

まるさす人口論出版當時ノ反對論者

特ニ生存權論者

法學博士 福田 徳 三

争論ハ學問ノ生命ナリ、争臣ナキ社稷ノ危フキガ如ク争論者ヲ寛容シ得ザル學問ハ甚ダ危シ。
社會科學ノ内我經濟學ハ其進歩ノ大部分ヲ論難攻撃ニ負フモノナリ而シテ經濟學ノ先覺中自ラ争
論ニ干與スルコト最モ多ク其學說ノ建設ニ方ツテ最モ大ナル援助ヲ争論中ニ得クルモノハな
らすナリ。然レバ今まるさすヲ記念スルニ方リテ争論者トシテノ彼ノ面目ヲ考察スルコト必ズシ
モ無用事タラザル可キカ。

ぼーなーハ云ノリ、

He was the "best-abused man of the age"..... Malthus from the first was not ignored. For thirty years it rained
refutations. The question, as he stated it, was thoroughly threshed out. The Essay on Population passed in the author's
lifetime through six editions.....; even between the first edition and the second, there were more than a score of
'Replies'; and the discussion was carried on in private correspondence, as well as in public journals and parliamen-
tary speeches..... Such a privilege is seldom used..... As it is, Adam Smith has left a book which "every one
praises and nobody reads", Malthus a book which no one reads and all abuse..... The truth must be told, howe-
ver, that Malthus and the rest of the learned world were by no means at utter discord. He always treated a hostile

論 說 (四)

よるさす人口論出版當時ノ
反對論者特ニ生存權論者

第一卷 第五號

economist as a possible ally. He was carrying on the work of their common founder. In the Essay on Population he was inquiring into the nature and causes of poverty, as Adam Smith had inquired into the nature and causes of wealth. But Malthus himself did not intend the one to be a mere supplement to the other..... Malthus..... gained his reputation by a bold and sudden stroke, well followed up. 1)

まるさす述作ノ性質ガ特ニ爭論ニ絶好ノ題目ヲ供スルコト誠ニぼーな一ノ言ノ如シ。而シテまるさすハ始メヨリ爭論ヲ豫期シテ其論ヲ立テタリ。若シ終生爭フ所ナキヲ以テ君子ノ理想ナリトセバ、まるさすノ志ハ決シテ君子タラントスルニ存セザリシヤ言フマデモナシ。之ニ反シ最も能ク最も有力ニ爭論スルコトガ學者ノ任務ナリトセバ、まるさすハ古今ノ經濟學者中比儔少キ一典型的學者ナリト云ハザル可カラズ。個人トシテ温厚玉ノ如カリ、まるさすハ學者トシテ最も猛烈ナル爭論者タリシナリ。而シテ彼ガ學說ハ此ノ絶ヘザル爭論ノ間ニ研磨セラレテ大成シタリ。彼ハ始メヨリ一ノ系統的理論ノ書ヲ作リシニアラズ又タ作ラント欲セシニアラズ。

He did not approach the subject from a purely scientific side. He had not devoted long years of travel and reflection to the preparation of an economical treatise..... His Essay..... was meant to turn the light of political economy upon the political philosophy of the day. 2)

ぼーな一ノ此評誠ニ克ク要ヲ得タリ。

えむぶそんハえぢんばら評論千八百三十七年一月號ニ於テまるさすノ反對論者ヲ分類シテ左ノ如クセリト云フ。³⁾

(一) 自ら愚ニシテまるさすノ説ヲ諒解シ能ハザルモノ。

(ぐらほむ)

1) Bonar, Malthus and his work. 1885. pp. 1-5.

2) Ibidem. p. 5. 3) Ibidem. p. 377.

(二) 感情的恐怖ヨリ反對スルモノ。

(さうせー、これりつち、價正はんちどん)

(三) 人口ノ法則ハ事情ニ從テ異ル可シトシテ反對セルモノ。

(さざらー、及ごどうふん)

(四) 自らまるさすノ法則ニ代ル可キ人口法則ヲ主張シテ反對セルモノ。

(あんたーせん、をーうえん、すくろーぶ)

(五) まるさすノ前提モ結論モ共ニ之ヲ否定スルモノ。

(うえーらんど)

而シテばーなーハ更ラニ自己ノ分類ヲ作ルコト左ノ如シ。⁴⁾

(一) まるさすノ説ヲ以テ無用自明ノ事ナリトスルモノ。

(はずりつと人口論辨妄第二十頁)⁵⁾

(二) まるさす説ノ正シキヲ認ムルモ將來ニ於テ或ル反對法則ノ發見セラル可キヲ信ズルモノ。

(ぐれー、Iniquitas of Life, 8th ed. 1874 pp.58 et seq. ごどうふん第一回駁論モ亦此種ニ屬ス)

(三) まるさす説ノ細目ニ就テ反對スルモノ。之ヲ數類ニ分ツ左ノ如シ。

一 増加率ニ就テ。

人口増加ハ等比的ノ傾向ヲ有セズ、遙カニ小ナル率ヲ有シ又タ却テ減少ノ傾向ヲ有ス

(ちからー)。食料増加ハ必ズシモ等差的タルニ止マラズヨリ大ナル率ヲ示ス(けりー、へんり
(いんじふん)。)

(さざらー)。

論説(四)

まるさす人口論出版當時ノ
反對論者特ニ生存權論者

三

第二卷 第五號

4) Ibidem. p. 394.

5) Hazlitt, Reply to Essay on Population.

(二)人口ノ制限ニ就テ。

(イ) 制限ハ毫無モ必要ナラズ(ごどうゆん、さざら)

(ロ) 罪惡ト窮困トハ人口ヲ抑制セズシテ却テ之ヲ増加セシムルコトアリ(ごどうゆん、さざら)

(ハ) 制限中ニ道德的抑制ヲ加フルハ本來ノ議論ヲ紊ルモノナリ(ごどうゆん、さざら、はじなつこ)

(ニ) 道德的抑制ハ時トシテハ人口過超ヲ來タスト共ニ大ナル弊害ヲ惹起ス

a. 其抑制ヲ實行スル結果トシテ

b. 其抑制ノ守ル可キヲ勸説スル結果トシテ

(ごどうゆん、さざら)

(ホ) まるさすノ説ク以外ニ重要ナル抑制アリ即チ

a. 政治ノ惡シキコト(ごどうゆん)

b. 惡キ法律(ごどうゆん、これりつち、さうせ)

c. 奢侈(だぶるで)

d. 智能ノ發達(すべんさ)

e. をいうゆんの説

ぼーなーハ更ラニ先天的批評ヲ分類シテ次ノ四種トセリ。

(一) 教會的 反對論者。まるさすヲ以テ聖書又ハ教法上ノ權威者ノ教訓ニ異背ストナス。

(二) 神學的 反對論者。まるさすノ説ハ神ノ攝理ヲ否定スルモノナリトス。

(三)獨斷定教的反對論者。まるさすハ自然法并ニ道德經濟法則ノ調和、人類平等ノ本能ヲ否定スルモノナリ。

(四)倫理的及通俗的の反對論者。まるさすノ説ハ人類ノ道德的本性、自然的善意及世界的道德ト矛盾スルモノナリトス。

此兩種ノ分類タル單ニまるさす同時代ノ學者ノ説ニ就テ下サレタルモノニアラズ彼以後踵ヲ接シテ現ハレ今日ニ至リテ未ダ其跡ヲ絶タザル一切ノまるさす反對論ヲ綜括シタルモノニシテ粗ボ要領ヲ得タリト認ム可シ。然レトモ凡テノ Schematisierung ニ免カレ難キ缺點ハ分類以外ニ重要ナルモノヲ遺スコト是ナリ、今ば一なりノ分類モえむぶそんノ分類モ共ニ此嫌ヲ否定スルコト能ハズ。而シテ予ヲ以テ見ルニ此等分類ハ餘リニ一律的ニシテ反對論中輕重精粗ニ甚シキ相違アルヲ輕視スルモノノ如シ。凡ソまるさす反對論ノ數ハ甚タ多キガ中ニ就テ其最モ根本的ナルモノハば一なりガ神學的ト呼ビ獨斷定教的ト名クル論者ノ中ニ在リテまるさす主張ノ人口法則ガ攝理又ハ自然ノ法則ト而立セザルコトヲ指摘スルモノナラズンバアラズ。此種論者ハば一なりノ第一分類中ニ就テ云ヘバ其(一)ニ屬スルモノアリ其(二)ニ屬スルモノアリ、即チ人口ノ法則其モノニ就テ必ズシモまるさすヲ以テ誤レリトハセズ却テ其ガ一ノ『とるいずむ』ヲ説クニ過ギズシテ別ニ他趣ノ法則ガ人類社會ニ行ハルルヲ無視スルヲ難ズルヲ以テ眼目トスルナリ。えむぶそんノ分類ニ就テ云ヘバ其(三)若クハ其(四)中ニ此種根本的の反對論者包含セラルト云ノ可シ。サレバえむぶそんモば一なりモ此種反對論者ノ論旨ヲ十分明瞭ナラシメズ、ば一なりノ如キ精密ナル評論家却テ此種反對論ヲ殆

ンド、度外ニ置クガ如ク、少クトモ以下予ガ例示セントスル所ハ、其一モぼーなりニヨリテ暗示ダモセラレザルハ、寧ロ異トス可キ所ナリ。予ノ期スル所ハ、ぼーなりノ缺點ヲ指摘セントスルニアラズ又タ彼ガ遺漏ヲ補充セントスルニモアラズ。抑モまろさす人口論ヲ其現レタル時代ト關連シテ考究スルニ於テ最モ始メニ而シテ最モ十分ニ諒解セザル可カラズシテ而シテ更ラニ今日現在ニ於テ經濟理論及經濟政策ノ最モ重要ナル根本問題ト關連スル一事ヲ明カナラシメントスルニアリ。其ハ他ニアラズ人口論出版當時ノ反對論者中特ニ生存權ノ主張ニ基キテ立テラレタル反對論即チ是レナリ。

二

、まろさすノ人口法則ガ社會政策ノ理想ト一致シ難キ所以ヲ最モ十分ニ指摘シタルモノハ別人ニアラズ彼ガ學生ノ論敵タルウありあむ、ごとうゐん其人ナリ。此意味ニ於テモぼーなりガ

There is a sense in which the Essay on Population begins and ends with Godwin, for it begins and ends with the question of human perfectibility. The relation of Malthus and Godwin are as it were the tale on which the play is founded. 6)

ト云ヒシハ當フ得タリ。まろさすトごとうゐんと共ニ今日ノ所謂社會政策其モノニ就テ考ヘタルモノニアラズ彼等ハ『人間ノ完全性』テフ先天的範疇ニ就テ互ニ議論ヲ應酬シツツアリタルニ過ギズ。然レトモ今日ノ吾人ヨリシテ之ヲ見レバ『人間ノ完全性』云々ニ關スル討論ノ多クハ無用ニ屬スルヲ認メザル能ハザルト同時ニ其討論ノ中ニ包含セラレタル社會政策的價值論ハ向後更ラニ其重要ヲ加フルトモ減ズ可カラザル底ノ根本問題ニ接觸スルモノナリ。而シテまろさすトごとう

6) 前掲書、p. 355.

ゐん及同種論者トノ間ノ討論ヲ此ノ新ナル意義ニ於テ解釋シ之ニ清新ナル光明ヲ與ヘタルモノハ『唯物論史』ノ著者トシテ有名ナル哲學者兼社會論者タル獨逸ノあるべると、らんげナリ。彼ハ千八百六十六年公ケニセル『みる及けれ』評論ニ於テ明言スラク、

Das Bevölkerungsgesetz ist das A und das O der sozialen Frage. Dies ist einer der wenigen Punkte, in welchen es keine verschiedenen Ansichten giebt, sondern nur verschiedene Stufen der Einsicht. Mit der Erkenntnis des Bevölkerungsgesetzes und seiner Wirkungen beginnt erst das Verständnis der sozialen Uebelstände und ihrer Quelle, und erst mit einer Aenderung des Bevölkerungsgesetzes können die letzten Spuren der sozialen Uebelstände schwinden.⁷⁾

『人口法則ハ社會問題ノ「あるふあ」ニシテ「をめぐ」ナリ。此一事誰人モ異論ナシ異ルハ唯ダ之ヲ認ムル程度ノミ。人口法則并ニ其作用ヲ認ムルニヨリテ始メテ社會上ノ弊害ト其淵源トヲ諒解スルヲ得可ク、人口ノ法則ヲ變化スルコトニヨリテ始メテ社會上ノ弊害ヲ根本的ニ掃蕩シ得可シ、從テ人口ノ法則ニシテ依然トシテ渝ハラザル限り現存ノ社會上ノ弊害ハ、ヲ根絶スルニ由ナキナリ。是レらんげノ半生ノ研究ヲ捧ゲテ反覆主張力説スル所ニシテ、彼ハ其主張ヲ以テ其一代ノ大傑作タル『勞働問題』ノ根本見地トナセリ。

Der zivilisierte Mensch geht von dem Grundsatz aus, dass dies Lebensziel ihm selbst und allen seinen Mitmenschen zukommt. Das Leben, was einmal geschaffen ist, soll auch erhalten werden. Die zarten Kinder, welche am meisten von Krankheit und Elend bedroht werden, sind es gerade, die er auch am meisten liebt und am sorgsamsten pflegen möchte, wenn es nur der Kampf um das Dasein gesattete..... Wir verlangen eben für den Menschen eine andere Natur, als die Natur der Tiere ist, und das ganze grosse Ringen und Streben der Menschheit hat zum Zweck, einen Zustand zu schaffen, in welchem der Lebende sich, sein Dasein genießend, in möglichster Vollkommenheit auslebt und weder einer plötzlichen Vernichtung, noch auch dem langsam nagenden Zahn des Elendes zum Opfer fällt.⁸⁾

7) Friedrich Albert Lange, J. S. Mills Ansichten über die soziale Frage und die angebliche Umwälzung der Sozialwissenschaft durch Carey. Duisburg. 1866. S. 24.
8) Lange, Die Arbeiterfrage. Ihre Bedeutung für Gegenwart und Zukunft. 5.

世ニ生ハ生物ノ中抵抗ノ力少キモノヲ最モ多ク愛護スルハ自然的性情ナリ。然ルニ生存競争ノ大
法則ハ遠慮ナク這箇愛護ノ目的タル弱キ生物ヲ淘汰シツツアリ社會問題ノ淵源スル所ハ實ニ此ノ
大矛盾ノ中ニ在ルナリ。而シテ人間ハ他ノ生物殊ニ動物ト此點ニ於テ異ル。

Das Grundgesetz des Kampfes um das Dasein in der physischen Natur ist das der Ueberproduktion von Lebens-
keimen, deren grosse Masse dem Untergang gewidmet ist. Wir finden namentlich im gesellschaftlichen Leben des Men-
schen ein ganz analoges Gesetz hinsichtlich derjenigen Eigenschaften, durch welche der Einzelne eine bevorzugte Stel-
lung erwirbt und behauptet: die Keime der Befähigung und Neigung zu einer leitenden Stellung sind in Massen
ausgestreut und die grosse Mehrzahl derselben ist von der Natur zur Verknüpfung bestimmt. 9)

是レ人間社會ヲ支配スル大則ニシテ社會上ノ弊害ノ依テ起ル淵源亦茲ニ存ス。らんげノ『勞働問
題』一篇ノ出立點即チ此ノ考究ニカカレリ。此研究ハ又タ社會民主黨ノ人口法則ト社會問題トノ
關係ニ就テノ學說ヲ刺戟シタルモノナルコトハ社會民主黨中ノ碩學タルめーりんぐガ近來十
ニ至リ特ニらんげノ此書ノ新刷ヲ企テ最モ多ク彼等ノ立脚點ニ近キ其第一版(第三版以下ハ著シ
ク右黨ニ傾ケリ)ヲ原形ノ儘ニ重刷シ之ニ長篇ノ解題ヲ附シタルニ徴シテ知ルヘキタリ。めーり
んぐ評シテ曰ク、

In den beiden ersten Kapiteln seiner Schrift schilderte er die Unerbittlichkeit der darwinistisch-malthusischen Bewöl-
kerungstheorie, im dritten und vierten Kapitel die Hilfslosigkeit aller Versuche, ihren verheerenden Wirkungen zu
steuern, um dann im fünften, kürzesten und letzten Kapitel den "Weg zur Rettung" zu zeigen, in einem politisch-
sozialen Programm, das für die damalige Zeit vorgeschritten genug war und sich auch heute noch ganz gut sehen
lassen kann, aber in Langes Zusammenhang wie aus der Pistole geschossen erscheint. 11)

9) 前掲書、S. 47.

10) Die Arbeiterfrage von F. A. Lange mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen,
herausgegeben von Fr. Mehring. Berlin 1910. Sozialistische Neudrucke. IV.

11) 前掲書、Einleitung、S. 27.

ト。然リらんげノ長所ハ自然法則タル人口法則ト社會運動ノ要求トノ而立シ難キ所以ヲ新ナル觀察ヲ以テ明瞭ナラシメタルニアリテ其調和救済ニ關スル立案ハ寧ロ議論ノ薄弱ナルヲ覺ヘシムルモノナリ。然レトモ積極的調和論ノ成否ハ別問題ナリ。學問ノ上ニ於テ最モ重大ノ價值アルハ自然法則タル人口法則ト文化價值ノ上ニ築カル可キ社會政策ノ要求トノ根本的矛盾ヲ指摘シタル一事是ナリ。而シテ此一事ニ於テらんげノ名ハ學問上ニ永遠不朽ナラザル可カラズ。而シテまるくオノ學問上ノ後繼者ヲ以テ自ラモ任ジ人モ亦之ヲ許ス所ノかうつきーへらんげニヨリテ此點ニ關シ學問上ニ眼ヲ開カレタルモノナルコトハ彼自ラ左ノ如ク告白スルニヨリテ之ヲ徵ス可キナリ。

In dem ersten dieser Artikel beschäftigte ich mich auch mit dem Malthusianismus, den ich als Darwinianer nicht ignorieren konnte. Indes fertigte ich ihn noch in der herkömmlichen Weise sozialistischer Kritik ab. Aber je mehr ich mich in den Darwinismus vertiefte, desto weniger genügte mir in der Bevölkerungsfrage der landläufige sozialistische Standpunkt. Am ehesten fand ich das, was ich suchte, bei Albert Lange, dessen "Arbeiterfrage" während der 70er Jahre in Parteikreisen grosses Ansehen genoss. Als Philosoph und Politiker vermochte mich Lange freilich nicht zu befriedigen. Dem stand schon der Umstand entgegen, dass ich gerade damals enragierter Materialist Büchnerscher Konfession war und gleichzeitig höchst rebellisch dachte..... Da konnte ich dem friedfertigen kantischen Ethiker Lange um so weniger folgen, als mir seine Schrift zuerst in ihrer dritten Auflage bekannt wurde, die dem bürgerlichen Standpunkt sehr viele Konzessionen macht.

Aber ich wusste ihm darin zustimmen, dass dem Sozialismus eine Theorie der Bevölkerung fehle, dass er dem Malthusianismus keine eigene Theorie entgegenzusetzen habe. Was ich in sozialistischen Schriften darüber fand, auch denen von Marx und Engels, beantwortete zum Teil nicht meine Fragen, zum Teil schien es mir nicht genügend oder sogar falsch. Der Malthusianismus als Grundlage des Darwinismus war für mich zu einer unwiderleglichen Wahrheit geworden, und seine Misachtung durch die sozialistische Theorie erschien in meinen Augen ein grosser Fehler. 12)

是レ今日ノ社會民主黨ノ人口論者ノ白眉タルかうつきーガ人口論ノ依ツテ成ル所以、然レバらん
 げ唱説シ効ノ没ス可カラザルコト些ノ疑ノ容ル可キナシ。かうつきーハ自然法則ト文化法則(彼
 ハ精神法則ト名ク)トノ這箇ノ矛盾ヲ調停セントシテ『増殖ト發展』ナル書ヲ著シテらんげノ一
 度創メタル業ヲ完成セント欲スルモノナリ。而シテ更ラニ又タ埃國ノ學者ておざる、へるつかニ
 至ラハらんげノ提出シタル這般ノ問題ヲ自家ノ出立點トシテ社會問題考究ノ出立點トスルモノナ
 リ。彼ハ其社會問題¹³⁾ノ第一篇ヲ『奴隸制度ノ發展史』ト名ク其一章ニ於テまるさすヲ論評シテ以
 テ發端ス。彼ハ項ヲ分テ(一)種ノ増殖ハ食料ノ限度マデ達セス(二)生殖力ハ生存條件ニ順應ス(三)人口
 過超ノ事實管ヲ存セシコトナシ將來亦起ルコトナカラント主張スルモノナリ。彼ハ開卷劈頭論ヲ
 起シテ曰ク、

An den Pforten sozialpolitischer Forschung hält ähnlich dem Erzeugel mit dem Flammenschwert vor dem
 biblischen Paradies, das Gespenst der Uebervölkerungstheorie Wache. Etwas über elf Dezimien sind es jetzt, dass
 R. T. Malthus die bürgerliche Welt mit der Entdeckung beschenke, Not und Elend seien nichts anderes, als der
 vollendete Ausdruck einer durch göttliche Weisheit in die Natur gesetzten ewigen Harmonie. Damit die Lebewesen
 nicht ausstirben, ward ihnen unbegrenzte Fortpflanzungsfähigkeit beschioden, und damit sie den Erdball nicht über-
 füllen, sei dafür gesorgt, dass sie Hungers sterben, wenn ihnen die Nahrung mangel..... Man mag nun über
 die letzere Seite der Frage denken wie immer, so ist doch für alle Fälle klar, dass allen sozialen Spekulationen der
 Stempel hoffungsloser Torheit aufgedrückt wäre, beruhe das Malthussche Bevölkerungsprinzip auf Wahrheit.....
 Erste Voraussetzung sozialwissenschaftlicher Forschung ist daher die gewissenhafte und vorurteilslose Ueberprüfung
 dieser Theorie. ¹⁴⁾

斯クシテ此古キ問題ハ更ラニ新ナル意義ヲ附與セラレ社會問題社會政策ハ勿論一步進ミテ經濟學

13) Theodor Hertzka, Das soziale Problem. Berlin 1912.

14) 前掲書 SS. 1-3.

ノ根柢ニ肉薄シテ這箇自然法則對文化法則ノ對立ニ就テ十九世紀初頭ノ學問ヲ精査スルノ必要ヲ促成スルニ至レリ。まるさすノ論爭其事ハ古シト雖モ其意義ハ今ニ於テ猶ホ清新ノ問題タルヲ失ハザルナリ。

三

まるさすノ人口論ハ其第一版ノ着題ニ明記スル如ク始メ主トシテむどうあん次デこんごるせーノ『人間完全性』Perfectibility of man ニ關スル意見ニ反對スル趣意ヲ以テ著ハサレタルモノナリ。『人間完全性』ノ可能ヲ認ムル前提トシテむどうあんモこんごるせーモ共ニ生存權ヲ是認ス。

むどうあんノ生存權論ハ主トシテ『政治的正義』第二卷第八篇第二章『私有財産ノ原則』中ニ在リ。彼ハ私有財産ノ原則ニ三種アリトシテ云ハント、

Of property there are three degrees. The first and simplest degree is that of my permanent right in those things, the use of which being attributed to me, a greater sum of benefit or pleasure will result, than could have arisen from their being otherwise appropriated. It is of no consequence in this case, how I came into possession of them, the only necessary conditions being their superior usefulness to me, and that my title to them is such as is generally acquiesced in by the community in which I live. Every man is unjust who conducts himself in such a manner respecting these things, as to infringe, in any degree, upon my power of using them, at the time when the using them will be of real importance to me. It has already appeared (Vol. I. Bk II Chap. V. VI.) that one of the most essential of the rights of man, is my right to the forbearance of others; not merely that they shall refrain from every thing that may, by direct consequence, affect my life, or the possession of my powers, but that they shall refrain from usurping upon my understanding, and shall leave me a certain equal sphere for the exercise of my private judgment. 15)

是レ最モ有力ニ人ノ生存權ヲ主張スルモノニアラズシテ何ゾヤ。人ノ欲望ヲ以テ財産私有ノ論據

論 說 (四)

まるさす人口論出版當時ノ
反對論者特ニ生存權論者

一

第二卷 第五號

15) Wm. Godwin, Enquiry concerning Political Justice and its influence on morals and happiness. 4. E. London 1842. Bk. II. pp. 207-8.

トナス以上欲望ヲ最モ充實ス可キ人ノ手ニ其欲望ヲ充實スルニ足ル可キ財産ヲ附與ス可キハ理ノ
 當然ナリ。もれり一ハ『自然法典』^{十五卷五}ニ於テ此ノ生存權ヲ定義シテ Tout citoyen sera homme
 public, sustenté, entretenu et occupé aux dépens du public ¹⁶⁾ トナセリト云フ。ごごらぬんノ主張ス
 ル所ハ更ラニ根本ニ徹底スルモノナリ。彼ハ財産私有ノ第二種ヲ定義シテ The empire to which
 every man is entitled, over the produce of his own industry, even that part of it the use of which
 ought not to be appropriated to himself ¹⁷⁾ ト云へり。是レ所謂勞働全收權ノ主義ノ上ニ私有財産
 ヲ建ツ可シトナスモノニ外ナラス。而シテ曰ク此第二種ハ in a less rigorous sense fundamental
 than the rest ト。彼ハ又々財産私有ノ第三種ヲ論ジテ第一種ト全然相容レザルモノナリトシテ
 a system in whatever manner established, by which one man enters into the faculty of disposing of
 the produce of another man's industry. ¹⁸⁾ ナリト定義セリ即チ所謂勞働權ノ原則ヲ認承スル所以ナ
 リ。

こんごるせーモ亦々『其人類精神ノ進歩』中ニ論ジテ曰ク、

En parcourant l'histoire des sociétés, nous aurons en l'occasion de faire voir que servent il existe un grand
 intervalle entre les droits que la loi reconnoit dans les citoyens, et les droits dont ils ont une jouissance réelle; entre
 l'égalité qui est établie pour les institutions politiques, et celle qui existe entre les individus; nous aurons fait
 remarquer que cette différence a été une des principales causes de la distinction de la liberté dans les républiques
 anciennes des orages qui les ont troubleés, de la foiblesse qui les a livrées à des tyrans étrangers. Ces différences
 ont trois causes principales; l'inégalité de la richesse, l'inégalité d'état entre celui dont les moyens de subsistance,
 assurés pour lui-mêmes, se transmettent à sa famille, et celui pour qui ces moyens sont dépendans de la durée de

16) A. Menger Das Recht auf den vollen Arbeitsertrag. 3. A. 1904 S. 9.

17) 前掲書、p. 208.

18) Ibidem. p. 209.

sa vie, on pluriel de la partie de sa vie où il est capable de travail, l'inegalité d'instruction. 20)

こどうあん、こんざるせー兩者ノ斯ク論ズル所ハ即チまるさすヲシテ其反對論ヲ打出セシメタル所以ナリ。而シテまるさす人口論出版當時ノ生存權本位ノ反對論者ハ程度ノ差コソアレ概ネ其出立點ヲ茲ニ有スルモノナリ。

生存權ノ論據ニ立テテ最モ強クまるさすト反對ノ主張ヲ布キタルモノハ有名ナル農政學者あり・やんぐナリ。蓋シやんぐハ其人口論ニ於テハまるさすト同一意見ヲ有スルコト多クまるさすハ人口論第二版ノ序文中ニモ明カニやんぐヨリ學ブ所アルヲ公言セリ。曰ク『予ハ予ノ研究ノ進ムニ從ヒ始メテ此書ヲ公ケニセシトキ知り居タルヨリモ遙カニ多クノコトガ既ニ前人ニヨリテ成サレアリシヲ見出シタリ。人口ノ激増ヨリ起ル貧困并ニ窮厄ノ事實、看取シ又タ其救濟法トシテ極端ナル提案ノ唱ラレタルハぶらとーん及ありすとてれーすノ時代ニ於テ既ニ之ヲ見ル可シ。近年ニアリテハ佛蘭西經濟學者中ノ若干者、斷片的ニハもんですきゆー等同一ノ論法ヲ以テ此問題ヲ論究シ英國ニテハどくどる・ふらんくりん、さー・じぬーむす・すちゅあーと、みすたー・あーさー・やんぐ、及みすたー・たうんせんじ等亦然リ』ト。而シテまるさすハ人口論第二版第四篇第十章 Of the errors in different plans which have been proposed to improve the condition of the poor (第七版ニテハ第四篇第十一章 Different Plans of improving the condition of the poor considered. ニ於テやんぐノ人口論ヲ稱揚シテ左ノ如ク云ヘリ。

Mr. Arthur Young in most of his works appears clearly to understand the principle of population, and is fully aware

論 說 (四) まるさす人口論出版當時ノ 一三 第二卷 第五號 反對論者特ニ生存權論者

19) Esquisse d'un tableau historique des progrès de l'esprit humain. Ouvrage posthume de Condorcet 4me E. Paris An, VI. (1798) p. 344.

20) やんぐニ就テハ社會政策學會論叢所掲ノ拙文『歐洲戰亂期ニ於ケル英佛兩國大農制度ニ關スルあーさー・やんぐノ研究』及拙著改定經濟學研究坤卷第六篇『人口法則ト生存權ト』ニ詳論セリ。

of the evils which must necessarily result from an increase of people beyond the demand for labour and the means of comfortable subsistence. In his "Tour through France" he has particularly laboured this point, and shown most forcibly the misery which results in that country from the excess of population occasioned by the too great division of property. Such an increase he justly calls merely a multiplication of wretchedness. 22)

やんぐハ單ニ『佛蘭西旅行記』ニ於テノミナラス其『政治算術』ニ於テモ亦莫ラニ溯リテ『北英旅行記』改定經濟研究叢卷十二頁十一頁ハ予ハ未ダ此書ヲ見ズノ書ニ於テ其人口論ヲ説クコト周到ナリ。彼ガ人口論ノ要旨ハ『労働ニ對スル需要増加スルトキハ人口ノ増加必ズ之ニ伴フ。需要減ズルトキハ人口亦減少ス可キナレトモ他ノ事情アリテ其働キラ妨ゲ需要ナキ人口ノ存スルコト往々之レアリ、此クノ如キ國ニテハ貧窮困厄交々到ルコトヲ免レズ』ト云フニ在リテ大體ニ於テまゐるさすト同一説ヲ執ルモノナリ。然ルニ此ノやんぐハ生存權ヲ主張スルコトニヨリテまゐるさすト全然反對ノ立場ニ立テ彼ノ爲メニ駁撃セラルルヲ辭スル能ハザリシナリ。まゐるさすハ前ニ引ク第四篇第十章(後ニ第十一章)ニ於テやんぐヲ難シテ曰ク、

After having once so clearly understood the principle of population as to express these and many other sentiments on the subject, equally just and important, it is not a little surprising to find Mr. Young in a pamphlet, entitled, *The question of Scarcity plainly stated, and Remedies considered* (published in 1800), observing, that "the means which would of all others perhaps tend most surely to prevent future scarcities so oppressive to the poor as the present, would be to secure to every country labourer in the Kingdom, that has three children and upwards, half an acre of land for potatoes, and grass enough to feed one or two cows..... If each had his ample potatoe ground and a cow, the price of wheat would be of little more consequence to them, than it is to their brethren in Ireland. Every one admits the system to be good, but the question is, how to enforce it." I was by on means aware, that the excel-

22) 前掲書第二版、p. 570. 第七版 p. 449.
23) まゐるさすが、Tour through France トセルハ、不精確ナリ、實際ノ標題ハ、Travels in France ナリ、

lence of the system had been so generally admitted. For myself I strongly protest against being included in the general term of *every one*, as I should consider the adoption of this system, as the most cruel and fatal blow to the happiness of the lower classes of people in this country, that they had ever received..... The obvious tendency of Mr. Young's plan, is, by encouraging marriage and furnishing a cheap food, independent of the price of corn, and, of course, of the demand for labour, to place the lower classes of people exactly in this situation..... Mr. Young must know, as well as I do, that the principal reason why poor laws have invariably been found ineffectual in the relief of the poor, is, that they tend to encourage a population which is not regulated by the demand for labour. Mr. Young himself, indeed, expressly takes notice of this effect in England, and observes, that notwithstanding the unrivalled prosperity of her manufactures, "Population is sometimes too active, as we see clearly by the dangerous increase of poor's rates in country villages". But the fact is, that Mr. young's plan would be incomparably more powerful in encouraging a population beyond the demand for labour, than our present poor laws 24)

なるをすへ人口論第三版ヲ著ヘスニ方ツテ附録ヲ添へ反對論ノ重ナルモノニ對シテ稍々詳細ニ答
 くタリ。其第一へ The first grand objection that has been made to my principles is, that they
 contradict the original command of the creator, to increase and multiply and replenish the earth ニシ
 テ彼へ第二版第二卷五百六頁ヨリ五百十八頁ニ涉リテ詳密ニ之ニ對シテ答フル所アリ。第二種ノ
 反對論へ The next grand objection which has been urged against me, is *my denial of the right of*
the poor to support ナリ彼へ五百十八頁ヨリ卷末即チ五百五十頁ニ涉リテ一々ニ答辯シテ詳論セリ。
 やんぐノ生存權論モ亦再々此一節ニ於テ批評ヲ下サレタリ。曰ク、

Among those who have objected to my declaration that the poor have no claim of right to support is Mr. Young, who, with a harshness not quite becoming a candid inquirer after truth, has called my proposal for the gradual abolition of the poor laws a horrible plan, and asserted that the execution of it would be a most iniquitous procees-

24) 前掲書、第二版 pp. 572-575.

thing..... If the statute which gives the poor a right to support were to remain unexpunged, we should add to the cruelty of starving them, the extreme injustice of still professing to relieve them. If this statute were expunged or altered we should virtually deny the right of the poor to support, and only retain the absurdity of saying that they had a right to a certain sum ; an absurdity on which Mr. Young justly comments with much severity in the case of France..... He allows that his plan can only provide for a certain number of families, and has nothing to do with the increase from them ; but in allowing this, he allows that it does not reach the grand difficulty attending a provision for the poor. In this most essential point, after reproaching me for saying that the poor have no claim of right to support, he is compelled to adopt the very same conclusion..... Now the sole reason why I say that the poor have no claim of right to support is the physical impossibility of relieving this progressive population. Mr. Young expressly acknowledges this physical impossibility ; yet with an inconsistency scarcely credible still dis-claims against my declaration 25)

まるさす謂ラク社會ガ貧者ヲ救フ力アリヤ否ヤト救フノ義務アリヤ否ヤトハ判然區別セザル可カラズ其爲シ能フ限りニ於テ救済スルノ希シキハ予ノ否ム處ニアラズ然レトモ之ヨリ直チニ推論シテ生存權テフ一般の權利ヲ認承ス可シト云フノ速斷モ亦極レリ。貧者ニシテ眞ニ生存權ヲ有シ我現時ノ成法ハ其認承ノ主義ノ上ニ立ツモノトセバやんぐノ如ク單ニ一部分の施設ヲ以テ農民ノ或モノニ一定ノ土地ヲ供セントスルガ如キハ却テ不公平タルヲ免レズシテ決シテ一般ニ貧者下層民ノ生活ヲ保障シ向上セシムル所以タル能ハズ況ンヤやんぐノ論ハ誰人モ容易ニ看取スルヲ得可キ底ノ自吾撞着ヲ意トセザルモノナルニ於テラヤ。予ガ生存權ヲ否認スル唯一ノ理由ハ其ガ自然の不可能ナルニヨル、人口ノ法則ニシテ正シキ限り此ノ自然の不可能ハ之ヲ如何トモスル能ハズやんぐハ此ノ自然ノ大事實ハ之ヲ十分ニ認識シツツ他方ニ生存權ヲ社會的ニ認メントス之レ理路

25) 前掲書、第三版第二卷 pp. 528-531.

ノ紛淆ニアラスシテ何ゾヤト。蓋シやんぐノ生存權認承ニ立脚スル提案ハ三人以上ノ子ヲ有スル農業労働者ニ馬鈴薯ヲ作り一二頭ノ牝牛ヲ畜フ可キ草ヲ得セシムル爲メニ半「エーカー」ノ土地ヲ給與ス可シト云フニアリテまるさすノ極力反對シ駁撃スル所即チ是ナリ。まるさすハ此提案ヲ以テやんぐガ主張ノ正シキ部分ノ人口論ト相矛盾スルモノナリトシ此クノ如クスルトキハ結局英國人ヲ最低ノ生活程度ニ引下グ濫婚ヲ促シ從テ出生ヲ不當ニ獎勵スルコトトナリ需要ナキ人口ヲ増加スルコト現存ノ貧民救助法ヨリモ更ラニ一層甚シカル可シト云ヘリ。ぼーなーハやんぐニ對シ深キ諒解ヲ有セント期セザルモノノ如クやんぐハ自己ニ許サレタル特權トシテ矛盾セル二個ノ説ヲ並列シテ平然タルモノナリト評セリ。元ヨリやんぐハ事實ノ觀察ニヨラザル議論ハ凡テ之ヲ顧ミズト公言シ現實ノ研究ノミヲ事トスル學者ナレバ撞着矛盾ノ世評ヲ度外ニ措キシハ疑ナシ。然リト雖モ彼ガ提案ハ生存權ニ關スル其根本見地ヨリ出ヅルモノナルヲ知ラザル可カラズ。まるさすハやんぐノ所謂矛盾ヲ難シテやんぐノ前説誤ニシテ後説正シグレバ矛盾ヲ咎ムルニ及バザルモやんぐハ正シキ前説ヲ誤レル後ノ説ニヨリテ顛覆スルモノナルガ故ニ之ヲ責メザル能ハズト云ヘリ。まるさす又タ曰ク、

If I firmly believed that by the laws of nature, which are the laws of God, I had no claim of right to support, I should, in the first place, feel myself more strongly bound to a life of industry and frugality. 26)

ト是レ殆ンド宿命論ニ落下スルモノナリ而シテ社會政策一切ノ努力ハ必竟一ノ晝夢ニ歸スルノ外ナキナリ。やんぐノ矛盾ハ彼ガ自ラ云フ如キ自吾撞着ナルニアラズ抑モ人口ノ法則ト文化法則ト

論 說 (四)

まるさす人口論出版當時ノ
反對論者特ニ生存權論者

一七

第二卷 第五號

26) Bonar, Malthus and his work, p. 380.

27) p. 529.

28) p. 527.

兩立スルヤ否ヤノ大問題ニカカルナリ。若シ單ニ理路ノ一貫ノミヲ取ランカまるさすノやんぐニ勝ル萬々ナルヤ言フ須タズ。やんぐハ所謂理論學者ニアラズ現實的實驗的思索家ナリ、彼ノ人口理論モ貧民救済ノ政策論モ共ニ悉ク現成事實研究ノ上ニ立脚ス。矛盾ハ單ニ彼ノ論說ニ存スルニ非ズ抑モ自然ノ大則タル人口法則ト現實文化社會ノ價值要求タル生存保障ノ主張トノ間ニ存スルナリ。まるさすハ自然ノ法則ヲ發見セント期シ而シテ之ヲ發見シ得タリトシテ其「人口論」ヲ作レリ。やんぐハ之ニ反シ人口ノ問題ヲ現在且ツ具體的ノ事實トシテノミ取扱ヒ特ニ英國ト佛國トノ比較ニヨリテ論ヲ立テタリ。まるさすハ自然ノ法則ヲ認ムル厚ク人爲ノ力ヲ視ル輕シ、彼ガ道德的抑制ノ可能ニ重キヲ置クニ至リタルハ第二版以後ノコトニシテ反對論者ニ學ビテ當初ノ着想ヲ遠ルコト著シキモノナルコトハ多言ヲ要セズ。サレバ彼ハ人爲ノ力ヲ認ムルモ人口過増ノ防止テフ消極的方面ニ專ラニシテ其積極的方面ニ考ヘ及ブコト甚ダ尠シ。彼ハ自然ノ力ノ偉大ナルヲ發見シテ之ニ打タレタリ彼ハ如何ニシテ之ヲ回避シ得キヤノ考究ニ全力ヲ傾倒シタリ。自然ノ力ノ相働ク間ニ廣大ナル餘地ノ存スルコトハ彼ノ想到セザリシ所ナリ。生存權ガ一ノ社會權トシテ一ノ文化價值要求トシテ認承セラルルハ此ノ餘地ノ存在ヲ前提スルハ勿論ナリ、餘地ニシテ存スルコトナクンバ生存權ノ要求ノ如キハ誠ニなるさすノ痛撃シタル如キ痴人ノ夢タル可キナリ。らんげ故ニ曰ク、

Der Widerspruch, welcher darin zu liegen scheint, dass wir das Opfer ganzer Generationen zu Gunsten weniger einerseits als eine geschichtliche Notwendigkeit anerkennen, andererseits aber als den Fluch der Menschheit und als

das eine grosse Uebel betrachten, von dem unser Geschlecht erlöst werden soll und muss—dieser Widerspruch enthält nichts Unlogisches, sondern er ist vielmehr nur das reine Spiegelbild des ewigen Gegensatzes von Natur und Geist, von objektivem Erkennen und sittlichem Wollen. Aus der Unvernunft des überlieferten Daseins ringt das vernünftige Ideale sich los und niemals, so lange wir sittliche Wesen sein wollen, dürfen wir auf den Anspruch verzichten, dass heute der Tag ist, an welchem ein neues Leben beginnt, für das Individuum wie für die Wissenschaft. Blicken wir in die Vergangenheit zurück, so zeigt sich in jenen fruchtbaren Opfern unverkennbar eine gewisse Zweckmässigkeit; doch nicht jene menschlich umsichtig berechnende, die uns geläufig ist, sondern immer wieder jener riesenhafte und erbarmungslose Mechanismus, welcher durch Schaffen und wieder Vertilgen im langsamen Gang der Aeonen sich seinem Ziel unter dem Aechzen der Kreatur entgegenwälzt. ²⁹⁾

四

生存權ノ立場ヨリなるさすガ痛撃ヲ辭セザリシモノニ更ラニとます・ペーんアリ。ペーんハ佛國革命ノ辯護者否或ハ謳歌者トシテはどもんど・ばーくノ好敵手タリシ學者ニシテ殊ニ其著『人權論』ヲ以テ聞ユ。まるさすハ此書ヲ以テ有害ニシテ其所説ヲ危險的ナリトシテ排撃ニ力ヲ餘サズ。曰ク、

The circulation of Paine's Rights of Man, it is supposed, has done great mischief among the lower and middling classes of people in this country. This is probably true; but not because man is without rights, or that these rights ought not to be known; but because Mr. Paine has fallen into some fundamental errors respecting the principles of government, and in many important points has shown himself totally unacquainted with the structure of society, and the different moral effects to be expected from the physical difference between this country and America..... Nothing would so effectually counteract the mischiefs occasioned by Mr. Paine's Rights, as a general knowledge of the real rights of man. What these rights are, it is not my business at present to explain; but there is one right,

論 説(四)

まるさす人日論出版當時ノ
反對論者特ニ生存權論者

一九

第二卷 第五號

which man has generally been thought to possess, which I am confident he neither does, nor can, possess, a right to subsistence when his labour will not fairly purchase it. Our laws indeed say, that he has this right, and bind the society to furnish employment and food to those who cannot get them in the regular market ; but in so doing, they attempt to reverse the laws of nature ; and it is, in consequence, to be expected, not only that they should fail in their object, but that the poor who were intended to be benefited, should suffer most cruelly from this in human deceit which practised upon them. 30)

べーんガ人権ヲ主張スル必ズシモ不可ナラズト雖モ彼ハ政體ノ異同ヲ無視シ社會ノ實狀ニ昏ク無差別ノ論ヲ立ツルヲ以テ下層民ヲ誤ルコト甚シク殊ニ人權ノ一トシテ生存權ヲ主張スルニ至テハ其害最大ナリ、此權ヲ認ムルコトハ自然ノ大則ニ逆行スル所以ニシテ其目的ヲ達スル能ハザルハ勿論之ニヨリ益セントスル貧民ヲ却テ無用ニ欺クノ不仁ニ陥ルノ外ナシト。而シテまろさすハ直チニ此句ニ接續スルニ獨リ第二版ノミニアリテ第一版ハ言フマデナク第三版以降何レノ版本ニ於テモ全ク削除シ去リタル次ノ一句ヲ以テセリ。

A man who is born into a world already possessed, if he cannot get subsistence from his parents on whom he has a just demand, and if the society do not want his labour, has no claim of right to the smallest portion of food, and in fact, has no business to be where he is. At nature's mighty feast there is no vacant cover for him. She tells him to be gone, and will quickly execute her own orders, if he do not work upon the compassion of some of her guests. If these guests get up and make room for him, other intruders immediately appear demanding the same favour. The report of a provision for all that come, fills the hall with numerous claimants. The order and harmony of the feast is disturbed, the plenty that before reigned is changed into scarcity ; and the happiness of the guests is destroyed by the spectacle of misery and dependance in every part of the hall, and by the clamorous importunity of those, who are justly enraged at not finding the provision which they had been taught to expect. The guests

learn too late their error in counteracting those strict orders to all intruders, issued by the great mistress of the feast, who, wishing that all her guests should have plenty, and knowing that she could not provide for unlimited numbers, humanely refused to admit fresh comers when her table was already full.

此一句第二版本ノ第五百三十一頁ニアリテ第三版第二卷ノ三百八十三頁(第七版ニテハ第四百二十一頁)ノ該當所ヨリ全然削リ去リアリ古來社會主義論者ノ最モ重大視スル所ナリまるさす。第三版ヲ印行スルニ方ツテ其語句ノ餘リニ強キニ過グルヲ發見シテ之ヲ撤回シタリト雖モ彼ノ思想ハ第二版ニ於ケルト些ノ變化ヲ示メスコトナシ。彼ハ此一句ニヨリテ最モ鮮明直載ニべいんノ説ヲ一掃セント期シ兼テ生存權説ヲ全然排斥スルノ用意ヲ示シタルモノナリ。其趣意ハ自然法則ノ不可抗性ヲ力説シ人爲ノ如何トモスル能ハザルヲ主張スルニ在リ。社會主義者ハ此句ニ顯ハレタル思想ヲ甚殘忍刻薄ナリトシテ或ハまるさすノ心事ヲスラ疑フモノアリ。彼ガ翻然トシテ此句ヲ削去シタルモノ故ナキニアラズ。

まるさすハ更ニ論歩ヲ進メテ僭正レ一なるカAvant toutes les loix sociales l'homme avoit le droit de subsister³¹⁾ト云ヒタルヲ難ジテ是レ『人ハ百歳マデ生クルノ權ヲ有ス』ト云フニ均シ元ヨリ人ハ百歳ト云ハズ千年生クル權アリトモ云ヒ得可シ然レドモロハ principally an affair of power, not of rightナリ。然ルヲ此ヲ權利ナリトシテ人ヲ誤リ貧者ヲシテ空想ニ耽ラシムルハ有害ナリ。If the great truths on these subjects were more generally circulated, and the lower classes of people could be convinced, that by the laws of nature, independently of any particular institutions, except the great one of property which is absolutely necessary in order to attain any considerable produce, no person has any claim of right on society for subsistence, if his labour will not purchase it, the greatest part of the mischievous declamation on the unjust institutions of society would

31) 改定經濟學研究坤卷第千二百三十六頁以下『西洋學者不詮索ノ一例』ヲ見ヨ。

32) 猶 Anton Menger, Das Recht auf den vollen Arbeitsertrag. S. 3-4 ヲ參照
セヨ。

33) Raynal, Histoire des Indes. vol. X. f. X. p. 322. 8vo.

fall powerless to the ground (p. 532) ナル可シト。之ニ反シテペーレントハ其人權論ニ於テ明カニ斷言シテ『生存權ハ總善ニアラズ一ノ權利ナリ』³⁴⁾ This support is not of the nature of a charity, but of a right ト云ヘリ。

五

まるさすトノ關係ニ於テペーレント正反對ノ立場ニ立ツモノハペーレントナリ。まるさすハ抑モペーレントノ政治哲學ノ全部ヲ否認スルモノナルニペーレントノ政治哲學ニ至リテハ其大部分ヲ認承シ或意味ニ於テハペーレントヲ以テ其政治哲學ノ師父トナスノ觀アリ。然ルニ生存權ノ問題ニ就テハペーレントモペーレント同ジクまるさす反對者ナリ、ペーレントハ人口論ニ就テハ後年まるさすノ説ヲ是認シタルモノナルヲ知ル人ニ取リテハ此ノ一事甚ダ深キ興味ヲ與フルモノト云フ可シ。生存權ニ關スルペーレントノ説ハ次ノ數句ニ就テ之ヲ看取シ得可シ。共ニ『道德及政治哲學』³⁵⁾ 中ニアリ。

P. 66. A poor neighbour has a right to relief; yet, if it be refused him, he must not extort it.

P. 73.— Another right which may be called a general right, as it is incidental to every man who is in a situation to claim it, is the right of extreme necessity; by which is meant a right to use or destroy another's property, when it is necessary for own preservation to do so; as a right to take, without or against the owner's leave, the first food, cloths or shelter we meet with, when we are in danger of perishing through want of them..... Of which right the foundation seems to be this: that when property was first instituted, the institution was not intended to operate to the destruction of any; therefore, when such consequences would follow, all regard to it is superseded.

P. 149. The obligation to bestow relief upon the poor..... whether it be an instinct or a habit, it is in fact a property of our nature, which God appointed; and the final cause for which it was appointed, is to afford to the miserable, is the compassion of their fellow-creatures, a remedy for those in equalities and distresses which God foresaw that many must be exposed to, under every general rule for the distribution of property. *Beside this, the*

34) Thomas Paine, Rights of man; being an answer to Mr. Burke's attack on the French Revolution, 1819. Works. vol. II. p. 93. Part II. ch. v.
35) Paley, Moral and political philosophy. 1785. Works vol. II.

poor have a claim founded in the law of nature, which may be thus explained : All things were originally common. No one being able to produce a charter from Heaven, had any better title to a particular possession than his next neighbour. There were reasons for mankind's agreeing upon a separation of this common fund ; and God for these reasons is presumed to have ratified it. But this separation was made and consented to, upon the expectation and condition that every one should have left a sufficiency for his subsistence, or the means of procuring it ; and as no fixed laws for the regulation of property can be so contrived, as to provide for the relief of every case and distress which may arise, these cases and distresses, when their right and share in the common stock were given up or taken from them, were supposed to be left to the voluntary bounty.

ペーレ一又曰ク、A poor man has a right to relief from the rich, but the mode, season, and quantum of that relief who shall contribute to it, or how much, are not ascertained 故ニ彼へ之ヲ不完全權ト呼ベリ。而シテ彼ハ不
完全權タル一般權(General right of mankind)ヲ列擧シテ左ノ三者ナリトス。

1. A right to the fruits or vegetable produce of the earth.
2. A right to the flesh of animals.
3. Right of extreme necessity.

六

ござらゐん、ペーレ一及あーさー・やんぐトノ間ニ開始セラレタル人口法則對生存權ノ
討論ハ更ラニ幾多ノ學者ニヨリテ繼續セラレタリ。予輩ノ寓目シタル所すくろーぶ³⁶⁾アリウ³⁷⁾にら
んど³⁸⁾アリじ³⁹⁾あろーるど⁴⁰⁾アリウ⁴¹⁾ありあむ⁴²⁾・はずりつと⁴³⁾アリさどら⁴⁴⁾ーアリちあーま⁴⁵⁾す⁴⁶⁾アリふれ⁴⁷⁾ーす
アリペーレ⁴⁸⁾ーアリえぞもんづ⁴⁹⁾アリ又タじ⁵⁰⁾ござらゐんノ人口論駁論アリテ何レモ此問題ニ就テまるさ
すノ所論ヲ品階セリ。此等ヲ一々評論スルコトハ限ラレタル此文ノ能クスル所ニアラズ唯其若

36) Ponlett Scrope, Political Economy. 1833. p. 290 ff. 37) Weyland, The principles of population and production. 1816. p. 333. 38) Dissertations on man etc. 1806 p. 18 39) Hazlitt, Political Essays. 1819. p. 401-428
40) Sadler, Law of population 1830. 41) Chalmers, Political Economy. 1832.

千句ヲ左ニ列擧シ更ラニ他日詳説シ得ルノ機會ヲ待タントス。

Scrope— We affirm..... that it is in the power of man, by a judicious direction of his resources, to increase his supplies of food so as to meet every possible increase of his numbers..... It is not to be looked upon as a measure of charity, so much as one of police..... This is the birth right of every individual, natural right..... It is the very first duty of a government to secure the means of subsistence.

Weyland— We are commanded absolutely and without any reference to its effects upon society to give unto the poor sufficient for his need.

Jarrold— At nature's mighty feast none are bishops, but all are men ; there is no distinction ; all that are invited are at liberty to partake ; and the life of a guest is sacred ; to be invited to the same table implies equality, and to possess life, is to possess the invitation.

Hazlitt— That he has made him keep a dog or a horse the less, or part with a single vice, arguing from a mathematical admeasurement of the size of the earth and the number of inhabitants it can contain, he shall have my perfect leave to disclaim the right of the poor to subsistence.

Place— Mr. Malthus denies to the unemployed poor man the right to eat, but he allows the right to the unemployed rich man &c.

然リ而シテ生存權ノ根據ニ立テテ最モ猛烈ニなるさヲ攻撃シタルモノ、實ニぶれー及こべつとノ兩人ナリ。ぶれーハ『勞働ノ不當侵奪ト其救濟』ナル書ヲ著シ全篇ヲアゲテなるさヲ生存權ヲ否認スルノ故ヲ以テ其人人口論ヲ痛撃セリ。曰ク、

It is an indisputable right of man to live upon that earth on which he has been placed by his creator and this right of existence must from its nature be accompanied in every man by the right of appropriating to himself the various necessaries of life which he can, by his labour, compel the earth to yield him..... The absolute rights of all to life and sustenance must necessarily be equal..... that remedy is not merely the possession of political

46) J. F. Bray, Labour's wrongs & labour's remedy, or the age of might and the age of right. 1839.

power, as political power now is — that remedy is not morality as morality now is — but it is a remedy which can be derived only from the establishment of First Principles. (P. 32.)

こべつとハ著作ノ多キヲ以テ有名ナルト共ニ其「貧民ノ友」ハ英國社會主義ノ聖書トモ稱ス可キホド絶大ノ影響ヲ及ボシタル學者ニシテ其「貧民ノ友」一篇ノ趣意ハ實ニまるさすニ反對シテ生存權ヲ主張スルニ在ルナリ。彼ハふれート共ニ今日ニ於テハ隠レタル學者ニシテめんガーニヨリテ始メテ再ビ世ニ紹介セラレタルモノ其著書ハ何レモ永ク忘レラレテ今日ニ於テハ稀覯ニ屬セリ。予輩ハ既ニ紙限ノ刻々ニ迫リツツアルヲ感ズルガ故ニ此兩人者ノ評論モ共ニ之ヲ他日ニ讓ルノ外ナシ。

讀者ハ以上ノ列擧ニヨリテ生存權對人口法則ノ問題ガ如何ニ豐富ナル文献ヲ有スルカノ一端ヲ觀得シタルナル可シ。まるさす人口論出版當時ニ在リテ斯ク論究セラレ討論セラレタリシ這箇ノ問題ハ今日ニ至リテ再ビ新ナルヨリ進ミタル意味ニ於テ現實ノ研究ヲ要スルニ至レルコト予ガ本文ノ始メニ叙シタルガ如シ。知ラズまるさすノ人口論其モノニ對シテ今ヤ新タニ刺戟セラレタル我日本ノ學界ハ更ラニ這般ノ問題ニ對シテモ亦タ學問的興味ヲ覺知スルニ至ルヤ否ヤラ。遮莫予輩ハ本論文ニ於テハ唯ダ一ノ學說史紹介者ノ任ヲ盡サント期セルノミ、讀者希クハ其以上ヲ以テ予輩ヲ責ムルコト勿レ。(尖正五年四月九日原稿)

附言、本論文著シク省略ニ從ヒ學問文ノ體ヲ損ズルコト甚シ。其理由ニアリ一ハ近來予輩閑暇ニ乏シカリシコトニハ本論關係ノ書籍ニシテ近ク予ガ手ニ入ラントスルモノ若干種アリテ此等ヲ繕讀シテ後更ラニ推敲ヲ加ヘント欲スルコト是ナリ。幸ニ寛恕ヲ祈ル。

論說(四)

まるさす人口論出版當時ノ
反對論者特ニ生存權論者

二五

第二卷

第五號

47) Wm Cobbett, Poor man's friend; or a defence of the rights of those who do the work and fight the battles.