

Section 5 The enlightening movement of socialism

Chapter 16

As stated above, we considered social democracy from economics, ethics, jurisprudence, politics, sociology, history, biology, and philosophy. Especially, we argued that Japanese race has reached social democracy in a legal ideal and moral belief following the way of historical evolution. And we explained from a viewpoint of historical philosophy that the Meiji Revolution legally realized an ideal in old times of *Taika*. We concluded that nationalization of lands and capitals was enough to make economic contents of the state reach the level that laws express under the laws. Namely, we said that social democratic revolution in the future meant economic revolution based on legal wars that new social influence became the national will and intended to evolve economic class state into economic nation-state.

Hence, we need to mention Confucian theory of an ideal state that was regarded as an ideal in *Taika* Revolution furthermore because this is the same with Plato's Republic in Europe that the theory got resource of socialism after ages and is theory of an ideal state in the ancient times as resource of socialism in China and Japan.

In the ancient Greece where Plato lived, politics (not today's sense but including the national science widely) had not divided from ethics. Also, in the ancient Chinese Confucianism, the situation had been the same. This fact proves that a principle of human nature and social existence and evolution were controlled by the same law of nature because both the ancient Occident and Orient that were entirely blocked up formed the great national polity having divided from one which had been one human being; though they got to be quite different each other since they differentiated to one-side course as the process of evolution afterward. Politics is ethics of the great organism of the society and ethics is politics of an organism of an individual. So, ethics and politics not only stand the same principle. Without progress of mutual studies, they cannot make their requirements realize. In this way, as socialism intends to construct the political system that is fit for inhabitant of ethical organisms ethically since human beings are ethical organisms, human beings had had the ethical political system by

ethical and political instinct like bees make nests by instinct in the age of philosophical history that they had considered intuitively. As a result of strict scientific studies, as we insist that we must satisfy economic requirements before ethical actions, their politics and ethics intended to release human beings from economic temptation. Mencius' remark, 'although former-sage (Shun) was different from times and places with latter-sage (Wen Wang, Ji Chang), their ways were the same', tells the truth. As European socialism seeks the resource to Plato, let us tell the theory of an ideal state of Mencius, whom was an Oriental Plato, in fragments. He inherited the teachings of Confucius, whom was an Oriental Socrates, and developed. It was the same that Plato inherited the teachings of Socrates, whom was an Occidental Confucius, and proposed the theory of an ideal state of ancient human beings in the first of philosophical history. His arguments reveal in the opening page of Oriental history of thoughts how a socialist ideal state was regarded as a human ideal from old ancient times.

The following speech about the government by love and justice to the King Xuan in Qi clearly expresses ethical foundation of scientific socialism. He said this:

Only a very few educated or cultured people can keep morals without definite properties but the general public cannot keep them without definite properties. If they lose morals, they do everything such as self-centeredness, a warped disposition, injustice, or luxury their own way and just as they like and commit any crime. You have known that but you don't devise to prevent that; none the less, if you punish them severely at once when they commit crimes, you would entirely ignore people. The monarch who should give them benevolence is a position of a governor, nevertheless, if he ignores people like this, why can he rule his country? Therefore, wise rulers in old times were anxious about people's lives, let their parents to live fully, let them to support their wives and children; as long as a bumper of year for crops kept, rulers let them to live in comfort in a lifetime and let them not to be anxious about death from hunger, even if they met with a bad crop. Under the presupposition, they taught people morals and urged them to do good deeds, so people could easily follow. Though today's rulers are anxious about people's lives, their parents cannot live fully either they can support their wives and children; even if a bumper of year for crops keeps happily, they suffer from heavy taxes in a lifetime and once they meet with a bad crop, they are drove into death from hunger. In a situation like this, they solely hope not to die. They have no time to master courtesy at all. His majesty, if you really think to practice merciful government, why don't you return the foundation of government and begin to stabilize their lives?

Thus, he looked for ethical requirements on the political system and put this on the theory of nationalization of lands that he regarded as the foundation of government. Lands at that time that were different from today's sense that we lump lands and capitals together meant every economic resource that was regarded as an object of nationalization for socialists at that time (in Greece where Plato lived, slavish class and women were slaves and were one's possessions, not personality, so he regarded them along with lands as economic resource that was regarded as an object of nationalization). He said, 'that the general public don't starve either be numb is finishing of government by love and justice. Those who practiced this government became always kings of the whole country from old times to today.' And he said, 'that people's lives steady and they can perfectly support their parents, wives and children, and hold a funeral of the dead is the very beginning of the government of by love and justice.' In this way, he showed that satisfaction of economic requirements was a precondition of every ethical action.

His ethical doctrine that human nature is fundamentally good recognized by intuition that social instinct existed by nature. He said, 'grains are the first-class and among what we eat but they are inferior to even barn grass unless they ripen fully. Like that, perfect virtue is not valuable until we make it mature fully'. This explains that a role of social instinct is limited and some people are hurt and the other are matured peacefully according to surrounding social circumstance. And he said this:

When Mencius went to the capital in Qi from the town, he saw the prince in Qi and admired sighing. 'A proverb says that the position where one is makes human nature change and nutrition one's bodies change. How wonderful the position is. Everybody is the same human being whether he is a prince or not. Nevertheless, only the prince quite dignified. Horses and vehicles he rides on and clothes he wears are not so different from others, none the less why he has unparalleled elegance is because his position makes him do naturally. Still more, the attitude of those who put themselves on perfect virtue that is the best mansion of the whole country must be superior to ordinary people. Once when the monarch in Lu went to Song, he called the gate-keeper from the capital gate in Song and made him open the gate. Then, he wondered and said, "He is not our master but his voice is very similar to our master". Now, their voices and attitudes naturally resemble since their positions resemble.

This reveals why any minister kneels on the ground like slaves before majestic figure of the great Oriental emperor of the present Emperor in and agrees with our argument

that explained that looks was made in accordance with class.

Furthermore, he said this:

Mencius said to Dai Busheng, who was a chief retainer in Song. 'If you hope your master is magnificent, I will give an example and say this: if a chief retainer in Chu thinks that a dialect in Chu is vulgar and wants his son refined a dialect in Qi, should he make a person in Qi a child-minder or make a person in Chu a child-minder? Dai Busheng answered, 'of course, he would choose a person in Qi'. Then, Mencius said, 'Yes, but even though a person in Qi become a child-minder, if a great number of people in Chu yak with him loudly in their dialect, he would not be able to make the child speak a dialect in Qi, even though he whips the child everyday to make him speak a dialect in Qi. But if he takes the child over to a bustling street such as Zhuang or Yue in the capital in Qi and remain him for a few years, the child would get used to a dialect in Qi. He would not be able to make the child speak dialect in Chu, even though he whips the child everyday and to make him speak a dialect in Chu.

This agrees with our argument that explained that conscience is made socially. As foreign people having different languages have different conscience, the medieval conscience of the German Emperor in the Court where vassals flatter dexterous words, and arrogant and slavish conscience is produced in a society of government officials. Also, in lower class that has a language like in a barbarous village, cruel, barbarous and slovenly conscience is produced like barbarians. Mencius said this:

Craftsmen who make arrows are not always worse than craftsmen who make armors but craftsmen are always worried not to hurt men because their arrows are poorly-made. On the contrary, craftsmen who make armors are always worried to hurt men because their armors are poorly-made. Maidens in the service of a shrine who intend to cure diseases and coffin-makers who greatly make a profit when men die are the same relationship. Since our moral attitudes are decided in accordance with arts (jobs), we must be very careful to choose jobs.

Thus, he skillfully explained that the whole world has remained the low-grade stage morally because of competitions among states based on the medieval barbarous customs and industrial wars of economic nobles.

He clearly understood that developed geniuses were entirely brought up by the society. And his argument is extremely delightful because it overthrows dogmatic theory of

inequality¹ of Rostrum Socialists at one blow.

Mencius said this: in a bumper of year for crops, many youths are honest and dependable since we can live peacefully. In a year of bad crop, many youths do wrong since we are short of food and clothing. But the heaven does not discriminate in accordance with the yield when it gives men natures. When they are short of food and clothing in a year of bad crop, they are tempted to do wrong and are dragged into wickedness. For example, suppose that we sow seeds of a barleycorn and cover with earth. As long as the area of the land and a season of sowing seeds are the same, they will soon put out buds and will entirely ripen by the time of the summer solstice. But if their yield is not always the same, it is based on the degree of fertility; it depends on the degree of rain and dew and of care by farmers, not good or bad of seeds of a barleycorn at all. So, not only a barleycorn but also everything resembles with each other as long as it belongs to the same kind. Why are only men exceptional? Even a sage is the same with us. If so, it is undoubted that we are also fundamentally good along with a sage. The ancient sage Long Zi said, ‘even if we make shoes not knowing foot size, we don’t make a big size thing like a tool carrying earth’, and it is true. There is little difference among the shape and size of shoes since human feet of the whole world have little difference. It is not only the foot but also the mouse or the sense of taste. Human taste is almost the same. The ancient famous cooker Yiya, who served the king Huan in Qi found the point of taste that everybody regards as tasty before anyone. If human taste is different by nature like between dogs or horses and us, do men in the whole country like Yiya’s cookery, on earth? Actually, men in the whole country all say that Yiya’s cookery is the best. This shows that there is little difference among human taste. It can be applied to ears. Why men in the whole country all say that Shi Kuang’s music is the best is because there is little difference among human hearing. It can be applied to eyes, too. Everybody knows that Zidu is beautiful. Those who do not know Zidu’s beauty are what we call those who have no eye. So, I do say this: when we taste food, there is what everybody thinks delicious, and when we hear music, there is what everybody thinks wonderful and is lost in the music; when we see a beautiful person, there is who everybody is lost in fascinated by. Nevertheless, why isn’t there only a moral that we accept in unison? Then, what we accept in unison is our peculiar justice and virtue. And a sage is only a man who found what we accept in unison before anyone. So, this reason or virtue satisfies not only a sage but also us as beef or pork satisfies our tongues.

¹ In Japanese original text, this part is ‘dogmatic theory of equality’ but it is contradictory with his argument in the Section 1. It would be ‘dogmatic theory of inequality’.

He regarded that a sage was little different from us and held up fundamentalism of the theory of equality. And he argued that if we human beings were the same with dogs or horses, the society shall not be able to understand a sage. Really, he was the ancient magnificent sage!

And he explained the present working class like this:

Those who are starving or are thirsty feel everything tasty. But they have not understood the real taste of food and drink since their correct taste is damaged because of hunger and thirst and cannot judge rightfully. By the way, is only mouth or stomach damaged by hunger or thirst? Human heart is also damaged by poverty and gets not to be able to judge rightfully. So, those who don't lose right heart by poverty don't have to be worried at all although they are not richer than others because we can say that they have been noble men already.

He grasped an ideal and a law of social evolution by simple intuitive belief. Finding an ideal to the future and a law to realize it can never be relation to the theory of union between the Shogunate and the Court or of harmony between capitals and labors. He held up the most radical and fundamental principles of revolution and went canvassing around the whole country. 'Mencius preached the usual view of human nature as fundamentally. When he opened his mouth, he always referred to the ancient sages Yao and Shun.' We can imagine that this shows how his every argument was based on his socialistic fundamental thoughts and poured from his mouth like spinning cotton into yarn. The view of human nature as fundamentally good and a great undertaking of Yao and Shun he recognized show that he understood a conclusion of today's scientific socialism—human beings have social instinct by nature of social animals and were peaceful and equal in the primitive age as social animals—intuitively. He had enthusiasm like today's social democrats from the fundamental theory of human nature and the society and had abandoned a principle of reform or harmony at first. He argued from this belief, 'we cannot govern the country splendidly only by goodwill either formal but inconsiderate institutions don't have an effect'. When Zichan was the prime minister in Zheng, (he felt pity that people went across the river on foot in the cold winter and) he carried people in the river Cou and Ziao² by his ship. Mencius criticized this and said this:

² Cou and Ziao are names of rivers in China.

He is merciful but it is a pity that he should not know how to govern. When he wants to carry people across the river, if he builds a temporary bridge which people can walk across at present on November of the off-season for farmers, and builds a bridge which horses and vehicles can pass through on December, people would not be worried to go across. As long as a ruler solely thinks his government impartially, even if he orders passer-bys away when he passes through the river, it is inconvenient for him because it is based on a distinction of ranks. Why can he carry all people in the whole country by his own ship? So, a governor should see matters in perspective. If he intends to satisfy each person, businesses are too many to practice; although he practices everyday, he would not be able to deal with those.

Though we cannot agree with his bad-smelling argument that approved of distinction of class entering into the age of the monarchal country, he showed that the charity system was worthless. And he got very fundamental and radical to nationalize economic resource: as if he was Christ who said, ‘Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up’³. He always said, ‘on earth, the way that we go to is only one’ and ‘medicine is not effective either cure a disease unless it is so strong that it makes us be dizzy’. They express just the present social democracy that strictly refuses anyone other than nationalization of lands and capitals. When Dai Yingzhi said: I want to collect taxes from one tenth of people’s income and to abolish other taxes such as customs duties of checkpoints or taxes to commodities in the market. But I cannot it in this year, so I’m going to reduce them at present and to abolish next year—what a similar to Rostrum Socialists! How pleasant!—, he strictly denied it in the name of economic justice based on a socialistic thought of rights.

Suppose that a person steels chickens which getting from the house next door everyday. When one advises him, ‘a man of virtue mustn’t do like that. Don’t steel

³ This phrase is seen in Chapter 2, section 19 in The Gospel according to St. John of the New Testament. The context before and after is like this:

And the Jew’s Passover was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem, And found in the temple those that sold oxen an sheep and doves, and the changers of money sitting: And when he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep, and the oxen; and poured out the changer’s money, and overthrew the tables; And said unto them that sold doves, Take these things hence; make not my Father’s house an house of merchandise. And his disciples remembered that it was written, The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up. Then answered the Jews and said unto him, What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body. When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said. Now when he was in Jerusalem at the passover, in the feast *day*, many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles which he did. But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all *men*, And needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man.

neighbor's chickens', if he said to this advice, 'then, I'll reduce an amount and steel a chicken every month, and I'll stop steeling next year', what do you think? If we are aware that our actions are wrong, we must stop them at once. Why must we wait next year?

But it goes without saying that we should not identify all Mencius' thoughts with today's social democracy. What is important is that he dreamed the theory of an ideal state and made efforts to realize it most in his lifetime in the Oriental thought history. His theory of nationalization of lands can get the theory that monarchs own lands shifting a step. And, 'the Method of Jingtian' only meant the restoration to the primitive age of the system of joint ownership of villages and needless to say, it is different from the national management of scientific socialism that practices agriculture by machines, so it is only a bud. The system of private ownership or tyranny was one of human natural processes of social evolution. Seeing from especially excellent conscience like Mencius, it was evil but seeing from social standard conscience through the ancient and medieval times, it was right since the society approved of. So, we declare that even severe collection of taxes was not immoral because they power class did it severely but was approved by social influence; this proves a moral level at that time. Historical records reveal that he was regarded as a mere dreamer⁴. In the primitive times of Yao and Shun when it had had a small population and human beings had begun to settle, lands were second to the air and the world was paradise where there were abundant natural crops. As he said, 'those who use spirit ruled those who use the bodies. Those who are ruled pay taxes and support those who ruled, and they are supported by those who are reigned over since they have no time to cultivate lands', when the society evolved, the population increased, and struggle for existence in the unit of villages, plundering class appeared. It goes without saying that in this age, it was impossible to revive the system of joint ownership of villages. That is, the system of private ownership produced the monarchal country and only a monarch got the subject of properties; next, the aristocratic country appeared and a few nobles got the subject of properties. Beside, the age entered into the democratic country and all the people, who had been regarded as monarchal or noble properties as slaves or serf and later were approved of personality and were given tenancy rights on the lands that monarchs or nobles had, got the subject of properties. In this way, individual freedom and authority was expanded from one element to a small number of elements, and to all elements. The system of private ownership was not based on vice of men of power as a process of social

⁴ Mencius was pay any attention for a long time until Han Yu praised him in the age of Tang Dynasty.

evolution from the ancient to modern times as people thought in the age of 'Utopian socialism'. However, he who left the theory of an ideal state like Plato on the first page of philosophical history clearly held up a socialistic utopia. He said this:

If a ruler make people exploit fields and reduce collection of taxes, he can make people rich. When he helps people's occupations, he thinks its timing; when he sets people to work, he uses them moderately. If he does so, the national wealth will accumulate the degree that they cannot make full use of it. Human beings cannot live a single day without water or fire. But when you knock on the doors of others' houses in the evening and ask them to give this important water or fire, everybody would give you them pleasantly because they have ones enough and to spare. If so, the saints must always have the ideal of making staple food such as beans and grain richer like water or fire for ruling over the whole country. If beans and grain gets to be rich like water or fire, the people would be very well-mannered naturally and why do those who fail in their duties appear?

Of course, why he called Yao and Shun sages was because they were in the primitive age when the world was peaceful and natural crops such as beans and grain like water or fire. It goes without saying that he praised them not because they governed the country skillfully like those who respect old ones. Hence, although a ruler at that time made people exploit fields and reduced collection of taxes, of course, he would not be able to make beans and grain rich like water or fire, and it goes without saying that it was only a utopia of a dreamer. Now, social evolution for 2,000 years let us human beings reach the material civilization like today, and steam and electricity replaced human physical labors. And human beings almost only engage in mental labors. Namely, saying in his words, those who use spirit are the whole people and those who use the bodies are steam and electricity. Those who support people are steam and electricity and people are supported by them. Those who are ruled by people are steam and electricity that only philosophers recognize as living bodies and the whole people rule them and become the monarch on everything of the earth as sages who brought the cosmos peaceful. –A spring of socialism begun to flow thanks to Plato and Mencius passed through a precipitous cliff of the system of private ownership in the monarchal, aristocratic, and democratic country, flowed into a plain of material civilization, and got 'merciful lake'. As the Meiji Revolution absorbed the sovereignty that resided in many patriarchal monarchs to the state, economic revolution shall absorb the right of production that resided in many economic patriarchal monarchs to the state. And the

state shall manage lands and productive organs as the substance of the sovereignty that shall hold every economic resource.

But what we should pay attention to most is that Mencius didn't understand the enlightening movement of socialism that we explain at all. It was unavoidable that he was an ancient man who didn't know that however excellent he was. Since a principle of class conflict had not been known until Karl Marx discovered in Europe (of course, his explanation was not perfect), he had no choice but to preach power class to realize his ideal in the age of 2,000 years ago. We can say that he practiced the enlightening movement in the point that he intended to make monarchal conscience socialistic, but as we have explained, the enlightening movement makes lower class the target and it becomes a presupposition that socialism exercises strong power in class war. On the contrary that his movement was practiced by canvassing tours to monarchs, today's socialism only aims at development of knowledge of the general public, that is, working class. This point touches what is regarded as the most terrible problem whether social democracy can be consistent with the Japanese Emperor, so we cannot avoid saying a word his principles of the national science.

It is a serious false that the general public believe that Mencius' politics is vaguely regarded as democracy. Of course, seeing from our viewpoint, his thoughts are magnificent democracy. As we have previously explained, we classify states in accordance with evolution, and name the country of the age that human beings had not been conscious that they had been social existence and had had no choice but to follow individual selfishness of one or a small number of monarchs the patriarchal country of monarchism. And we classify the modern state that after long evolution all parts of the state are conscious that the state has the purpose of existence and evolution, and all parts got to act in accordance with the national interest base on jurisprudential social selfishness nation-state of nationalism. Hence, if we classify the former with the monarchal country and the latter with the democratic country according to whether the monarch is outside the state and is its owner or he or she is its part acting under the national personality, (since we have used a word of democracy in this sense in the above argument), we want to insist on naming his politics democracy (see the Section 4, *The so-called principle of restorative-revolutionaries*). However, many scholars, like individualistic jurisprudence that they have still depended on, classify monarchism that modern monarchs are the substance of the sovereignty and democracy that individual people are the substance of the sovereignty. Worse scholars classify states in accordance with the number of the sovereign and name monarchism or democracy like Aristotle.

From this standpoint, to name Mencius' thoughts democracy in this sense is clearly fault because he had not assumed other than a despotic organization. So, we apply the legal theory we have previously explained to his thoughts—he recognized the ethical national purpose and thought that men of political power had to act for the national interest ethically. And he thought when he departs from this position as the organ; the Emperor became a mere man Zhou⁵ who people don't have to obey. In this point, he was a man who advocated the theory of the sovereignty of the state. His argument that the supreme organ is organized by one privileged person and it expresses the national will depending on inner political morals agrees with the first form of our three classification of form of government. The ideal in the *Taika* Revolution intended to realize it and in the age by 23 years from the Revolution in 1868, his all political ideals were realized in Japan. But after the Imperial Constitution in 1889, Japan changed the system of the supreme organ by exercise of the national sovereignty and the Emperor and the Imperial Diet organized the supreme organ. By this change, 'the sovereign' became a union of the will of a privileged element and the will of other elements. Hence, although ideals except for the enlightening movement were realized legally, we cannot be satisfied that we only make the Emperor a social democrat. We must assume jurisprudential possibility that capitalists and landlords depend on the Upper and Lower Diets and prevent social democracy of the Emperor.

Why Mencius advocated the theory of the sovereignty of the state was because he intuitively understood the national real existence and purpose by instinct as a political animal and reached the theory of the monarch as an organ of government as a view to the monarch. Democracy before and behind the French Revolution that regarded that individuals before social contract were the substance of the sovereignty or that Greek philosophers named as government by majority can never be dreamed by unhappy people who have not discovered 'decision by majority' that is only way that perfectly expresses the national will fitting the purpose of the state. Means to express the national will through decision by majority is an invention of the first step that human beings enter into a utopia in an aspect of political system; it was the same with an invention of a lever in physics. Since there was a difference in this step, the Oriental political evolution greatly delayed. Of course, the Occident has always advanced and 1,000 years of the long medieval history until the Germanic peoples inherited Greek

⁵ Zhou was the last Emperor in Shang Dynasty. He favored his consort Da Ji and indulged in luxurious life, and he tyrannized. Because of this, Shang Dynasty lost the support of the people and he was overthrown by the Emperor Wu (Ji Fa), who was who was the first Emperor in the Zhou Dynasty.

The king Xuan in Qi touched on this episode and asked Mencius, 'are subjects permitted to kill their masters?' He answered, 'the master who goes against justice is no longer the master but a mere man. So, Ji Fa killed a mere man but didn't kill the Emperor'.

and Roman cultures after their republic ruined was not different from the Orient at all; they were in a stream of the patriarchal country and fought for territories (only government by majority after the French Revolution can be called a civilized state in the Occident. Before the period, like Japan, European countries the aristocratic countries formed by knights and serf). We have previously explained in detail that states are organisms that have the purpose and an ideal of existence and evolution as real personality and nevertheless, they had been objects of rights like slaves' personality and had been owned by monarchs. Mencius stood in the stream of the patriarchal country like this, insisted on the argument of 'a mere man Zhou', and clearly expressed the theory of the sovereignty of the state. Why the monarch can require people to obey him or her is because he or she is the national organ that acts having the same sociality with the King Wen (Ji Chang) or Wu (Ji Fa) (in Japan, the Emperor *Tenji* or the present Emperor after the Meiji Revolution) for the national interest. The Russian or German Emperor like Jie or Zhou who don't act in accordance with sociality as the national organ and ignore the national interest base on individual trivial selfishness, as he said, are jurisprudentially mere men, not monarchs. Since he deprived the name of 'the master' that expressed the national organ of Jie and Zhou to insist that to kill mere men who weren't masters was not rebellion ignoring the national purpose. This is the same that today's Russian Revolutionary Party regards that the Czar is not the Emperor but a mere traitor and is on the watch for an opportunity to assassinate him.

In Japan, people had never been faithful to the Imperial Household for a long time from the ancient times, none the less the emperors had had deep and warm virtue. Though there were a few exceptions such as the Emperor *Buretsu* or *Yūryaku* and in one age, they had not been able to have virtue oppressed by other strong power, historical facts show that it is undoubted that they had had virtue in general. But all monarchs in the world are not Japanese emperors. Even in Japanese Imperial Household, there were not so many philosopher monarchs who Plato expected to appear. The age evolved the modern times and the Russian or German Emperor got to be conscious of the national eternal purpose; nevertheless, they depart from the monarchal position of the national organ to satisfy their small selfishness still and become 'mere men'. -To preserve the national polity of the sovereignty of the state, the state should be formed pure democracy or democratic form of government that organized by a privileged person and equal majority. Otherwise, the sovereignty of the state shall become only a political moral. The Imperial Constitution in 1889 shows that the present Emperor made this political moral develop to a legal conception and formed the supreme organ that expresses the national supreme will by a privileged person and

equal majority based on noble sociality that pursued the national interest. Of course, it goes without saying that a mere man like the German Emperor behaves selfishly not thinking the national purpose, as he is about to do now, although democratic form of government has been established. If so, it is possible that he or she who is not the monarch of the national organ, nevertheless puts on the Imperial Crown is regarded as a traitor and the revolution gushes out by the argument of 'a mere man Zhou'. Valuing the present Emperor who got the great leader in democratic revolution for himself in comparison with facts in history, there is no room to assume that Japanese emperors in the future shall lose their noble patriotism except for the case a mental illness prescribed in the Imperial Household Law. But it is unavoidable that the sovereignty of the state cannot be exercised only by the Emperor today. So, even if the Emperor *Tenji* appeared again and intended to carry out nationalization of economic resource (this meant lands at that time, and means lands and productive organs today), we cannot expect only the Emperor to realize social democracy like Mencius since the system of private ownership has established and lands of capitalists and landlords don't belong to the Emperor, and since they have freedom to deny the will of the Emperor depending on the Upper and Lower Diet. So, the Economic Revolutionary Party intends to practice the great enlightening movement being quite different from the theory of reverence for the Emperor that insisted on returning lands and productive organs to the Emperor and to drive out economic nobles from the national will.

What is incompatible to social democracy is a traitor putting on the Imperial Crown like the German Emperor who tramples on the national purpose along with economic nobles who plunder the national interest. It is perfectly free exercise of the sovereignty for the state to go into action by the great privilege to protect the important organs for its existence and evolution.

Really, Mencius can be said the Oriental Plato and his national science is resource of the Oriental socialism. He said this:

Although all attendants praise one is prominent, don't appoint him at once. Although all chief vassals praise him as the same, don't appoint him at once. Although all people in the whole country praise him as the same, you should not appoint him until you should make sure whether he is prominent or not. When you discharge one on the contrary, the situation is the same. Although all attendants blame one is useless, don't discharge him at once. Although all chief vassals blame one is useless, don't discharge him at once. Although all people in the whole country praise him as the same, you

should not discharge him until you should make sure whether he is useless or not. It is applied to punishment. Although all attendants insist on putting him to death, don't put him to death him at once. Although all chief vassals insist on putting him to death, don't put him to death him at once. Although all people in the whole country insist on putting him to death, you should not put him to death until you should make sure whether you should put him to death or not. Then, it is said that he was killed by the monarch but by all people in the whole country. If you respect the will of the people in appointment, discharge, or punishment and tread warily, you are qualified to be the monarch as parents of the people.

In the age that there had not been a political lever of voting, he approved of naked exercise of social spirit by the argument of 'a mere man Zhou and showed an ideal of democratic form of government to make the monarch the representative of the social will by his political morals. And in his volume, there is a section that he explained the primitive age of states. He said this:

In the state, people are the most important and the state symbolized by the Deity of Grain is second to it; and the monarch is made light of. So, one who was trusted by a large number of people becomes the Emperor and one who was trusted by the Emperor becomes a lord; one who was trusted by a lord becomes a chief retainer. If a lord is outrageous and endangers the state, we should dethrone the lord and appoint a new and wise lord because the monarch is less important than the state. If a sacrifice to offer to the Deity of Grain is fully fat, grain to offer it is perfectly clean, and we deified it at just time, none the less dry weather or flood occurs, the responsibility rests with the Deity of Grain. We are enough to abuse the Deity, to break down the altar, and to rebuild it because the Deity is less important than the people.

This 'the Deity of Grain' meant the country; the age evolved from the nomadic lives, human beings got to settle by agriculture, got to have certain territories, and got to deify every deities but if the territory was not fit to settle and to practice agriculture, they abandoned and left it because the territory was less important than their society. A phrase that If a lord is outrageous and endangers the state, we should dethrone the lord points that the lord was regarded as less important than the territory because the lord appeared as a leader of wars in conflicts with other nomads or native agricultural races on the way of a scrambling territories. The age was the primitive age of the system of joint ownership of villages that the monarch had not been an owner of all lands and

people like in the age of the system of private ownership; they instinctively recognized existence of the state as the purpose and made a simple and temporary organ for the purpose. In his volume, there is a dialogue that explained birth of the monarch of the organ and reason of succession. He said this:

Wanzhang⁶: Sir, they say that once the Emperor Yao gave Shun the whole country. Is it true?

Mencius: No, even the Emperor cannot give the other the whole country willfully.

Wanzhang: If so, sir, why did Shun reign over the whole country?

Mencius: Because the heaven ordered.

Wanzhang: Does it say something and order?

Mencius: No, it says anything. It only expresses its will seeing the man's actions and matters based on his actions.

Wanzhang: What does it mean?

Mencius: On earth, the Emperor can recommend a man suiting as his successor but cannot make the heaven give him the whole country. It is freedom of the heaven whether the whole country is given him or not. Like that, a lord can recommend a man suiting as his successor but cannot make the Emperor give him the position; a chief retainer can recommend a man suiting as his successor but cannot make a lord give him the position. This is why the heaven approved of Shun when Yao recommended him. And when he appointed him a regent and showed him before the people clearly, they delightfully accepted. In this way, Shun became the Emperor. So, I said, 'it says anything. It only expresses its will seeing the man's actions and matters based on his actions'.

Wanzhang: Then, I ask you, sir. To put it concretely, how did the heaven and the people accepted him?

Mencius: When Yao ordered Shun to deities of the earth, mountains, and rivers, the deities accepted it and there was no natural disaster or incident. This clearly showed the heaven accepted him. And when he made Shun governed the country, everything was at peace and the people were satisfied with it. This clearly showed the people accepted him. So, I said, 'even the Emperor cannot give the other the whole country willfully'. Shun served as a regent for 28 years. This could not be done only by a feat of strength at all. This was the very will of the heaven. After the death of Yao and three years of mourning expired, Shun retired to the far southern region of the South River⁷

⁶ He was one of Mencius' pupils.

⁷ This means the Yellow River (the Huang He).

to make Yao's son Danzhu succeed the throne. But all lords in the whole country took an audience with him, not Danzhu. Those who requested a trial visited him, not Danzhu. And all the people praised his virtue, not Danzhu. So, this was the very will of the heaven. Because of this, Shun reluctantly returned the capital and enthroned the Emperor. If Shun stayed on the Yao's Palace after his death and terrified his son agreeing to enthrone the Emperor, it would be said that he usurped the throne and it would never be what the heaven would give. In *Shujing*, 'the heaven has no eye or ear, so it sees and heard through the people's eyes and ears'. This proverb showed the above-mentioned.

Wanzhang: there is an opinion that why virtue declined after the reign of Yu was because he started to abdicate the throne to his son, not to a sage. Is this true, sir?

Mencius: No. The Throne is succeeded by a sage when the heaven intends to make a sage succeed and is succeeded by the Emperor's son when it intends to make the Emperor's son succeed. All are based on its will. Once, Shun knew Yu was wise, recommended him to the heaven, and made him govern the whole country for 17 years. After the death of Shun and three years of mourning expired, Yu retired to the far southern region of Yangcheng to make Shun's son Shangjun succeed the throne. But the people followed Yu just like the people followed Shun, not Yao's son Danzhu after his death. And Yu also recommended Yi to the heaven and made him govern the whole country for seven years. After the death of Yu and three years of mourning expired, Yi retired to the far region of Jishan, the south of Yangcheng to make Yu's son Qi succeed the throne. But, on the contrary, the people visited Qi to take an audience and to request a trial, not Yi because he was a son of Yu. They praised Qi and recited poems, not Yi because he was a son of Yu. This clearly shows that Yu made his son succeed the throne not by selfishness but the will of the heaven.

Yao's son Danzhu and Shun's son Shangjun were sons who were unworthy of his fathers. Shun served as a Yao's regent for 28 years and Yu served as a Shun's prime minister for 17 years. Since the people received their mercy for a long time, public feeling did not submit sons of Yao and Shun but Shun and Yu. On the other hand, Yu's son Qi was so wise and humbly succeeded the way of Yu. And Yi served as a Yu's prime minister only for seven years. Since the people did not receive so much Yi's mercy, public feeling didn't submit him. Thus, there was a great difference of a period served as a prime minister among Shun, Yu, and Yi and there were a great difference of wisdom among their sons. This was the Providence. Nothing can be done about it by human power. The Providence naturally comes even if we don't do consciously. If a mere man

wants to become the Emperor and to govern the whole country, he must hold high virtue like Shun or Yu and must be recommended by the contemporary Emperor. So, Confucius had held virtue as high as Shun or Yu but he was ill-fated and could not become the Emperor governing the whole country because the Emperor didn't recommend him to the heaven. And, once the Throne of the Emperor becomes hereditary by the Providence, the Providence is fixed. Only an atrocious emperor like Jie or Zhou is deserted and is dethroned by the heaven, although he inherited the Throne from his father. So, Yi, Yi Yin, or the duke Zhou (Ji Dan) had held high virtue but could not be the Emperor. Yi Yin became a prime minister of Tang, helped him and made him the Emperor in Shang Dynasty. After he died, since the Crown Prince Taiding died before enthronement, his brother Waibing enthroned. But he died in two years and his brother Zhongren enthroned but he died in four years. Then, the son of Taiding Taijia enthroned but he broke laws the Emperor Tang decided freely. So, Yi Yin unavoidably exiled him to Tong where there was the Tang's cemetery for three years. As might have been expected, Taijia repented his false, blamed his evil deeds, and made efforts to practice virtuous actions for three years. Since he listened to Yi Yin deeply, he could return the capital Hao and enthrone. So, Yi Yin didn't enthrone for himself. The reason why the duke Zhou didn't become the Emperor was the same with Yi in Xia Dynasty and Yi Yin in Shang Dynasty. As Confucius said, 'Yao and Shun made a sage succeed the Throne and the emperors in Xia, Shang, and Zhou Dynasty made their sons succeed but they only followed the will of the heaven. The reason was the same'.

Think about two dialogues removing a turn of phrase respecting old ones and formal adjectives. Phrases 'certain years of mourning', 'serving as a prime minister for certain years', 'retiring the far region to make the son succeed the throne', or 'recommending certain to the heaven' were effected old thoughts at that time. Unessential words being peculiar phrases at that time can ignore. In the age of Yao and Shun when Confucius and Mencius regarded as an ideal, people could not live on the plain until Yu practiced river improvement and had dug caves on a hillside and lived there. It was so primitive that they made their beds on the trees to avoid being attacked by beasts at night. We would not have to dare to argue it. In China at that time, there were so abundant that people equally lived in peace and there was no conflict. So, in the primitive villages where there was no conflict and was based on happy and primitive equality, the leader didn't appear to scramble territories like after ages; gentle and infantile men like Yao and Shun became the leaders and managed easy accidents (in the primitive German societies where were republican and equal, the strongest men became leaders because

they scrambled territories by nomadism and agriculture). This was the very early form of monarchy. Without a ceremony of abdication or retiring the far region to make the son succeed the throne like after ages, other men managed accidents, when the leader died. So, it was a made-up story that the people praised him, came to him to take an audience, or visited him to request a trial. His word, 'if Shun terrified his (Yao's) son agreeing to enthrone the Emperor, it would be said that he usurped the throne' is only a false coming from a turn of phrase respecting old ones.

Entering into the age of Yu, the population increased and the people went down to the plain because of narrowness of a hillside; they got to do best to prevent flood. The society so evolved that it had to have the reliable political system in this age. The throne got to be hereditary because the society evolved to this state. The big organism of the society is the same with small individual organisms; it makes its organs evolve or degenerate for existence and evolution in accordance with a Lamarckian theory. Social consciousness that evolved self-awakening one from instinctive and unconscious one gradually expanded itself tracing a family line. They judged social positions with each other (see the parts of Section 4, *The so-called principle of restorative-revolutionaries*) and blood worship that admired the son of daughter of their master appeared. That constant wars because of the struggle for existence by the social unit (see the Section 3, *The theory of biological evolution and social philosophy*) need monarchs constantly combined requirement that social confusion by scrambling the throne every monarchs died and made the age evolve the age of hereditary of the throne. Confucius' word quoted in his volume, 'Yao and Shun made a sage succeed the Throne and the emperors in Xia, Shang, and Zhou Dynasty made their sons succeed but they only followed the will of the heaven. The reason was the same', well recognized that the standard of justice in accordance with social evolution. So, why the age entered into the age of the patriarchal country by blood superiority and the throne got to be hereditary was because the society needed for social existence and evolution; the national personality got not to be exercised by the argument of 'a mere man Zhou' unless the monarch terribly went against social purpose and ideals like Jie or Zhou. Mencius' word, 'even the Emperor cannot give the other the whole country willfully' drove out the theory of the sovereignty of the monarch that regarded lands and people as the subject of rights for the monarch's interest and magnificently expressed the theory of the sovereignty of the state. He was the same with us who said based on a philosophy of teleology of the cosmos and a science of the theory of biological evolution that the whole world was controlled by the law of nature, and approved of all things base on a religious belief, 'all are based on the will of the heaven'. To understand as if it is unjust to be succeeded the throne hereditarily like an

opinion, 'why virtue declined after the reign of Yu was because he started to abdicate the throne to his son, not to a sage', is dogmatism. He drove out this dogmatism strictly like us as if he had seen the law of social evolution: The Throne is succeeded by a sage when the heaven intends to make a sage succeed and is succeeded by the Emperor's son when it intends to make the Emperor's son succeed. The heaven deprived quite a many nobles of the throne and made the present wise Emperor succeed. And it orders us to make his descendants succeed the throne even if they are wise like him for the national existence and evolution through the Imperial Constitution. It intends to deprive the whole country of the stupid Russian Emperor not to make and not to give the son of the German Emperor (the German Empire shall be pure republic in the reign of the Crown Prince); seeing the present situation, why people regard social democracy as a mortal enemy of the Emperor at once is because they understand that Lamarckian theory can be applied to the big organism of the society. If the heaven doesn't give the throne to a sage or to the son of the Emperor, why did the Revolution bring about and was the Imperial Constitution enacted? Why the national organ appeared was because evolution of the society needed it. When evolution needs to make it continue, a continuous organ appears. Japanese Emperor is a continuous organ that appeared for the purpose of the national existence and evolution and has been continuing.

Thus, Mencius' theory of an ideal state is magnificent like this and he would do credit as the Oriental Plato. But since Japanese race had been agricultural race that had plundered territories by wars when they had migrated to this country, they had experienced the period of republic and equal primitive age like Yao and Shun wandering other lands. And we can imagine that their society had evolved the stage that the heaven had made the son of the leader succeed the throne. This succession of the throne was different from what Mencius regarded as an ideal, so the organ was not the national organ that exercised the sovereignty of the state like today. The country was the patriarchal country where the sovereignty was inherited in the sense of ownership to the property of the state (as we have explained, countries that Mencius preached in the Warring States period were the patriarchal countries). So, Historical records of Japanese race started from the patriarchal country but did not write the period of republic and equal primitive age like the barbarous Germanic races; their republic and equal primitive age was recorded by the other race Romans. So, even if Confucianism got to be taught in Japan after ages, since Japanese race had not had history to understand his theory of the national science, the revolutionary theory in the ancient China had no choice but to understand as sanctions against those who went against

political morals as the monarchs⁸.

But ancestors of today's Emperor had been the emperors in the sense as the patriarchal monarchs for a long time; nevertheless, they had never gone against Mencius' political morals except for a few emperors. On the contrary, the patriarchal monarchs such as Shogun or feudal lords after the medieval history had prospered or ruined by exercise the argument of 'a mere man Zhou' or had ruined; they had been strictly taken sanctions in this way. Seeing from the side of monarchs in the age of the patriarchal country, the argument of 'a mere man Zhou' means a counterattack by the state of a slave that had not been recognized its legal personality against a cruel and violent slave owner for the purpose of existence as an organism. Through reputation of rebellions, slaves had been gradually recognized legal personality. Like that, through reputation of the argument of 'a mere man Zhou', the state also evolved the medieval age of the patriarchal country. All element of the state recognized the national purpose and an ideal. Patriotism regarded as purpose of morals, the state got legal personality and got the resource of all laws and orders. But since classics such as *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki* started from the record of the patriarchal country, it was unavoidable for them not to have been able to understand the theory of the sovereignty of the state by Confucian theory of an ideal state, when the patriarchal countries were overthrown by social democracy of the Revolution in the medieval Japan. So, unavoidably, for a while, they constructed their arguments through reviving a conception of the Emperor in the sense as the patriarchal monarch in the age of the Emperor *Jimmu*. That is, to deny nobles' powers of life and death to its territories and people, they expanded the rights of the Emperor to the whole country. They unavoidably and constantly advocated the restorative-revolutionary theory that went against nationalism until they imported European jurisprudence and the national science after the Revolution and enacted the Imperial Constitution in 1889. It was today's political parties that fought hardest with this 'theory of Japanese constitution' most. They stood the foundation of the system of private ownership that people got economic independence and required democracy based on literal translation of the bloody French Revolution. Social democracy thanks them before corruption!

This gratitude expresses infinite contempt to today's Rostrum Socialists. You would understand by the above-mentioned why Rostrum Socialists have no theory, system, insistence, or ideal in economics, ethics, and any other scientific philosophies. They call themselves 'national socialists', none the less they are ignorant about the essence and

⁸ Accurately speaking, Japanese rulers understood the meaning of revolutionary theory and regarded as dangerous, so they dare not to teach the theory.

legal principles of the state; we have no choice but to being amazed at them. See Mr. Higuchi Kanjirō's *New Pedagogies of National Socialism*. He says this:

Our country tended to be practiced socialism historically. Our country forms a family by the whole country. With all due respect, the Imperial Household is the patriarch of the family. All people are equal before the Emperor. When he sees the people, he treats them equally and practices charity. If so, a conception that the whole country is owned by a family of Japan has not changed even now. In the reign of the 37th Emperor *Koutoku*, the court confiscated lands of powerful clans and gave rewards in return for it but people didn't doubt it. And it forbidden that local clans annexed small farmers and made the people choose jobs freely; it was really socialistic revolution. It was practiced by the same virtue with a conception that the whole country formed a family. See *Ryō no Gige (The Annotation of the Legal Code of the Nara and Heian era)*⁹. The law prescribed that men should be given two *tan*¹⁰ paddy fields and women should be given two-thirds paddy fields of men but children of five and under could not be given them¹¹. When they died, fields were returned to the court. After that, fields that were given to men of merit to the court and manors appeared and feudalism was established but the emperors had authority to give subjects lands. In the time of the Restoration, Daimyōs or Shōmyōs in the whole country declared to abandon their land and to return them to the Emperor. This is an excellent way of thinking not being able to see in other countries. Lands and all other properties reside in the Emperor. It is freedom of the patriarch to confiscate these for the great house of Japan from children of the family. To return them for the family is children's virtue. But merciful parents give their children toys or sugar in return for confectionery they gave once. That is why he gave Daimyōs or Shōmyōs public loans. In Japan, these reforms can comparatively easily be practiced. Sometimes, children shall start fighting but the patriarch can stop this by his thunder.....

Ah, those who hear these talks are wet with perspiration on their backs with shame!

Be ashamed! Be Ashamed! If 'national socialism' is like this, it is not nationalism either socialism. It shall be absolute and infinite monarchy! He is proud, 'our national socialism is based on our history, our national polity, and our present situations. So, it is not socialism based on a literal translation that circulates public', but can he preserve

⁹ It was edited to unify interpretations of the Legal Code of the Nara and Heian era. Editing started from 826 and completed in 833.

¹⁰ Tan is a land unit of the ancient Japan. In the ancient Japan, one tan is equal to 360 bu. One tan is about 11.7 are.

¹¹ In this part, Higuchi writes when the people become 5 years old, they were given a paddy field but it is fault.

his honor? Japanese are vexed that they are smaller than European but they are never 'children' who stop fighting by 'toys or sugar' from the Emperor. Children having beards, cropped-hair-children, children getting pregnant, children of old women, or children having grandchildren! A descendant of 'an unbroken line' can be the Emperor, however young he is. But the baby or the ten-year-old child as parents is not a parent who bore you as parents forming a family along with today's members of the National Socialist Party. Mr. Itō Hirobumi is not a fellow with the His Highness Prince of the present Emperor because he is not of the same blood with the present Emperor. Mr. Katsura Tarō is not a brother with the Imperial grandchild making His Highness Prince be parents, either. These don't show 'our history' or 'our national polity' at all. No! There has been no laughing history or national polity like this in any other country. Answer clearly: if you say that lands and all other properties reside in the Emperor and it is confectionery he gave once, who and when were all productive organs by steam and electricity given today's capitalists in 'our history'? Can the Emperor deprive capitals of foreign capitalists and add them the expense of the Imperial Household or advocate a tour of foreign nobles, and deprive jewels of them and decollate his crown because 'this is an excellent way of thinking not being able to see in other countries' and 'it is freedom of the patriarch to confiscate these for the great house of Japan from children of the family'? Answer. Needless to say, this is not only Mr. Higuchi. Since this country is the Oriental barbarous village, 'a baby' Yamaji Aizan, who have a mustache and made principles and a manifest of the National Socialist Party does not understand social democracy in the Meiji Revolution, he insists on economic theory of revere the Emperor and expel the barbarians of return of the productive rights freely.

Social democracy inherits perfect development of the system of private ownership and individualism, and is nationalism and cosmopolitanism achieving an ideal independence of states and individual absolute freedom. Unless all parts of the state experience social evolution of individualism that they become the subjects in the system of private ownership, nationalism and cosmopolitanism that intends to evolve the society that is formed by all elements based on free and equal competition and mutual aid of all elements shall be only a dream. That is why the theory of nationalization of lands in the *Taike* era ended a dream. Unless all elements of the society awaken up, however noble ideals an element of the Emperor *Tenji* held, they would have no choice but to remain sleeping in the society formed by slept elements. When only the Emperor awakens up like parents and rest 45 million people have not been conscious of like babies, it is '*L'état c'est moi*'. Unless rest 45 million people are regarded as beasts that are outside the state, the state formed by unconscious babies has been unconscious;

otherwise, it has been the primitive communism society. —But remember that the first process of evolution from the primitive communism society was a sign of monarchy that all territories and properties were owned by a chief. They were not always philosophical monarchs Plato expected. Those who perfectly realized Mencius' social democracy morally were only heroes in the *Taika* Revolution and in the *Meiji* Revolution even in the Japanese Imperial Household weren't they?

After the hero in the *Taika* Revolution, mediocre emperors who didn't understand his undertakings abandoned his socialism and made lands he nationalized theirs. And they gave lands to subjects they favored or temples, or sold what was established as the national organ local clans or *Kokushis* like they sold their properties. It goes without saying that there is no room to think that the Japanese emperors who were at the head of social evolution went against it and degenerated the ancient times. Hence, needless to say, speech and action of national socialists are childish—many of traitors used a scheme like this and respected the emperors but kept them away. What we must ask them explanation: does nationalization of lands mean to own lands by states or the monarchs? Did capitalists get machines by steam and electricity they plundered by monopoly of social productive actions or theft of labors of the emperors? Slaves! The aggregate of slaves! We do not find pleasure in the ancient system of slaves along with national socialists but must make efforts to save rights of capitalists and landlords in the name of the theory of the sovereignty of the state. They don't understand the state or the society at all, none the less they loudly argue 'the state' or 'the society' but don't have no knowledge. Socialism means that all parts of the society become the subjects of rights of properties. Nationalism means that all parts of the state become rightful claimants that interest resides in. In the present economic aristocratic country, a small number of parts of the society are the subjects of rights of properties and most of parts of the society only have the right to use properties—do national socialists intend to prevent evolution to the economic democratic country and to turn it back to the economic monarchical country legally? In the present economic class state, interest resides in a small number of parts of the state and most of parts of the state are sacrificed by wars and poverty—does national socialism intend to prevent evolution to the economic nation-state and to establish the absolute and infinite rights of the patriarchs legally in the age when the people themselves were owned by the monarchs?

In addition, answer. Do you members of the National Socialist Party present you wives under the ownership like the Emperor *Yuryaku*? And do you present your parents under the ownership like the Emperor *Buretsu* and leave them to him breaking them? —You shall answer, 'no'. If so, your insistence is a dirty action that you make use of the

Emperor to get interest by your insistence. Needless to say, it is 'disrespect'. Nevertheless, they fit arrows of 'disrespect' in reverse and shoot social democracy. We have no choice but to say that they are barbarians. The most outspoken example about this is Dr. Kuwata who always confronts social democracy by 'the theory of Japanese constitution' (it is said that he desired to join the National Socialist Party of Mr. Yamaji and so on but was refused). He says on the analogy of struggle between the German Emperor and the German Social Democratic Party that Japanese Socialist Party is dangerous for the Japanese national polity and they disrespectfully behave to the Emperor. A traitor who departs from the position of the national organ and becomes 'a mere man Zhou' like the German Emperor does not share a table with the Social Democratic Party (they say that the Social Democratic Party envies), and on the other hand, the Social Democratic Party has not bowed very low to this traitor. They suggested a provision of lese majesty but were defeated because they were a minority at the time (they say that this was what the Social Democratic Party disappointed). However, the Japanese Emperor is not so mediocre that he is compared with the German Emperor. The position of the Emperor is the important national organ that was given the present 'wise' Emperor by 'the heaven' and the Imperial Constitution orders his 'son' of an unbroken line to succeed the throne. Those who go against the national organ are traitors against the state. Social democracy does not revolt against the state but only make efforts to help the national existence and evolution by perfect exercise of the sovereignty of the state. It is always important that we mustn't forget that the content of a word of 'the Emperor' is different in accordance with regions and times even if the letter, form, or pronunciation is the same (see the Section 4, *The so-called principle of restorative-revolutionaries*).

As we have explained, you shall understand what is called national socialism not only has no fundamental thought being worth naming socialism but also does not understand 'nation' at all that is named with the prefix. And this insistence makes us express that today's so-called socialism is actually pure utopian cosmopolitanism, that is, individualism and denies the state without understanding 'the state' as the same.

Today's pacifism in the Japanese Socialist Party is a religious theory of the principle of nonresistance as some of them say for themselves. –But this religious theory of the principle of nonresistance, like Tolstoy's nonresistance, denies even class war of resistance of lower class against upper class and leads socialism itself to the ruin. It means cosmopolitanism that assumes atomic individuals and intends to unite today's one billion people at once. –But a principle of unification of the world shall approve of

Napoleon's dreams backed in the age of the individualistic French Revolution. It makes Japan abandon her independence when Russia invades her and makes people become soldiers under Napoleon when she intends to invade China or Korea. Utopian cosmopolitanism stands on an assumption of individualism. When individualism ignores other countries, it becomes Napoleon and when it forgets its own country, it becomes Jewish.

—So, we shall declare this: social democracy can never discover a reason to advocate those who deny the state; even if they violently do so (Marx did do so violently). This declaration leads us to next declaration: the resolution of the International that denied the Russo-Japanese War based on a preoccupation of violent words in Marx's *The Communist Manifest* and speech and action of individualists in the Japanese Socialist Party is never enough to adapt.

Weak we don't think that we can have a showdown only a pen against the solution that the Socialist Party in the world proposed. But to be fascinated Marx's great achievements is an awkward fault for the Socialist Party in the whole world. His greatness is limited in an economic aspect that he explained capitals in the modern machine industry historically and a part of history that he discovered social evolution is based on class conflict. His theory of the value was fault and he did not analyze a mental aspect of class conflict. Social democracy was not invented in the 19th century. It was a great thought that had flowed from the source of philosophical history since human beings had entered into civilization; Plato's *Republic* was the source. Since lands were the only economic resource in the ancient times, the great flow of social democracy appeared as the theory of nationalization of lands; in the modern times, since capitals got the most economic resource, the theory added capitals as the object of nationalization.

Social evolution has not only competition between classes but also between the states. Did Plato advocate the theory of nationalization of lands for the state that should be denied? Members of the Socialist Party in the world, if you don't deny that a Plato's word¹², 'one who is outside a state is the God or an animal' agrees with today's scientific socialism that all thoughts, morals, and races are made socially, why do you deny the state and competition among states? Members of the Socialist Party in the world should be the God or an animal. Tolstoy who regards the primitive equal republic as a village of the God based on utopian cosmopolitanism seems not to be the God because he did a sex when he was young and he has not insisted on abolishing a sex to the world. Bebel is never the God because unavoidably excretes like the German Emperor. Human beings

¹² In Chapter 5 in the Section 3, this word is quoted as an Aristotle's word.

don't exist as individuals like beasts but form the state to reach the God who doesn't a sex either discharge (see the part in the Section 3, *The theory of biological evolution and social philosophy* that we explained a utopia that human beings shall evolve and reach). We have been in the state; nevertheless there is no competition among states? Of course, we must overcome the reality of competition among states. The reality is the same with the reality of a sex or discharge in the point that they have not been overcome. So, like today's class war is fought by class moral, knowledge, and looks, competition among states that is fought for national moral, knowledge, and looks is unavoidable because separation between class expands more and it is quite difficult to assimilate among the present states.

Social democracy regards extermination of class conflict and competition among states as an ideal. But since equal material protection and spiritual development has not spread to real states, there is class war in the name of socialism. Like that (as the same, see the Section 2, *Ethical ideal of socialism*, we shall argue spiritual satisfactory of socialism and Section 3, *The theory of biological evolution and social philosophy*), unless great difference of economic circumstances and great change of spiritual lives are driven out by realization of the World Federation of Nations and world language (for example, Esperanto¹³ and so on), we cannot ignore competition among states in the name of socialism. Except for those who are remarkably excellent, like people cannot transcend class knowledge, virtue, and beauty, the general public who are rare to contact with foreign races and do not understand foreign languages and thoughts cannot transcend national moral, knowledge, and looks. Namely, individuals must contact with the world through class and the state. As class war is caused by class separation, competition among states is caused by the national confrontation.

But loyalists of the Japanese Socialist party who advocated pacifism in the violent enthusiasm of winning and the solution of the International that denied the Russo-Japanese War based on their speech and action badly ignore the fact. They understand as if capitalists who have interest in Manchuria or Korea freely brought about the Russo-Japanese War. If they think that small Japanese financial combines such as Mitsui or Mitsubishi have power like this, their sorrow is only literal translation. It is true that the South-African War¹⁴ was brought about by British capitalists who had interest in the South Africa¹⁵ and the Spanish-American War was brought about by American capitalists who had interest (in Cuba) but Japanese

¹³ Esperanto is an artificial international language made by a Polish scholar Zamenhof. In 1906, the Esperanto Society of Japan was established.

¹⁴ It means the Boer War.

¹⁵ In Transvaal, diamond and gold were discovered.

capitalists' interest played little part in the Russo-Japanese War. We declare this: the main motive of the Russo-Japanese War a collision of the national authority and the fundamental thought required the war is inheritance of the theory of reverence the Emperor and expel the barbarians.

We cannot endure the pain that the name of a scientific study goes against our feelings too much. A declaration like this badly goes against a feeling that admires pacifists who struggle hard against the whole Japan. –But we dare to insist this because socialist movement must be the fundamental enlightening movement. A war was not fought only for soldiers' honors. Neither was it fought for capitalists' interest. Really, it was the national spirit of the theory of theory of reverence the Emperor and expel the barbarians. If race psychology does not teach that the national spirit is changed in two or three decades, it goes without saying that Japanese people inherit the theory of reverence the Emperor and expel the barbarians today. If only interest of capitalists is caused the war, we are enough to open Manchuria. The explosion in Hibiya Park¹⁶ expressed requirements that made Japan do the war naked. It was the very theory of reverence the Emperor and expel the barbarians, as one European critic said that Japanese were Tartars worn a cloth of civilization. Humiliating diplomacy! This word is beyond capitalists' interest. They shouted, 'we proved ourselves a good match with Russia. Nevertheless, why Japan could not force Russia to give in was because our diplomacy was poor and so the national authority was insult'. And said, 'we could only repaint a map of half of Karafuto (Sakhalin) but it is not enough to have our past revenge¹⁷, so it does not express that Russia surrendered to Japan'. Since lower class has remained the low stage in all knowledge and morals, and was rare to contact with foreign thoughts, literature, and races, they died for this theory of reverence the Emperor and expel the barbarians most faithfully. We shall tell so-called socialists who attribute the Russo-Japanese War to underdeveloped capitalists this: as the theory of Japanese constitution does a laughing argument that traitors were only Yoshitoki and Takauji and a few hundred thousand people defeated the force of the Emperor were loyalists to the Emperor, a logic that the Russo-Japanese War was fought for Mitsui or Mitsubishi, or the General Nogi or Tōgō, and 45 million people unavoidably insisted on the outbreak of war, became members of a charge and a suicide corps is the same logic with the theory of Japanese constitution.

¹⁶ In 1905, in Hibiya Park, a meeting opposing to the Portsmouth Treaty was held but it developed a riot. Why a riot occurred was because people exploded into angry to the treaty that didn't admit to pay compensation to Japan from Russia

¹⁷ In 1895, Japan made China cede the Liaodong Peninsula as a result of winning in the Sino-Japanese War but Russia, France, and Germany interfered with Japan and made her return the Peninsula. 'Our past revenge' meant it.

The law of nature has no false or useless one. The theory of reverence the Emperor and expel the barbarians meant that personality of the state began to insist on its own authority in the barbarous shape. When individuals awaken the authority up, they intend to exercise their own authority on others becoming soldiers. Like that, the state escaped from ownership of the monarchs ignores other states' authority and intends to exercise its own authority on others as the result that it awoke its authority of actual personality up. –It means Imperialism. The law of nature has no false or useless one. Socialism clearly inherits evolution of Imperialism because it advocates the national authority. Unless socialism receives evolution of the system of private ownership that advocates individual authority, it cannot realize economic freedom and equality; and unless it receives evolution of nationalism that advocates the national authority, it cannot realize the World Federation of Nations based on international freedom and equality cannot realize. The first name of 'Imperialism' was shouted against Napoleon's individualistic cosmopolitanism advocating the national authority. –Nevertheless, how is the reality? Today, social democrats advocating cosmopolitanism by the national unit deny the state in reverse and advocate cosmopolitanism supported by individualism in the French Revolution. And capitalists and landlords advocating individualism hold on imperialism that insists on the national authority!

Ah, since friends and enemies do great confused fights in the world of thoughts, they mistake the emblems on flags with each other. Without individualism, there is no socialism on authority of the whole individuals. Without imperialism, there is no World Federation of Nations built on authority of the whole states. So, for 'commoners' who obeyed nobles and monarchs slavishly and didn't have individual authority, social democracy was a dream. Like that, in an aggregate of states that wholly serve the strong and don't understand their won national authority, the Roman Empire can be existed but cannot be the World Federation of Nations. In this point, needless to say, it is fault what Mr. Abe Isoh argued in his *Switzerland* that he regarded her as an ideal on the earth and it is pity that we should have armaments. Like the state, an independent state supported by guns and swords of other states is not an ideal state. Why Switzerland is said as ideal is because she holds the national authority that she shall become extinct after she shall be defeated because of a little armament. When personality awakens up to authority and advocates its own freedom, it does not respect and ignore others' freedom for its own freedom at first. So, like freedom in the age of the democratic country, before freedom respects others' freedom, it attacks and overthrows nobles at first and oppresses others' freedom. Today when 'the state' released from the monarchs and evolved a little bit—in Europe, 'patriotism' bore only about 200 years ago

and today's Japan only passed fifty or sixty years before and after the Meiji Revolution—, we admire that a small noble named Japan removed oppression of a big noble of the Slavs and advocated freedom opposing to the resolution of the International. But freedom must respect and admit others' freedom. We must evolve our freedom doing aristocratic noble and barbarous behaves into civilized democratic freedom and must strictly put an end trampling down Chinese and Korean freedom. Social democrats' pacifism is put into the future efforts.

If we don't acquire the national freedom because of foreign oppressions, we cannot realize socialism. The Oriental barbarous village not having the national authority under a threat of the theory of Japanese constitution is the same with barbarous villages in the South Pacific and does not have the right to require to seat in the World Federation of Nations.

(Section 5 The enlightening movement of socialism End)

**A DISCOURSE OF THE THEORY OF JAPANESE C
ONSTITUTION AND REAL SOCIALISM END**