we insist that repeaters should be executed making capital punishments more for improvement and progress of races, we cannot help providing scaffolds in the hospitals which take in patients of a pulmonary tuberculosis²¹ who disturb improvement and progress of races most taking a matter too seriously. We cannot help sentencing bad-looking women and stupid men to death without taking into consideration for improvement and progress of races and making scholars who are harmful for improvement and progress of races tie like donkeys and send scaffolds. Though it goes without saying that struggle for existence is one of means to realize improvement and progress of races, it is unreasonable that struggle for existence should always be done

²¹ A pulmonary tuberculosis was feared as a *incurable disease* in those days Japan.

by capital punishments. –In one individual of society, what other elements or groups of elements slaughter one elements in it had been permitted by general consciousness in the age of one-side socialism, but it has not been regarded as justice today. Extremely examples which great elements had been regarded as criminals and executed by other elements or groups of elements are Christ and Socrates. As we have argued in previous section (Section 2), we define crimes as going against general consciousness. General consciousness at one age does not always get general consciousness at next age. Many of general consciousness at next age is composed by special elements having foresight who had been regarded as criminals by general consciousness at one age. If you advocate that other elements or groups of elements have the right to slaughter one elements by consciousness of the time of one-side socialism today, it is an attempt to revive punishing powers which the Roman Pope had had against scholars and theories, isn't it? Suppose that Darwin was born in the medieval age instead of Galileo. And suppose that *On the Origin of Species* was written in the medieval Italy. Biologists advocating theory of biological evolution must go to the gallows by their logics. Dr. Oka shall not have enough knowledge about criminal jurisprudence but why doesn't he suspect why prerogative of every evolution is held by only special individuals?

Anyway, human races' struggle for existence has the moral contents entirely like the theory of criminal laws which advocates selections by capital punishments remains today. This is not only human beings. It can be applied all living things such as plant-eating animals which lives forming groups and do struggle for existence by the units of societies. Lower animals, because their units of struggle for existence are the lowest individuals, their contents are based on individual selfishness. The higher stages animals progress, the more their units expand and the more noble they become, and they get struggle for existence which have moral contents of social selfishness—that is, sociality. Hence, carnivorous animals (which do competitions) by individual selfishness decide superiority by fangs and claws, but in general plant-eating forming social groups, ones which have developed sociality are the fit or the strongest, and ones which harm social groups by only small selfishness are selected as unfit ones in struggle for existence. For example, they say that elephants exile ones which harm their social peace from their groups and monkeys punish ones which commit adultery most severely. Everybody shall know moral selections²² in ants' and bees' societies. And human beings are moral organisms organizing the biggest societies. So, moral struggle for existence is done strongly the degree of selecting by capital punishments.

In fact, human beings have been moral organisms since the ancient primitive age. We

²² The meaning of 'moral selections' is not clear.

want to conclude this; they are groundless hypotheses to be renounced that scholars of the time of individualism imagined that the situation of pre-contract was war of all against all and that hominids had been pure cannibals who had slaughtered with each other wholly. That is, although we imagine the primitive age as the age of fishery or hunting and infer that they had learned man-eating from killing fishes or birds, those would have been what had occurred in far latter age. We believe that it is far reasonable to infer that they had lived peacefully picking natural products grown in unlimited, rich, and fertile lands unless they had evolve to invent tools using fishery or hunting. If hominids had been cannibals, children who revive the primitive age in short years would always have to show cruel characters at least one time like when they sit putting the sole of their feet like animals do. The truth is just the opposite of that; childhood is the most peaceful and cowardly age and their smiles are called 'smile of the god', isn't it? And it can be said that the facts that children are peaceful and cowardly reveal that hominids had lived peacefully and feared a roll of thunder, wind, rain, fierce animals, fierce gods, darkness, and so on innumerable. We believe; on earth a fundamental mistake is caused that they name today's barbarians 'hominids' and guess our primitive age from these lives. Battling with each other and man-eating are only seen in races who suffer from hunger or get violent because of climates. Although today's barbarians might do battles and man-eating prosperously, scholars who admit divided developments of races should not infer the primitive age of today's civilized people who had been put under the happy circumstances being different from barbarians and developed the degree of being as different as the heaven and the bottom of rivers from the lives of barbarians. Although today's human beings sometimes have meat, those are what had occurred in far latter age as well, and when they had differentiated from anthropoid apes with today's monkeys and gotten hominids, they would have lived forming social groups in rich plains as pure plant-eating animals. Because biological fact is that plant-eating animals forming social groups had beaten carnivorous animals which live by themselves and spread on the earth like today, and it is groundless to imagine that hominids had not formed peaceful groups like monkeys and killed with each other like tigers unless we believe that human beings have belonged to near the cat family such as tigers rather than today's monkey family. No, even tigers killed with each other at random among them as we shall explain about food competitions on the follows. Their conscious opponents in their struggles for existence are plant-eating animals, and their struggles for existence are the competitions among the different species which are animals eating meat and animals eaten by them. Several struggles among the same species to be done indirectly and unconsciously to same food

have not occurred except when their desires overlap with each other and conflict because of having few food. If even carnivorous animals having fangs and claws like tigers don't compete with each other when they are satisfied with enough food, it is really unthinkable that primitive people who are presumed to be put in rich natural products had competed with each other wholly in the situations that food is more than enough the degree that even tigers don't compete with each other and they had been unsocial organisms who had eaten human flesh. The time of having ruled Yao or Shun was this primitive age.

However, with their populations had increased, having been rich and fertile lands had gotten small for them, some people had gotten to do fishery or hunting, the other had gotten to do nomadic lives, and they had gotten to compete with each other violently for fishing grounds and pasture; these competitions had been struggles for existence by the units of villages—that is, small societies, and had required each member of their villages mutual aid most strongly. Independence and freedom of each member of them had been ignored entirely and struggles for existence by villages had gotten to be felt as the final goals of their lives in their simple brains. —These consciousness are that an unconscious and instinctive sociality of hominids what is called ‘people shall have a good influence, if they are left as they are’²³ was roused as awaken moral consciousness by social evolution of struggles for existence, aren't they? It is an extremely childish idea to jump to conclude inhumane competitions in the age of fishery, hunting, and nomadic lives as ‘immoral situations’. We had been able to be conscious ourselves as social existence at last because of these competitions among the villages; this was seen the ancient time of one-side socialism. Freedom and independence of individuals had been entirely trampled because of struggles for existence by the units of societies and those who had been regarded as immoral from general consciences at one time had been selected by rash and cruel ways of capital punishments by consciences of one element of societies²⁴ or groups of elements²⁵ under the pretext of societies. Because monarchs had not only been elements of societies but occupied all parts of societies²⁶, Louis 14th in the time of one-side socialism had said, ‘*L'état c'est moi* (a state is just me)’. Only one element of monarchs were regarded as states and all other elements in them existed for interests of monarchs of states. Moral duties of being faithful to monarchs had agreed with patriotism by monarchs' existence and those who had been disloyal to monarchs had been treated with rebels to states. These selections by one-side socialism had been

²³ This word is in Chapter 57 of *Lao-tzu*, Chinese classic.

²⁴ It means monarchs.

²⁵ It means the noble class.

²⁶ This point is argued in the Section 4 in detail.

doing from the primitive age to the medieval age and have been doing before our eyes today. When ancient Greece or Rome was constructed, one-side socialism by the units of races was prosperous and it poisoned Socrates (since it had been a democratic state, a state was not formed one element like Louis 14th and the state will was the group will of elements). Since struggles for existence based on feudal divisions in the medieval Dark Ages had been violent, those who had gone against the will of elements who had formed the noble class had been selected by the ways of the rashest and cruelest death penalties as social rebels, and only monarchs or noble classes who had expressed social wills had kept their freedom and independence. Individuals of lower classes had not been approved their rights at all. That simple historical philosophy 'without hostile nations or foreign threats, states shall fall' reveals that struggles for existence had been done by the units of small societies divided racially or geographically from the ancient age to the medieval age and individuals had existed for states (actually, one element or groups of elements where had lodged national wills) which had been the units of those struggles. If we interpret struggle for existence by dogmatic assumptions of individualism before and behind the French Revolution, we cannot explain human history, namely, the theory of social evolution at all (this explanation is important when we shall explain about nature of states and state wills in the following. See the Section 4, *The so-called principle of restorative-revolutionaries*).

But social evolution is led to not only assimilating actions but differentiating actions. Struggles for existence by the units of societies which had been divided small societies, conflicted, and competed had been assimilated by the ways of conquests or annexations as results of conflictions and competitions. When the units of societies had expanded by assimilations, competitions among the individuals had occurred by divisions of individuals and as a result of it, human history had entered the age of individualism. Why an indication of individualism in later years of ancient Greece and Rome is because the units of societies had expanded by assimilating actions based on conquests and annexations and struggles for existence by the units of societies had been put down. Though those had been an awakening of requiring competitions to develop dividedly, those had progressed with not putting out buds in the darkness of the medieval age based on one-side socialism because Roman had been ruined by the Germanic peoples who had happened to do struggles for existence by the units of societies at that time. But when struggles for existence by the units of small societies based on feudal divisions had been assimilated under the power of Catholic Church of Roman Pope, those bud had gotten the great stream of individualism and led societies to the times of evolution by assimilating actions of individuals. By the law of social evolution based on

the movement like wave patterns, on the contrary a creation myth had regarded the positions of human beings as sons of the God, the theory of biological evolution has regarded human beings as the beast family. Like that, to overthrow the class states which had forced individuals of one element of societies to be sacrificed for kings or nobles of other elements of societies, the values of individuals had been recognized as final goals and people had gotten to regard that societies or states had been organized for freedom and independence of individuals and they had been mechanical artificialities which had been able to be broken up by individuals' wills. A proverb 'individuals must be treated with purposes, so they must not be treated with means'²⁷ was a spirit of individualism. Why the theory of struggle for existence which Darwin advocated was composed by only struggle for existence by the units of individuals perfectly is because he had been influenced by these side effects of one-side individualism. Dr. Oka and general biologists advocating theory of biological evolution should know that today's theory of struggle for existence has experienced the historical process²⁸.

These struggles for existence by the units of societies and individuals construct the theory of social evolution based on two piles of one-side socialism and one-side individualism. Social evolution had been supported by these two piles, though they had shaken because some time these two plies had gotten longer, the other time these had gotten shorter, and these shall evolve in positive and rapid ways by an ideal of social democracy which is constructed in parallel with these two piles for the first time. Social democracy not only regards social interests as final goals but advocates authorities of individuals strongly. Since individuals are elements of societies and societies are those elements themselves, individuals are societies. If you interpret like a view of mechanical societies in the period of one-side individualism that individuals are only in actual existence and societies are relationships or situations formed groups of individuals, a proverb 'individuals must be treated with purposes, so they must not be treated with means' doesn't have a meaning. As long as individuals are societies themselves as elements of societies, purposes of individuals should be purposes of societies. –In this sense, socialism inherits individualism. However, individuals as elements of societies go to ruin by their death. So, when individuals as elements of societies themselves are set as final goals, it is meaningless because their purposes come to an end after fifty years²⁹. Hence, freedom and independence of individuals

²⁷ Perhaps this phrase is Kant's words.

²⁸ It means that we should know that Darwin's theory of evolution is only a transitional one.

²⁹ The average of life span at that time of Japan had been lower fifty years.

only have strict meanings under the final goals of social evolution. And if freedom and independence of individuals as elements of societies are oppressed by other elements or groups of elements like one-side socialism, contents of social consciences cannot be rich by struggles for existence based on individuals' assimilating actions because wills of power classes such as monarchs or nobles are absolute nonaggression. Hence, even if social existence is set the final goals, we can expect only very slow social evolution—that is, societies can only bring the whole elements of them happiness and evolution, and give elements of particular classes in societies freedom and independence. Other lower classes are done perfect foundations to construct prosperities and happiness of upper classes. Social evolution is based on assimilating actions and differentiating actions. It had been unavoidable that evolution of times had not be able to be rapid because freedom and independence of individuals which had been indispensable to make differentiating actions do perfectly had been monopolized monarchs (in the period of monarchy) or a handful of nobles (in the period of aristocracy). It is natural that societies have begun to evolve very vigorously after the whole people are recognized free and independent and differentiating actions are done by most of people like today's and future period of democracy. Socialism cannot be noble without individualism. We must thank that individualism have developed.

I hope that today's individualists and nationalists take a glance of situations of present societies. Economic nobles defend their own territories in each region (if land lords) or in each occupation (if capitalists) like feudal lords, plunder economic resources of states, forget their duties that they must make efforts as elements of states for national happiness, and just deal with states as means. —Can nationalists endure be resigned to these situations? Only economic nobles are independent economically and advocate freedom of individuals freely, but the class of economic warriors and serf wholly obey them like slaves and individuals' authorities have been driven away like in before the French Revolution. —Don't individualists have a question against these situations? We don't advocate socialism by sorrows and sympathies but advocate the theory on the theory of scientific fatalism. Hence, we don't regard the period of economic aristocracy until today as evil and a mistake. We recognize that since the whole elements of societies cannot be honored at once as a natural process of social evolution, only elements of one class had been able to be independent economically and get political and moral freedom. But this is only a temporary process, so of course this is not a permanent one. Though once nobles had constructed their authorities on sacrifices of other elements by forces, lower class who had been forced to sacrifice have gotten freedom and independence with social evolution and spread political and moral freedom

and equality to the whole elements of societies legally. Like that, though only today's economic noble class is honored by economic evolution as one of processes of economic history, if economic evolution by public owning of lands and capitals is realized, the classes of economic warriors and serf which are forced to sacrifice as lower class shall get political and moral independence by economic freedom and equality. –Why don't individualists practice the French Revolution again? Why don't nationalists practice the Restoration again? Understand that modern societies are economic class states by aristocracy. Nationalism which had realized Restoration overthrowing class states must transfer lands and capitals of economic nobles to states by 'the supreme ownership' and individualism which had realized the French Revolution sweeping away aristocracy and legislating democratically must advocate the theory of freedom and equality and change despotic powers of economic nobles in a producing aspect into a democratic council system. How could nationalism and individualism oppress our Real Socialism on the pretext of states or individuals?

Exactly, nationalism and individualism can only realize their perfect ideals. States get one individual including elements of individuals, and the world makes states their own elements. Hence, as what makes individuals the best is the most noble moral duties to states and societies, states have a moral duties to make themselves the best for their own elements of individuals and the world which includes states as its elements. By carrying out these duties, states can be ethical institutions like Luther said. But like if individuals harm interests of states giving their small selves priority, they are regarded as crimes from a view of big selves of states if states—no, like imperialists admire, forgetting big selves of the world like today and taking every action by small selves of states are crimes of states ignoring that they are ethical institutions. Like freedom of individuals has a meaning for other big selves, independence of states has a strict meaning for big selves of the world. Hence, like one-side individualism, dealing with states as means for interests of individuals is immoral from a view of big selves of states. Like that, regarding states which are based on small selves as final goals and ignoring differentiated developments of all states and races of the world like one-side socialism is impermissible immoral from a view of big selves of the world. Like if freedom of individuals is abused, it produces crimes, if independence of states is abused, it dare to practice innumerable horrible crimes. –That is why socialism is cosmopolitanism. It respects independence of states like it recognizes freedom of individuals. But it drives out forgetting big selves of states for freedom of individuals or bigger selves of the world for independence of states. No! states by the units of small societies in the period of one-side socialism had trampled freedom of individuals for

state competitions, so states having trampled freedom of individuals had not contributed differentiation of the world at all. Hence, they had been the unfit in struggles for existence by the units of states. –An ideal independence of states as ethical institutions shall be realized by the World Federation of Nations based on socialism and perfect freedom of individuals by socialistic peace of all nations which have no one-side social competition by the units of small societies. Nevertheless that French Revolution of individualism had been done for realization of the theory of freedom and equality, when it had begun to do struggles for existence by the units of nations against neighboring allied forces, it had trampled freedom of individuals entirely, had sent Mrs. Roland³⁰ a guillotine, taken freedom of royalists entirely, and butchered them. Like that, we can see how ideals of individualism are only a dream under the state competitions. And if we see that those who advocated arguments against war on the eve of the Russo-Japanese War³¹ were striped them of all freedom by one-side socialism of ‘national unity’, we can see how ideals of socialistic peace of all nations should be advocated for ideals of individualism. There is nothing for it but to think identifying socialism with one-side socialism in the period that states by the units of small societies had been regarded as almighty and criticizing that it makes individuals melt in societies of shallow. If peace of all nations are realized, competitions among the states shall be done in the platform of the Federal Assembly which is carefree to ruin, states shall be ethical institutions for the world culture, and freedom of individuals shall carry out moral duties to the world culture through or beyond the states. And if like class conflicts which are battled in platforms of Congresses today become extinct perfectly and societies are unified in the situations without lateral differentials, state competitions which shall be competed in the Federal Assembly become extinct in the future perfectly and states are unified in the situations without vertical obstacles—Ah, this is the very utopia and ‘anthropomorphic gods’ shall evolve spreading their wings by assimilating actions of big societies by the units of the world and differentiating actions of individualities which are developed without obstacles. Nationalism and individualism can only realize their ideals perfectly when they are covered with social democracy.

Let us return to explain the theory of struggle for existence. As we have explained above-mentioned, human struggles for existence have been formed by the units of societies and individuals as it applies all species. And since human beings have been

³⁰ She was a wife of Roland who had belong to a Gironde party and taken office of the Home Secretary.

³¹ For example, Kotoku Shusui and Sakai Toshihiko of socialists and Uchimura Kanzo who was a Christian can be mentioned.

transitional organisms which shall evolve higher stages, they had gotten to make their small units of societies larger units of societies by assimilating actions gradually; On the other hand, they have subdivided villages or family groups which had divided larger units than individuals by differentiating actions at first, have regarded individuals as the units of struggles, and have gotten to do subdivided competitions. But thus, with propelling assimilations and differentiations in the units of struggles for existence, struggles for existence by the units of societies which have been expanded by assimilations and by the units of individuals which have been subdivided by differentiations evolve the contents of those competitions. Namely, struggles for existence by the units of societies had been done by battles entirely from the period of fishery, hunting, or nomadic lives and struggles by the units of individuals had also been done just like that. So, from within the states which had been superior to others in a military power—namely, individuals who had been superior to others in a force, some people had become chiefs of villages (in the period of fishery, hunting, or nomadic lives), the other had become kings, nobles, or warrior—knight, samurai and so on—(until the medieval age from the historic times), and in this way, they had been the fit of the struggle for existence. However, since struggles for existence resorting to military powers have been limited one aspect³² of competitions by the units of societies today, the class of soldiers have been the fit within that aspect. But in struggles for existence by the units of individuals inside the states, those who resort to violence like nobles or samurais previous the medieval age have not been regarded as the strong, just like robberies cutting people which had been had a habit of samurais have been weeded out by capital punishments or other heavy punishments. Struggle for existence inside the nations had completely changed its contents after the French Revolution had practiced (after the Meiji Restoration had practiced in Japan) and those who had been superior to others in an ability of economic activities had gotten to be regarded as the fit. But since strength of powers had determined all foundations of ownership even in upper class before the Revolution, those who had been superior to others in strength of powers had regarded as those who had had ability of economic activities. Like that, even those who have had ability of economic activities today have been explained their rights by the theory of labors of individualism as an ideal.

Nevertheless, the fit in economic wars have inherited ancient thoughts of theory of occupations³³ and made efforts to be economic nobles. If the theory of labors of the French Revolution which had overthrown occupations of military class in the medieval

³² It points wars.

³³ For the theory of labors or occupations, see the Chapter 2 of Section 1.

age advocated the world of individuals' competitions competed on flat equal conditions without inventions of steam and electricity, individuals who work most industriously would have been the fit in struggle for existence. But this was only an ideal. When economic noble class hold feudal castles of machines, the fittest in struggle for existence are babies born in those castles as if eggs of flies born in dirty mud existed as the fit of flies. –Ah! the fit should be admired! The word of the survival of the fittest or the law of the jungle has been hidden their contents from outside. The argument 'if the circumstances of species are different, the fittest or the strongest are different' should be understood in this sense. Under these economic aristocratic countries, any philosophy, any scientist, or any poet is the loser of struggle for existence who is scolded by nobles in front of their carriages. As in the period of economic civil wars, the most dishonest, wisest, and cruelest Hiranuma Kihachiro³⁴ and so on were the fittest, pure stupid Daimyos are the fit, the strong in trusts of economic feudalism. –Let us repeat to admire. Government and scholars oppress socialism to maintain this world of struggle for existence. In the period of these economic aristocratic countries, the fit of bureaucrats and scholars who form the class of economic warriors think the mind of Kusunoki Masashige³⁵ and sandayu (those who managed households in nobles or the rich houses such as butlers) who had pledged their loyalties to obey most slavishly as the mind of people. The fit who narrowly earn livings escaping from dismissals, though they are the weak in the class of economic serf, are slaves in a perfect sense who don't understand what rights are.

We can say that the fittest, or the strongest like these shall be losers in struggle for existence in the period of socialism.

³⁴ Perhaps he was a businessman...Detail is unknown.

³⁵ Kusunoki Masashige was a leader of samurai in Nambokucho era (1336-1392) in Japan. He pledged the emperor of Godaigo, resisted Kamakura Shogunate, and battled with Ashikaga Takauji who intended to construct the new Shogunate (Muromachi Shogunate).

Since a reign of the emperor of Godaigo (1333-1336) was a radical restoration which gave favorable treatment to court nobles but gave cold treatment to samurais, it lost the support of the people and Ashikaga Takauji rebelled the Court taking advantage of discontents of the general public. But he kept on pledged the emperor of Godaigo after that, took on Takauji for a final battle in Minatogawa (a present district of Kobe city in Hyogo Prefecture), and died in the battle there in 1336. It is said that in the battle in Minatogawa, he had been determined dying in the battle.

His *self-sacrificing* loyalty (in literally) have praised as a model of loyal retainer and especially he was treated as a hero in the Meiji era.

For Masashige, Kita take up in the Section 4 again.