

Section 3 The theory of biological evolution and social philosophy

Chapter 7

Here, there is a problem to happen invariably; the principle of population; Malthus' principle of population which argues that we shall not be able to live because of overpopulation if we leave free loves of men and women to take as their own course¹. Here, we have reached the stage we should explain food competitions of struggles for existence by the units of societies in the socialistic period.

If, as Mill, a economist of individualist, interpreted, Malthus' principle of population doesn't mean an iron wall which bars the way of societies but a net which is laid under the present societies, this is true to some extent. Because they are individualists who interpret these societies as an aggregate of individuals—namely, they don't understand that societies have evolved for their own purposes and on the processes of them, many phenomena have been shown us. They think why the poor suffer from poverty as their own moral responsibilities and only say, 'they are their own fault since you bore too many children'. According to them, frankly speaking, absorbed in dirty pleasures or in playing freely is a right of the rich of capitalists and poverty of the poor is one to forget their individuals' duties of restraining reproductions following the poverty. We don't deny that since today's working class doesn't have dignified and elegant spiritual pleasures, and since they have been put on the circumstances provoked their carnal desires from childhood, many of them deal with reproductions as pleasures; and accumulations of those actions excite their carnal desires by Lamarckian theory. But if you make them whom have been unhappy because of their unhappy circumstances take every responsibility of poverty, we must stop being generous to overlook loose lives of the class of capitalists who have been unhappy because of their unhappy circumstances like that. They say that plundering makes the right of loose lives and poverty makes indispensable duties as living things become extinct—is this what ones who have human faces should put into words? Statistics clearly show that; since population has increased, the people have been able to operate increased machines, to cultivate increased new

¹ In his *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, he argued that population increased in a geometric series but food only increased in a arithmetic series, so poverty was a kind of natural phenomenon.

lands, and so that the class of capitalists having increased wealth have been formed like today. Today's economic nobles have been able to live, since the poor have had strong desires of reproductions. Shame on you for interfering in even others' beds, though he was a priest²!

However, we must avoid falling into an emotionally-charged argument which those who talk theories should be shameful. Some people called 'socialists' get angry like this attitude to old man in the individualistic period like Malthus and abuse him, but they have only interpreted the principle of population from the side of the poor by individualism, too. Socialism has a different ground from them naturally. As far as we simply stand for individualism like Malthus and think about that principle of population, it is only a worthless dogmatism.

Malthus' principle of population begin to be deduced from dogmas, makes them preoccupations, interprets statistics as it suit those dogmas, making the exterior as if it were a fine scientific study from those inductions, and return to dogmas of the starting point again. A mirage of a principle of population draw the dream from two words of 'an arithmetic series' and 'a geometric series'³. All these are entirely groundless dogmas. Malthus said dogmatically that since food has increased in a arithmetic series, in a ratio of 1, 2, 3, 4... but population has increased in a geometric series, in a ration of 2, 4, 8, 16... poverty is a destiny following our lives forever—it is entirely incomprehensive that all of a principle of population are organized by dogmatisms which are more amazing than this dream and today's class of scholars have followed him as an authority without casting doubt on his dogmatism.

Of course, he argued his theory using statistics. But since in his plain brain, dogmatisms of an arithmetic and a geometric series had existed before he has made inductions from statistics, these dogmatisms have always dominated his thoughts when he have dealt with statistics. For example, he compared with entirely incomparable different ones to conclude that population have increased twice every twenty-five years, but food have increased by far less than population. His calculation by statistics, 'population have increased twice every twenty-five years' can be applied in the primitive period of America. He forgot the fact that, in America of those days, food had increased in the same ratio of an geometric series as natural phenomena with increase of population. But he didn't compare population which had increased in a geometric series in America with food which had increased like those, flied in the air holding only a data

² Kita compared Malthus to a priest from the point that he had explained a continence.

³ An arithmetic series is expressed, $a_n = a + (n - 1)d$ (a: first term, d: common difference). For example, 1, 2, 3, 4... (a: 1, d: 1). A geometric series is expressed, $a_n = a \cdot r^{n-1}$ (a: first term, r: common ratio) . For example, 1, 2, 4, 8... (a: 1, r: 2).

of American population, and compared them with European food. And he pointed with entirely different statistics, 'see, population has increased in a geometric series, but food has increased in an arithmetic series'. Though we seem to be able to see the traces as it were somewhat made a induction by an interpretation of statistics like these, what mean does his argument using 'an arithmetic series' or 'a geometric series' of his fundamental points have? On earth, neither food nor population don't increase in an arithmetic series. Nor they don't increase in a geometric series. Animals and plants which have been eaten by human beings today are living thing and human beings who have eaten them are also living things—Today's scholars, be ashamed of yourself! Don't the ear of wheat only increase two grains from a grain of wheat in a ration of an arithmetic series, although they might not increase ten thousand grains from a grain of one? They say that mice are born in a ratio of a geometric series but they *are only born* in that ratio. Most of them have died before their children which should bring second increase in a geometric series because of material dangers—some have been eaten by cats and the like, the others have died by struggles for existence with other living things such as the plague. So, they never increase in a geometric series as they are. In today's economists' altars where they have respected and worshiped Malthus, have mice increased from one mother mouse to eight thousand ones in a geometric series in a year? Needless to say, Malthus was a man below the ordinary men. Rather, lower living things which have been eaten by human beings have produce fifty or sixty times children, born a few hundred times fruits, laid fifty or sixty thousand times eggs as many as human beings who have eaten them. Hence, if he made a mistake as a ordinary man, he could conclude in reverse that food has increased in a geometric series but population has increased in an arithmetic series. Of course, we remember that there was a reaction against mercantilism which had encouraged increases of population for nation competitions too much in his age. And we remember that he could not keep calm to judge because of Industrial Revolution in Britain which had been beginning with bringing about miserable phenomena gradually. It is inevitable for the degree of social evolution at that time that since those days are the early times of Industrial Revolution and the period of economic feudalism, no one had been able to be Karl Marx, like traces of plundering by feudal lords had been discovered in the last years of Tokugawa Shogunate at length. However, we have no choice but to say that he only had an inferior brain to use unclear conceptions such as 'an arithmetic series' or 'a geometric series' than barbarous ones. Nevertheless, it has been inherited by innumerable economists for long one hundred years and has been regarded as a kind of the Bible. After it had been adapted by the powerful class, the principle has been used as means of cruel and

unreasonable oppressions to lower class. What a doubtful human spirits! Furthermore, Dr. Kanai who has a mysterious intelligence which has increased in a geometric series from the period of Malthus says this; even if we cultivate the lands of the whole world, it is inevitable to increase our population, since human beings shall increase even in the air building three-storied or four-storied houses. Human spirits have been quite wonderful!

But we should not pass away looking down on even lower scholars. They lower scholars rather only echo opinions of majority following majority at current times than tell the truth. Opinions of majority, however worthless they are, make their doubts disappear. And when we see that noble Dr. Kanai, not inferior, has used Malthus' principle of population as a final stronghold against socialism, we cannot overlook that the principle of population is a perfectly opinion of majority. He says; if lower classes who are forced to be starving become extinct, population of societies shall increase in all and shall cause to die of hunger in all. This is an argument based on not interpreting Malthus' principle of population as a net under the modern societies like Mill but an iron wall which disturbs social evolution. Since grounds of socialism have existed in the very theory of social evolution, socialism have needed a strict knowledge on the future of social evolution. Hence, if he constructs economics on a social philosophy and opposes against socialism, he would be magnificent as a critic. But when we see that he imagines the situation that three-storied or four-storied houses shall be built from the North Pole to the South Pole which even children shall not dare to say, thinks it as an increase in a geometric series, and worships Malthus, we have no choice but to say that it is ugly. Many of scholars like these flatter themselves patriots to distinguish themselves with socialists and think that scholars must see through after thousand years. So, they say that this principle of population after a thousand years is the urgent problem which everybody should always argue except for people died of hunger on the roadsides with the problem how we should preserve the Great Japanese Empire after the earth shall be cold. Socialists have always been required explaining their arguments before scholars like these. We shall declare; What is the best reply to these scholars is a silence with a contempt. Since economics is a learning which argues for material bases of societies, it needs sociological knowledge, and since sociology is a learning which studies the law of evolution of one organism of human beings, it is the first chapter of biology which studies evolution of all organisms. The principle of population which economists keep to their very small shells and study recklessly today has no biological knowledge. But since today's economists have preoccupations like the leas before biology or sociology has been originated, although we explain to them new societies by sociology,

or population of new societies by biology, it is meaningless as if we talked to stone statues. No! They have plentiful imaginations like poets which they say that although we cultivate the whole world, we must build three-storied or four-storied houses on the whole surfaces of it, even if we talk about an infinite food which is an object of today's economics, and say that only plains in America can still support 3 billion and 500 million people, or two thirds of the earth pastures of the sea are remained for us. Since they are like those, they would be impatient how we can live if our population increases ten or one hundred billion because of their wisdom and power to see into the future after a thousand years. And they would reply, 'if you predict that food in the future shall be made up chemically, we ask you to see the pill as an evidence. Or, we cannot regard your arguments as empirical science'. We cannot be particular about good manners. We shall notify that arguments in the Section 5, *The enlightening movement of socialism*, are not ones to explain to today's scholar classes who only have pitiful brains.

Though Malthus' principle of population argues the relationship population with food, we believe that it is groundless to interpret his principle as an iron wall which disturbs social evolution and to fear that, because we at first think about 'food' within the extent of present economics before studying 'population' by biology. Don't economists know that food also evolves? They assume increase of population at once by thoughts which were formed by a dogmatism of a geometric series, because they don't know that kinds of food—today's rice, wheat, fish, or birds— and producing ways⁴ of food—boiling, roasting, and so on which don't make much difference with today's primitive people— of food has evolved with social evolution and shall evolve hereafter. And they make a laughing dilemma that we shall have to choose starvation of all people in societies or a fancy of socialism. If today's economists don't deny the theory of evolution or don't think that societies have been stagnant or have circulated, we need to glance over the our world and think back on economic evolution that today's kinds and producing ways of food had evolved. It goes without to say that their evolution has only an insignificant. But it is a noteworthy facts that kinds of food had evolved according to social evolution such as the age of fishery and hunting, nomadic lives, or agriculture. Mr. Nitobe Inazo⁵, a doctor of agriculture, writes this in his *The Main discourse of Agriculture*, quoting thoughts of French Mr. Foissac⁶; agriculture can support population from twenty times to thirty times as many as livestock farming can do in the same squares. Furthermore,

⁴ Kita regarded the art of cooking as one of producing ways.

⁵ Nitobe Inazō was a Japanese schoolteacher in 19th-20th century. He was graduated from Sapporo Agricultural School, held successively a principal of the First High School and the like, and took office as a deputy manager of secretariat of the League of Nations. He was also famous for his book 'Bushido (shivery)'.
⁶ Perhaps, he was a French scholar of agriculture, but details are not clear.

livestock farming can only support population about twenty times less than fishery⁷ in the same squares. And he says; according to Settegast⁸, agriculture can support one person by from five tan to one cho⁹; livestock farming can support one person by from fifty cho to seventy cho. Furthermore, he says taking instances that livestock farming needs many lands; In Russia, from eighty to one hundred *cho* pasturelands are needed to support one men; In Queensland in Australia, a square mile fields are needed for one sheep.

In the age of fishery or hunting that kinds of food had been limited purely primitive productions such as wild fish or birds, since we human beings could not have used the extents on the earth not existing primitive productions to produce, it is the reason why the number of human beings had not been many and food had been lack. When our societies had evolved, human intelligence had been used in producing activities gradually and gotten to made primitive cows and sheep breed artificially. Thus, the extents of the earth which human beings had been able to use had been expanded by human intelligence and it had brought increase of population and food. And when kinds of food had been many by social evolution and rice or wheat had gotten to be cultivated, since plants are living things which can more increase than animals, the extents of the earth used producing had been more expanded greatly and it had brought increase of population and food. Articles of Mr. Nitobe reveal these facts, don't they? In the age of fishery or hunting, there was not a 'Malthusian principle for fish or birds', and in the age of nomadic lives, there was not a 'Malthusian principle for cows or sheep'. Nevertheless, why do a 'Malthusian principle for rice or wheat' appear only in the age of agriculture and very many people believe a superstition like that?

Societies make the producing ways of food evolve along with food; they are breeding of living things which are eaten by human beings (in the age of nomadic lives, cows or sheep, in the age of agriculture, rice or wheat) by human intelligence. For example in agriculture, Delbrück¹⁰ says that our production capacity have gotten four times as much as a hundred years ago by development of German science of agriculture being in direct proportion to Malthus' conclusion of statistics in America, 'population have increased twice every twenty-five years'. Followers of Malthus have been fanatical with the argument 'cultivated lands are limited within a certain extent', but scholars of agriculture have invaded the domestic lands with sciences—like the army and navy

⁷ In Japanese original text, this part is 'agriculture' but in Nitobe's text, it is 'fishery'.

⁸ Who is he?

⁹ Tan is a land unit of medieval Japan (for cho, see the note 2 of the Section 1). In the medieval Japan, 10 tan is equal to one cho. One cho is about one hectare, so five tan is 0.5 hectare.

¹⁰ Perhaps he was a German scholar of agriculture.

have seized foreign territories and expanded their territories— and made their lands expand three or four times. That is, during kinds of human food had evolved rice or wheat in the age of agriculture, the producing ways of them had also evolved. However, the word of ‘producing’ when we use to mention the producing ways of food is used as a technical term in economics. Namely, the word of ‘producing’ means that the breeding ways of living things we have eaten is one of the producing ways and they are economic actions given human intelligence by the time we have eaten them. In other words, breeding sheep with human intelligence to cut down their wools not only means the producing way but weaving cloths using human intelligence to sheep’s wools means that. Like that, raising trees such as pines or oaks with human intelligence to build houses not only means the producing way but cutting off them with human intelligence means that. And agriculture or livestock farming which raises or breeds of living things with human intelligence not only means the producing way but boiling or roasting using human intelligence to those animals or plants means the producing way in economics. –We doubt economists who have forgotten that the producing ways of food in this sense have evolved. It is an economic fact that every production evolves from primitive one to industrial one. Namely, ones which had been used food, clothing and shelter as they had been in the primitive age have used food, clothing and shelter after their shapes had been made to change by human intelligence according to social evolution. However, since only food have still been taken in the primitive shapes and we are much the same with primitive people, today’s us cannot digest most of food we have taken, we excrete them from our bodies. In the point that we have known to eat food cooking, it can be said that we have produced food industrially than primitive people but their ways have only been toasting bread from wheat, cooking rice, boiling or roasting meat of fish, birds, or beasts. We have not use accurate knowledge to cook like when we have made clothing or houses, but have only done the ways which suit us according to our instincts’ tastes perfectly.

Our primitive houses had been made on the trees or the hillsides making caves. But from the stage that we had used trees or stones as they had been, we had advanced the stage that we had made shelters doing poor industrial productive actions, and like today, we have advanced the stage that we have gotten to make from five-storied to ten-storied houses in large cities by industrial productive actions. So, even today’s economists don’t quote a Malthusian principle for houses; everybody, be discreet your reproductions. Trees and hillsides of the world have the limits, so if our population keep on increasing, you shall get not to live to make lairs or caves and shall die by drowning of floods in the plains (they say that also in ancient China, people had lived to make their houses on the

trees making lairs or hillsides making caves until the emperor Yu¹¹ had succeeded river improvement). Primitive clothing had been like that only one cloth had been able to be made from one sheep which had needed a square mile pasture. But today's us have abandoned the clothing as they have been like in the age of nomadic lives and gotten to do industrial productions of spinning which have cut down only sheep's wools every year. Thanks to those, present economists don't quote a Malthusian principle for clothing; everybody, be discreet your reproductions. Pastures of the world have the limits, so if our population keep on increasing, you shall die of cold. –Thanks to evolution of producing ways of houses, we have avoided dying by drowning of floods because of not having houses, and thanks to evolution of producing ways of clothing, we have avoided dying of cold because of not having clothing. Nevertheless, why do they think that only producing ways of food shall remain the stage of primitive productions like today and shall not evolve from that stage, insist on only Malthusian principle for food, and cry dying of hunger because of shortage of food?

Having given slight industrial productive actions such as by fire or by knives on food, we have advanced the stage that we have eaten food cooking from the stage that we had eaten raw grains or meat. Even if these industrial productive actions are slight and rash, if we have digested more food than barbarous people who have eaten raw food eating the same amount of food, you could imagine that today's primitive food of which most have excreted as only ugly materials sent from our mouths (Ha-ha! Even today's German emperor cannot avoid being animals experienced this evolution.) shall be given industrial productive actions which all nutrition of food observed by analyses of scientists can be digested and absorbed. Imagine that ones which have eaten as food at once today shall be simple ingredients for our food, so we shall be able to maintain fifty or sixty, or a few hundred times as much as today's population fully. We shall repeat; we don't talk to scholar classes having only low grade brains. We are only sure that the laws which had evolved until today shall evolve further and today's food as it remains primitive shall be given industrial productive actions according to an economic rule, 'every production proceeds from the stage of primitive production to one of industrial production'. And since we believe that the age made food industrially shall arrive, we listen to a prediction making bows when today's scientists sometimes open the windows their laboratories and tell us. –Namely, the age digesting food industrially that we shall evolve from the stage that nutrition which human beings had needed for our existence and evolution had been produced in the factories of our stomachs and intestines from

¹¹ Yu was a legendary emperor in ancient China. It is said that he was a first emperor in the Xia dynasty (about from 21st century B.C. to 16th century B. C.), which was a legendary dynasty.

primitive living things to the stage that that nutrition shall be produced in the large stomachs and intestines having steam and electricity, and nutrition itself shall not be produced from primitive living things but from artificial living things shall arrive.

Poets point to the heaven and scientists make ladders to climb up the heaven. Sciences shall get monism and a distinction inorganic substance with organic one shall be lost. Conclusion by experiments that everybody is a living thing shall enable us to make organic substance from inorganic one which had been regarded as not living. For example, it is said that in 1854, a chemist Berthelot¹² succeeded to synthesize kinds of fatty oil which are entirely the same with natural ones from glycerin and acids and, more easily, synthesize them from hydrocarbons¹³. And it is said that sugar contents are synthesized in chemists' laboratories today, and what have not been synthesized is only protein. For an extreme example—it has not been reported accurately—, it is said that one scientist made a perfect living thing in his laboratory. These results shall remove a repetition and a cruelty of a food chain that inorganic substance is eaten by organic one, plants are eaten animals, and those plants and animals are eaten by human beings, and enable us to make the original inorganic or organic substance (in fact, they are groups of indistinctive elements.) do our food. Though these are what infer amazing distant future, if you imagine the age of '*the class of the Gods*' which should arrive after the age of '*anthropomorphic gods*', it would not be very philosophical speculations (see the follower paragraph that shall explain ideals of social evolution). Malthus was a old man a hundred years ago and not only a economist of old schools who are laughed by economists of new schools but a man fifty years ago that Darwin had published *On the Origin of Species*. We want to think back on our past traces of evolution and follow prudent experiments of scientists rather than to believe ordinary old man like this obstinately and preach the Noah's flood in the field of economics.

Here, we must explain for 'population' by biology; to decide the position of food competitions which we have said 'struggles for existence species vs. other species' in biology.

According to Darwin's confession, he though of his theory of the struggle for existence getting a hint from Malthus' principle of population, so the present situations seem to confirm a Malthus' principle biologically. However, this was the very terrible carelessness of Darwin, and because of this, his *On the Origin of Species* could offer no theory other than discovery of the simple fact 'living things have not made by the God

¹² He was Marcellin Pierre Eugene Berthelot, a French scientist in 19th century (1827-1907).

¹³ Hydrocarbons is a general term of compounds composed only carbon and hydrogen such as benzene, naphthalene and so on.

like a creation myth, but formed by evolution'. Since Malthus had said that human beings who have been born in a geometric series have compete with each other over food which have increased in a arithmetic series, Darwin expanded that theory to all living things and made it a basis of his theory of the struggle for existence¹⁴. Like Malthus could not have understood the meaningful natural law of increasing population because he had been brought up by the air of individualism in the last years of 18th century, Darwin committed a regrettable error to determining the position of food competitions which should occupy in the theory of biological evolution because of having covered with an aftermath of individualism, nevertheless he had understood the facts of biological evolution which should be the scientific basis of socialism. That is, for him, food competitions was the same with the struggle for existence and meant individuals' desires conflicted over the same food and those who won those competitions can exist.

It is really regrettable; Darwin would have committed a false that he understood the struggle for existence as individuals' competitions among the same species if he had accepted a trend of socialism at that time which had evolved the degree that Karl Marx had appeared—at least he had grown out of dogmatism of individualism. In this sense, one who had had the most proper view was Huxley¹⁵ who was a contemporary of Darwin. He revealed that the struggle for existence among the same species is indirect and unconscious but the struggle for existence among the different species—that is, between the animals which eat other animals and the other animals which are eaten by other animals—is direct and conscious. Needless to say, Huxley's 'indirect and unconscious struggle for existence among the same species' was food competition in the narrow sense. In it, our struggle for existence in the wide sense—struggle for reproduction which was the most direct and conscious intending to realize ideals in generations of continued lives—was excluded. And it goes without saying that his struggle for existence among the different species was not determined the unit of competition clearly. Because food competitions of struggles for existence among the different species have not only done direct and conscious among the different species, but fellow same species have done direct and conscious struggles for existence by one units (of villages in the age of nomadic lives, of nations or classes in modern age, and of pure families or individuals when famines have happen) over same living things of food.

Although living things have done food competitions directly and consciously among the same species, they have only driven out the same species to be the fittest in struggles for existence against the different species which they have eaten directly and

¹⁴ It means he thought that since food gets shortage chronically, selections within the same species are unavoidable.

¹⁵ He was a Thomas Henry Huxley.

consciously. Where different species which they have eaten exists enough abundant the extent which they don't have to drive out the same species (taking an instance of human beings, the primitive age such as Yao, Shun and so on.), or where they have converted from making efforts to drive out their compatriots to cooperating with each other, have reigned as perfectly the fittest on other animals by united greater units (taking an instance of human beings, the times that socialism shall be realized.), so they have made the different species abundant, direct and conscious food competitions are limited in competitions between those species and other species. If, as Darwin had interpreted the facts of biological evolution from a standpoint of individualism, you interpret that the struggle for existence is to apply Malthus' principle of population to actions of all living things—it is that individuals have done against the same species—, how do you explain those protective colors of bugs which are the easiest to understand? Everybody knows why these bugs are protectively colored is because they guard themselves against other species of birds which eat them and they frighten other species which have the same protective colors by imitating colors which remind poisons of, leaves, or petals, or spoil other animals to eat themselves. With taking instances such as protective colors of bugs like these, you shall comprehend that opponents of struggles for existence are clearly other species, but those who have superficial views jump to a conclusion that fierce animals have competed with each other within the same species since dogs often battle with each other and cats bite with each other in front of them; fierce animals are only non-social animals which don't cooperate with each other but their fangs and claws are not ones which have developed to eat meat of their same species but meat of other animals which they have eaten and to be the fittest in struggles for existence. If individuals among the same species were opponents of other individuals among the same species, they would have to do food competitions directly and consciously, although other animals were not shortages which they have eaten or their desires didn't conflicted over the same food, and the fittest of them would have to eat meat of the same species by their fangs and claws. It would be incomprehensive for them biological phenomena that even fierce animals like wolves have formed groups organized from the number of a few thousand in Siberian wide plains where other animals which have been eaten by them exist plentifully. Meat of a few thousand wolves are never eaten by the same a few thousand ones. If biological evolutionists who worship Darwin as an idol want to maintain struggles for existence of individualism, we must ask them; have amoebas eaten the same amoebas? Have corals eaten the same corals and made coral formations? Have cows, horses, swallows, doves, or butterflies eaten the same cows, horses, swallows, doves, or butterflies and done struggles for existence? Have rice

plants, potatoes, or pine trees eaten the same rice plants, potatoes, or pine trees and done struggles for existence?

Here, we must repeat the meaning of the fit or the strongest in struggles for existence; so-called the conception of 'the fittest of struggles for existence' means ones which have the most superior points among the same species in struggles for existence against other animals exist maintaining those points. It is another meaning with the conception of 'opponent of the struggle for existence'. Repeatedly speaking, the fittest or the strongest among the same species have not compete with the unfit or the weakest among the same species. They have been the fittest or the strongest against other species in struggles for existence. It is a result of the struggle for existence that those who get the fittest or the strongest against other species survive. For example, suppose that each person battle with his enemy commanding an army corps. Ones who survive after the wars are the fit or the strong of the crops and opponents of the wars are corps of enemies. The fit or the strong are not decided by battles with members in the same corps. The meaning of the struggle for existence is the same with it. Horses' four legs have not evolved to kick with the same species but because the fittest of them which could have escaped from predators of other animals had existed. Dogteeth of the cat families such as cats or tigers have not evolved to bite with the same species but because the fittest of them which could have beaten rivals of other animals had existed. Hairy caterpillars or hedgehogs have not evolved having prickles on their skins to stick with each other. Weasels have evolved breaking offensive winds when they have escaped because the fittest of them had been able to repel rivals of other species by it. Nevertheless it is clear that results and opponents of the struggle for existence are entirely different, it is extremely nonsense to believe as if the fittest in struggles for existence defeated individuals among the same species by reason of direct and conscious struggles among the same species in special cases and to apply peculiar phenomena that cannibals who suffer from hunger eat human flesh of the same tribes who live neighbor villages to all laws of biological world.

The facts are above-mentioned. Food competitions through the biological world are struggles for existence between species which intend to eat other animals and other species which are eaten by other animals, and they are struggles for existence by the units of species, namely, of societies in the widest sense. Socialism regards units of societies as human races in these the widest sense and intends to make human beings be the fittest in struggles for existence on other species. Hence, in the period of socialism, there shall be struggles for reproductions by the units of individuals to realize ideals we

have explained and needless to say, there shall be food competitions to maintain reality by the units of societies between us and other animals. If so, how do we think a principle of population in relation to food competitions in the period of socialism?

Here, we see that biology give out very noble lights and the greatness of Darwin goes through the clouds and lengthens. He said; living things bear their babies to be able to maintain and evolve their species. From the beginning of philosophical history, what the cosmos has the purpose have been required being interpreted by speculation. And biology which had remarkably developed by Darwin has explained based on induction of scientific that everything of the universe has had its own purpose. Do bush warblers sing in sweet voices since they want to sing or want to sing since they can sing in sweet voices? Do butterflies have beautiful feathers since they want to flit or want to flit since they have beautiful feathers? Do lions have fangs since they want to eat meat or want to eat meat since they have fangs? –These questions have been treated as philosophical subjects through all ages. Those who believe a creation myth or advocate the theory by old materialism that the cosmos has no purpose regard that bush warblers sing since they can sing in sweet voice, butterflies flit since they have beautiful feathers, and lions are brave since they have fangs. But biology have overturned a creation myth and old materialism from strict facts and have established teleology of the cosmos which have thought that everything has evolved. It has made an induction those; from a wild flower on the roadside to pine or oak trees rising to the sky, insects crawling on the ground, birds flying among the flowers, whales roaring in the waves of the sea, snakes or dragons going across the opened valleys, dogs, cats, horses, monkeys, and human beings who hanker for the eastern sky brightening red at dawn and have been waiting that scientists have invented wings to fly in the air like birds, everything of the cosmos have been born as results of desires to exist and evolve. The cosmos has an eternal purpose that is incomprehensive for us who are transitional animals and an absolute ideal that is beyond the reach of human understanding whose are relative existence. Because there are these purpose and ideal, every living thing intends to achieve each purpose and to realize each ideal; ones which have a purpose to sing would sing evolving their voices sweet, or ones which have an ideal to flit would flit evolving their feathers beautiful.

The battle of both factions that had been continuing since philosophy had sprung up came to a clear end by the taking of evidences by a strict and fair judge of biology (nevertheless, it is pity that many of today's biologists should be satisfied to be a lowly occupation of an executer of capital punishments rather than a judge putting on a gold crown). –A principle of population should be also understood by biology based on

teleology of the cosmos. Namely, every living thing has evolved transforming its form to maintain its existence or to evolve—that is, to adjust circumstances (including other living things) around it. Like that, living things bear their children the extent that they need for the purpose of existence and evolution. This principle ‘all living things have the purpose of existence and evolution’ is the very principle of socialism that intends to evolve one living thing of human beings. Socialism believes; since living things bear their children the extent that they need for the purpose of existence and evolution, we never have to be afraid of today’s amazing populations like Malthus; without these phenomena happen, human beings shall become extinct or not be able to evolve, so these are inevitable results. Biology is a foundation of socialism in every aspect. It is a false by speculative dogmatism of one-side individualism that when food competitions have been done among individuals of the same species or with other species, the units of competitions are also individuals and it is not a right way admitting a genius to use the greatness of Darwin to hide from the big point of Malthus and so on juttet out the horizon¹⁶. It is the very right way admitting a genius to use his greatness to know the scientific foundation of socialism that living things bear their children the extent that they need for the purpose of existence and evolution (so, though it is an insignificant and stupid delusion that one biologist made efforts the theory of biological evolution because of a fear that it should bring socialism on the mass meeting of biologists in Munch, it could be said that he guessed that the theory of biological evolution would bring socialism by one unclear concept). We require those who study Darwin to pay attention to only two points; first, Darwin should be valued as great person in the point of confirming the facts of biological evolution—despite his explanation didn’t entirely accomplish as explanation of biological facts, in the point of beginning of the theory of the struggle for existence. Second, his theory should regarded as the eternal truth in the points that it had made an induction teleology of the cosmos and discovered the strict fact that living things had evolved each form for the purpose of existence and evolution and they had born the extent that they need for the purpose.

The principle of population can only be understood based on Darwin’s conclusions, so many of today’s economists who are satisfied with inheriting past knowledge before the theory of biological evolution has been advocated are only worthless like frogs croak. According to him, they say that the number of children that are needed for existence and evolution of species has decreased following to evolve from the grade of lower animals to the grade of higher animals. For example, according to a geometric series

¹⁶ The meaning of latter parts is not clear. Perhaps this part means that Darwin’s theory should not be used to hide a fault of a Malthus’ principle of population.

Malthus said, the number of mice's childbirth are the ratio that increases from one mother mouse to eight thousand mice in an year; bees bear fifty or sixty thousand children in an year; flies lay two-hundred thousand eggs by itself, bring up for fifteen days, and increase one million times every week. Cods have ten million eggs in their stomachs and tapeworms have one-hundred million eggs per one knot and they have one hundred fifty knots in their whole bodies. And an increasing ratio of plant louses are the degree that they should cover the whole earth in several years. According to calculation of Huxley, it is said that almost all plants have made their seeds in a ratio that they should cover the whole earth in eight or nine years. Whereas, the number of childbirth have decreased following to evolve the grade of higher animals, and birds or beasts, everybody knows, bear very few children. Darwin concluded from these innumerable facts that all living things bear their children for the purpose of existence and evolution of their species. Namely, all living things (taking an instance of human beings, human societies) bear their children the extent that they need for existence and evolution of their species (taking an instance of human beings, existence and evolution of human societies. Population of human beings are many since our societies need many population). If we don't bear the number of childbirth to maintain their species despite they need innumerable number of children for maintain their species, our societies shall become extinct at once like lower animals. Two-hundred thousand flies or fifteen billion tapeworms don't bear such an innumerable children to do struggles for existence among the same two-hundred thousand ones. Plants which have made the most seeds have done such an many seeds that they should cover the whole earth because they have had to maintain their species by a few lucky seeds that have put on the circumstances that their seeds tend to be brought by the wind, bugs, or birds by chance and have been able to escaped eaten by other animals by chance. Animals like tapeworms which have one hundred fifty knots that have one hundred million per one knot can only maintain their species; some of them get into the water by chance; some of them are eaten by particular fish accidently which encounter by chance; some of them remain in the fish's body and those fish which they remain in their bodies are eaten raw by human beings by chance. They cannot maintain their species until thus they get into human intestines, so they need such an enormous number of eggs. Actually, food competitions have done by the units of species and with other species to maintain animals' species by the units of species. Hence, lower classes which make a large number of sacrifices in struggles between them and other species lay innumerable eggs preparing for many sacrifices enough to maintain species even if they make a large number of sacrifices—no, to exist their elements the extent that they can maintain their species. On the other hand, the

reason why, the number of children of animals have innumerably decreased, as they have evolved the grade of higher classes, is because they have evolved the degree that they don't make many sacrifices in struggles between them and other species for the purpose to exist their same species and they have gotten not to need to bear many children. Why human beings bear the least number of children in every living thing is because we have evolved the extent that we have needed not bear many children. Since Darwin had entirely implanted fault thoughts by Malthus, he have intended to prove how violent the struggle for existence has been done through the whole biological world by experiments; he had revealed by an experiment that plants had bred at an amazing speed without other living things. Because of this experiment, people have interpreted that the struggle for existence have meant a competition that innumerable elements of the same species have intended to drive out other elements of the same species for their existence, and understood as if Darwin have applied a Malthus' principle of population to all living things and confirmed it from a view of the theory of biological evolution. This is based on individualism that understand that each individual has each purpose. So, for economists who have somewhat knowledge, Malthus' principle of population confirmed by Darwin would be the strongest fort against socialism. Now, his principle of population has reached on the theory of social evolution.

However, the greatness of a revolutionary in the history of thoughts is not covered with slight floating clouds. Though many of today's biological evolutionists have not been able to see his perfect figure, the lights shining from behind the clouds has certainly hit their eyes. I cannot understand why Dr. Oka argue the theory of biological evolution limiting 'races' especially—because there can be states, races, religious groups having united tightly one-time, classes making the great unions today, and 'human beings' being in a body against other species as the units of struggles for existence—, you could understand that his argument was never an exception of Darwin's teleology of the cosmos, seeing that his ignorant and cruel wild argument was deduced from the authority 'for existence and evolution of races'.

If economists think a principle of population as one lying before the social evolution nevertheless they recognize that living things have the purposes of existence and evolution as species, we cannot help saying that they are barbarians. It is a quite violent conclusion that on the one hand, one living thing of human beings who is obliged to be the unfit for the purpose of existence and evolution of species, so bears many children today shall decrease the number of the unfit in food competitions by realization of socialism (I don't say, 'it shall make the unfit *cease to exist*'. For this reason, I shall explain it in the following paragraph.), on the other hand, the number of human

children needed for existence of species—namely, population— shall keep on increasing at a geometric series the extent that we shall have to build three-storied or four-stories houses, and that increase shall bring starvation of the whole societies— human actions which had been done for existence of human beings shall ruin ourselves! Those who are called ‘doctors’ are just like American Indians put pince-nez. We shall declare repeatedly; today’s amazing population results from the facts that since the degree of human evolution has been low, the unfit have constantly come out in struggles with other animals, and it is the natural law needed for our existence.

Setting economists before biology had not developed enough aside, how could for even biologists, of all people, who are assigned to the most important missions to construct the foundation on the all social sciences, such as Dr. Oka, make people trample great Darwin by steps of an ordinary person such as like Malthus and be calm without feeling shames? You must think the reason why Malthus said that three fourths of our children would die when they were babies, or live only one fourth of usual life span is because that we have not perfectly evolved, so only our one fourth have been able to exist and evolve and we have been forced to make third fourths of us sacrifices. Barbarians have needed to bear their children most because they have difficulty in their existing most since they are lack of natural products materially or their mothers leave them unattended or themselves (many of animals have done so.), and today’s lower classes who have difficulty in existing most by oppressing of plundering classes have needed to bear many children. Everything is controlled by the law of nature. In this way, they have been able to get those who have made themselves exist from within their many children by happy opportunities (that is, have maintained their present states) and have evolved themselves (that is, have realized their ideals by continuing their lives). Three fourths of many of others, like Malthus said, have died in terraced houses on back streets which have been filled with when they have been babies because of malnutrition, and although they have not died when they have been babies, they, like Lassalle said, have obliged to die of hunger on one fourth of usual life span step in due order because of too much labors and the lowest standard of living.

We recognize that the so-called overpopulation of the poor has been needed for their existence. Without they have born many children, their continued lives would have been extirpated on the days long past—that is, they would have become extinct as the perfect unfit in struggles for existence. But since the law of evolution had made their desires of reproduction raise amazingly by its equal love, it ca be said that they have still narrowly existed and have been able to evolve, nevertheless many of their compatriots have been made sacrifices. You must not despise the word that the uplift of desires of

reproduction means a love. Prosperous desires of reproduction had never begun from today's unhappy classes of workers. Reflect that we Japanese had had such prosperous desires of reproduction until the reign of the emperor Yuryaku¹⁷ actually that not only incest such as between mothers and their children, and brothers and sisters but also bestiality such as between horses, chickens, or dogs and human beings had prohibited by penalties and apologized to the God for their evils exorcising¹⁸. Not only Japan, the Law of Moses had prohibited bestiality by severe penalties; women mustn't have sexual intercourses with cows or horses. If they do, they shall be put the capital punishment. Though we cannot imagine these criminal laws and prosperous desires of reproduction in our evolved senses at all, in ancient ages that it had been the most difficult for human beings to exist and they had forced to make their compatriots sacrifices, those ones had been indispensable and important desires to exist and evolve human societies. The law of nature has no false or useless one. It can be said that the God has ordered us to have today's prosperous desires of reproduction for the great purpose of evolution of the cosmos. –If so, why can we say that reflecting on today's situations of the whole societies that are dirty and ruined in the times of socialism and reflecting on the Law of Moses, or exorcising when the emperor Yuryaku passed away in present times are not the same? Even if we put a skeleton of Malthus on the side of the theory of social evolution, what authority does it have? Socialism removes the poverty, causes of shortages of clothes and food, and makes bearing many children that maintain descendents' existence in the way that lower organisms do unnecessary.

And the reason why lower classes have become overpopulation is because all the unfit by wars have come out from their classes. –Namely, like many of them have forced to be sacrificed in class conflicts on the horizontal axis, many of them have always forced to be sacrificed in state competitions on the vertical axis. Like the poverty has brought to bear many children inevitably, necessity of wars brought overpopulation. For example, since today's French population has been only on the level with the mean value¹⁹, France has not been able to win in state competitions, so it is said, 'too little population shall ruin nations', in direct opposition to Malthusians, and not only imperialists but also all people are anxious about it. But in the times that she had repeated invading other states under the king Louis 14th or had backed up Napoleon and involved the

¹⁷ The emperor Yuryaku was the Japanese emperor in the latter half of 5th century Japan. It is said that he paid tribute to Song (one of the dynasty in ancient China) in 478.

An anecdote in the text about desires of reproduction is seen in *Kojiki* (the book of Japanese old history), but it is seen in the chapter on the emperor Chuai. So, to be exact, this should be 'the emperor Chuai'.

¹⁸ This anecdote is seen on the parts of the emperor Chuai in *Kojiki*. This anecdote is quoted in the Section 4 the Chapter 11 again.

¹⁹ It points that a birthrate of France was low. France of those days was troubled with a shortage of population, so she intended to increase her population by punishing severely abortions.

whole Europe in the disturbances of wars, her population had amazingly been increased. Similarly, in the medieval times of civil wars, from those necessity, mercantilism had firstly aimed at increasing population in the world of thoughts and in actual policies. Increased people have gotten the unfit by wars, and lower classes have maintained themselves by only a few survivors of them. The reason why today's Japanese population has increased fifty thousand hundred people every year is that the plundering times under the nobles from the early days of the medieval age of civil wars to Tokugawa feudalism had been over—that is, long days of wars and poverty had been over—, none the less poverty has continued under the economic aristocratic countries, and the Civil War before the Meiji Restoration, the Ten Year's War²⁰, the Sino-Japanese War, the Russo-Japanese War had happened constantly. Japanese population has increased because we have needed to maintain ourselves as Japanese nationals, so these wars had not been brought about for seeking outlets of our population to Manchuria or Korea. Because of national thoughts that require state competitions having done in the primitive ages, and being the unfit by wars and poverty following wars, we have a large number of population. Namely, as we have explained, bush warblers don't sing because they have sweet voices, nor butterflies flutter because they have beautiful feathers but because they have the purpose to sing or an ideal to flutter, they sing in sweet voices and have beautiful feathers. Like that, why today's Japanese population increased too much by the teleology of the cosmos of biological evolution is not because wars have brought about by overpopulation and they have brought about increase of population but because our society has followed the law of nature that our population has increased since we are nations who have medieval thoughts of the purpose of going to wars and our nation has a barbarous ideal to be the fittest by wars. The law of nature has given snakes which have the purpose of biting poisons and wolves which have an ideal to eat fangs. Unless people and states grow out of these ideals like snakes or wolves, Japanese nationals would be forced to obey the law of nature like lower organism and would suffer from overpopulation forever.

To be spoken transcending the class feelings, today's lower classes have experienced these low grade of evolution like upper classes. So, socialism intends to remove despotic systems which are likely to develop international wars, overthrow industrial despotic systems of capitalists which have brought about trade wars, and renew our societies from the points that nations and states regard the purposes and ideals. Like the law of nature has not given bush warblers poisons and butterflies fangs, why shall population in the socialistic ages that regard universal peace as its purpose and ideal under the

²⁰ It points disturbances for about ten years from 1868 to 1877.

World Federation of Nations increase too much? (So, it was worthless and superficial explanations and pity that on the one hand, so-called imperialists who advocated supporting for war for the reason that Japan needed outlets of overpopulation when the Russo-Japanese War would have been brought about, and on the other hand, socialists who advocated arguments against the war understood that the war was brought about a few capitalists who were high-spirited but had not been the biggest powers yet.)

We must transcend from all class feelings or interests and not disgrace attitudes of scientific studies as real socialists; like it is false to interpret a principle of population by individualism on the side of capitalists and to shift moral responsibilities to the poor as individuals, it is an unrelated dogmatism with socialism to refuse by individualism on the side of lower classes and to argue that the general public are poor since capitalists avaricious and atrocious. –Clearly speaking, innumerable population of lower classes is the process of social evolution sacrificed by upper classes. Further concretely speaking, since thousands must die to make one hero²¹, that is, thousands peasants and laborers die as they are or break down from cold or hunger to bring prosperity to one person, many population had been and has been needed. In this sense, we firstly concluded, ‘without desires of reproduction of lower classes were prosperous, today’s the rich would not exist’ inverting moral behaviors of lower classes, namely ‘restraints’ Malthus said. As, observing by individualistic thoughts, desires of reproduction of the poor are regarded as vulgar, it goes without saying that our conclusion like this would sound ignoring rights of lower classes as individuals. Socialists cannot be individualists in all cases. If some charitable people say that the poor are enough to advocate happiness as individuals of the poor classes under the name of socialism, we who take every theory out from colder sciences than iron should despise them to be faithful servants of socialism. Those who have crowded under socialism led by their own dissatisfactions, or those who have inherited individualism in the times of French Revolution a hundred years ago and have never spoken up to that dogmatism have attributed poverty of today’s lower classes to evils of upper classes and have regarded all of them as criminals when they look at people of upper classes. The law of nature of the law of evolution has no irrational one. However, since they stand the flag of socialism on these dogmatisms, their passionate arguments are based on high-minded personalities, nevertheless, they are counterattacked by opponents, ‘if so, do you say that the God is prejudiced and his ability is imperfect and lack?’, and make them misunderstand socialism as if it were a den condensed jealousies of traders who sigh injustice of societies. Human societies are

²¹ This phrase is seen in a Chinese classic poem by Cao Song, who was a poet in the period of Tong dynasty.

one united individual in perfect harmony. Both the poor and the rich are the parts of one united individual of societies. That is, individuals mean societies and why individuals of the poor are sacrificed today is not because other individuals of the rich commit crimes. For social evolution, societies have needed to make particular parts of themselves evolve firstly, so they sacrifice other parts of themselves. Hence, bodies of the rich who are put on happy circumstances today are also parts of bodies of the poor. Sacrificed poor people are also parts of bodies of the rich, the body of the German emperor are parts of bodies of beggars on the roadsides, and even prostitutes who do prostitutions in the shades of willows are parts of the Queen of Netherland. A pitiful Malthus is a part of us, and furthermore, even ridiculous doctors are parts of the Buddha or Christ. Human beings had not existed individually before social contracts, conquests, or annexations as individualistic theories hypothesized. As it is proved by the theory of biological evolution based on scientific foundations, human beings are only parts of one individual who had divided like amoebas from the originally ones. Individuals have the purposes of existence and evolution as individuals. To reach these purposes, each individual take forms to adjust itself to those purposes. That is, one organism of human society—one organism which have human beings as elements having spaces among the middle have taken forms to adjust itself to that purpose for its existence and evolution in the process of evolution.

To explain this, we shall compare a little bigger individuals of human beings with individuals of lower organisms. Of course, needless to say, it should not be understood comparing societies to bodies which have necks, feet, trunks, and bellies like an old organic conception of society before biology has enough developed that only amuses itself with similes (for this, we shall explain in the Section 4, *The so-called principle of restorative-revolutionaries.*), why we make a comparison like this is because today's human societies have made lower classes sacrifice because the degree of evolution of these big individuals are entirely the same with the degree of lower organisms. Since lower organisms have always been in the degree of evolution having difficulty to exist because of material dangers or ones of other animals, they have run away sacrificing their one parts of them, sacrificed parts have been regenerated at once, they have recovered their original forms, and they have achieved purposes of existence as organisms. Organisms which have not been able to run away such as earthworms or leeches have regenerated lost parts at once, although they have been cut their parts. Although crabs lose their claws, small claws grow shortly and they regenerate lost claws. Why although newts lose their four legs or lizards are cut their tails when they run away, each regenerates its lost parts at once is because it is necessary for them to live by

the way at the sacrifices of their parts. In today's degree of evolution, even big individuals of human societies have no choice but to select the way to exist sacrificing their members like these lower organisms. But materials dangers such as earthquakes, floods, winds, or waves have been being avoided gradually, and we have gradually been going to the victors in struggles for existence between us and other species we have eaten animals and plants, and between us and microbes we have been eaten. Nevertheless, since small political units—namely, nations— or small economic units—namely, companies or trusts— have done violent struggles for existence, they have needed to fill up their lost members who have lived in their units constantly for maintaining individuals' existence as each unit. Minutely speaking, lower classes of nations—that is, classes who have been forced to die to make one hero have been filled up with overpopulation as lost parts of nations and lower classes of companies or trusts—that is, working classes who have been plundered and suffered from poverty have been filled up with overpopulation as lost parts of economy or societies. —Increase of population is not fearful. Without this, human beings would have become extinct from the earth by poverty and wars the days long past. We say yes. Increase of population is not fearful. But what we must fear is that lower classes began to doubt why they bore many children who die shortly. —And they get angry like lions get angry with their manes shaking and began to refuse a duty of sacrifice without waiting for scientists to prepare answers to that question. What an admirable law of nature! Though their many children they had born like pigs once had been used as slaves and exacted taxes as serf, and so they had cried and asked for help to the other world of the Pure Land, they had not known that they had been sacrificed. The have not known that fact and peasants and wage slaves have held many children in their arms, shouldered, and sighed handing them—Ah, my pitiful children, how can you live on this severe world? Social evolution deepen and spread compatriots' consciousness.

In ancient times, even compatriots' consciousness between brothers and sisters had been weak and not only other villages or states but even tribal chives or monarchs had been regarded as existence who they had not been able to understand. But compatriots' consciousness had spread to the whole states and to all over the world with social evolution and at the same time it had made them love their parents and brothers like themselves or more than themselves. Why we were required interpretation of a principle of population is to request these satisfactions of loves. Population had not increased for the first time in the times of Malthus. The number of childbirth of Japan has not increased for the first time since economics had been lectured in Japan. The rate of population had been much higher in the modern times than in the medieval

times, and in the medieval times than in the ancient times. Because past people had only had and narrow sympathies, they had only not felt their children's death and only not doubted of upper classes who had grown up freely. But the law of nature has never been delayed. Modern deep and wide compatriots' consciousness has never been one in the times that the general public had put up with being forced to sacrifice as slaves or serf. Thus, compatriots' consciousness had made human beings take in the rail of the law of nature, bring about the French Revolution, and overthrown kings and nobles claiming bread and the constitution. But bread had not been given them and new nobles who had born on the newly made constitution had begun to plunder bread again. Fathers and mothers fall drops of their loves thicker than oil on their dozing off innocent babies' faces and cry that their families have still had difficulty living. Malthus shakes his sleeve of priest's robe and takes the poor the moral responsibility cruelly. Though the of nature robs their hands of knowledge, their eyes of arts, and their ears of music, it invites them downtowns filled with lusts, pours their mouths into unrefined sake, robs them of beddings, always makes their husbands and wives lie down, and provokes their desires of reproduction as prostitutes make their guests get drunk. Because of these, children are born and held on their parents' knees. –On the point of loving their children, why can we distinguish between the Holy Mother and our mothers? For loves to their children, even pheasants twittering in burnt-out areas²² fight against weasels like eagles. Remember that the vanguards of revolutionary army having charged the Marseilles Castle were very slender women. –Revolutions bring about for satisfactions of loves. Malthus must go to the paradise that is said that deceived poor people go and insist on a principle of population that those who rise to heaven shall increase too much (if we leave present situation as it is)²³. It is time that fathers and mothers having deepened compatriots' consciousness gaze at upper classes, though they had looked at their many children having slept on their knees and worried about the future! Deepened compatriots' consciousness in these ways shall overturn carriages with powers like floods, scatter diamonds, break down dining tables placed meat, break glasses on the places of balls, and here shall bring about revolutions. –Overpopulation has been required by social necessity and in this sense, upper classes should fear it.

There only are facts like these. In the world that the Red Flag of socialism torn up by arrows or bullets is put on museums and it is told as people's tales having peace and equality, it is groundless to think about increase of population as terrible increase (for

²² It is said that pheasants lose themselves in their saving their children when fields they build nests are burnt. From it, 'pheasants in burnt –out areas' is used a metaphor of painfulness of parents' loves to children.

²³ The sentence in a parenthesis was supplemented by a translator to make means of this part clear.

population in the socialistic world, we shall explain following chapter). Since human beings have evolved most among the organisms, we have had the least unfit who are sacrificed. Hence, we are organisms that have the least number of childbirth. Furthermore, we are organisms that we would reduce the number of sacrifices and the number of childbirth as transitional organisms that have been evolving higher stage. Thinking that the number of childbirth shall not decrease after today's human beings shall evolve more and shall realize socialism, namely, we shall reach making the least sacrifices, rather, it shall increase in a geometric series and all human beings shall die of hunger because of this (or realized socialism shall be broken and societies shall circulate like the theory before the theory of evolution had thought.) is to ignore the facts; like newts regenerate their lost four legs driven by necessity, none the less we apply it human hands and legs having evolved the degree that human beings don't have to live sacrificing four legs and say that since human beings have not lost four hands and legs, our hands shall increase in a geometric series like 8, 16, 32...'. –Open and see your hands. It would not imaginable for even professors of universities in newts' societies to infer like these. Of course, Japanese scholars who only play a part of translators should not be born responsibility about these faults, but what should be born responsibility is our Darwin. Because he got a hint from dogmatism of Malthus, on the one hand, he induced from facts the conclusion, 'all living things bear their children for the purpose of existence and evolution of their species' and offered the foundation of socialism, on the other hand, he confirmed individualistic arguments, 'human evolution has done to compete with each other by excessive reproductive powers' as if he denied the former argument. These words was adapted by Benjamin Kid, made *Social Evolution* which is said a great work after *On the Origin of Species*, influenced today's scholar classes, and got such an incomprehensive one whether an argument of social degeneration or collapse. Human excessive reproductive powers are not ones to compete with each other but to make us exist in struggles for existence with other species. If only those who have strong reproductive powers make struggles for existence between individuals and other individuals violent, so they evolve their species best—it is a contemptible reasoning powers! If so, since flies lay 200,000 eggs and have excessive reproductive powers the degree of getting a hundred million every week, they would have evolved one hundred million of two hundred thousand times as much as human civilization, and would have established their civilizations gathering on our dead bodies; since tapeworms have excessive reproductive powers which can lay fifteen billion eggs, they would have evolved highly fifteen billion times as much as human beings, present world would have entered tapeworms' 20 century, Mr. Kid of tapeworms would have

written the theory of evolution of them, and scholar classes like flies would have worshiped. For today's scholars who join their hands and worship Malthus, Kid would be a man who had a brain shining gold. For us, he is only a three-foot boy who we are enough to insult a few words and fool with him.

We have forgotten *A lecture of the theory of evolution* of Mr. Oka Asajiro, a doctor of science, who we have pointed as a representative scholar in Japan writing works by Western people's words. In that volume, he says; some people say that since pains of lives are based on violent competitions, increase of population is caused by violent competitions, so we have to restrict the number of childbirth. But, as I have mentioned, I cannot say that this is a good plan. It goes without saying that we and him have known that plans of social reformations by neo-Malthusianism were rash acts without purposes. But all of his *A lecture of the theory of evolution* which he looked back on the parts of conclusion and said, 'as I have mentioned' are chaotic, cite only facts, and have no theory. It only explains that since all living things evolve by individuals' struggles for existence among the same species, human evolution who have excessive reproductive powers are based on a Malthus' principle of population. This explanation is done because today's theory of biological evolution itself has no system. Why we have especially pointed Dr. Oka who studies devotedly is because he is a representative scholar, not because we intend to put the responsibility of faults like these only him.

As we have explained on the above, socialism doesn't intend to depart from the theory of biological evolution, and make the struggle for existence quit or moderate. There are food competitions to maintain reality that big units of the whole human societies have done against other organisms And there are struggles for reproductions to realize ideals that each individual has done among the same species.