

This file archived at [UnionOfEgoists.com](http://UnionOfEgoists.com).

# Union of Egoists

This item was scanned by UoE from Libertarian Microfiche Publishing Peace Plans films. John Zube's LMP project preserved thousands of documents that would otherwise be lost.

More information can be found at our website under "contributors."

-Kevin I. Slaughter

## **What is a UnionOfEgoists.com?**

This is an informational resource provided by Kevin I. Slaughter of Underworld Amusements and Trevor Blake of OVO, initiated in February and publicly launched April 1st of 2016. The website initially focuses on providing historical, biographical and bibliographical details of a few their favorite Egoist philosophers. It is also integrating the archives of egoist website i-studies.com, the former project of Svein Olav Nyberg, and the EgoistArchives.com project of Dan Davies. Further, it will be home to Der Geist, a Journal of Egoism in print 1845 – 1945. UnionOfEgoists.com will be the best resource for Egoism online.

## **What is a Union of Egoists?**

"We two, the State and I, are enemies. I, the egoist, have not at heart the welfare of this "human society," I sacrifice nothing to it, I only utilize it; but to be able to utilize it completely I transform it rather into my property and my creature; i. e., I annihilate it, and form in its place the Union of Egoists."

- Max Stirner, *The Ego and Its Own*

## **What is Egoism?**

"Egoism is the claim that the Individual is the measure of all things. In ethics, in epistemology, in aesthetics, in society, the Individual is the best and only arbitrator. Egoism claims social convention, laws, other people, religion, language, time and all other forces outside of the Individual are an impediment to the liberty and existence of the Individual. Such impediments may be tolerated but they have no special standing to the Individual, who may elect to ignore or subvert or destroy them as He can. In egoism the State has no monopoly to take tax or to wage war."

-Trevor Blake, *Confessions of a Failed Egoist*

XXXXXXXX	X	XXXXX	X	X	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	XXXXX
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	XXXXX
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
X	X	X	X	X	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX

Number Twenty Six. August Nineteen Hundred and Seventy. One Shilling.

INDIVIDUALIST PERSPECTIVES

by J. Armand

The anarchist individualists do not present themselves as proletarians, absorbed only in the search for material amelioration, tied to a class determined to transform the world and to substitute a new society for the actual one. They place themselves in the present; they disdain to orient the coming generations towards a form of society allegedly destined to assure their happiness, for the simple reason that from the individualist point of view happiness is a conquest, an individual's internal realization.

Even if I believed in the efficacy of a universal social transformation, according to a well-defined system, without direction, sanction, or obligation, I do not see by what right I could persuade others that it is the best. For example, I want to live in a society from which the last vestige of authority has disappeared, but, to speak frankly, I am not certain that the "mass", to call it what it is, is capable of dispensing with authority. I want to live in a society in which the members think by and for themselves, but the attraction which is exercised on the mass by publicity, the press, frivolous reading and by State-subsidized distractions is such that I ask myself whether men will ever be able to reflect and judge with an independent mind.

I may be told in reply that the solution of the social question will transform every man into a sage. This is a gratuitous affirmation, the more so as there have been sages under all regimes. Since I do not know the social form which is most likely to create internal harmony and equilibrium in social unity, I refrain from theorizing.

*Why consider only territorial unity of ideas organization rather than extraterritorial autonomy & its voluntary diversity?*

When "voluntary association" is spoken of, voluntary adhesion to a plan, a project, a given action, this implies the possibility of refusing the association, adhesion or action. Let us imagine the planet submitted to a single social or economic life; how would I exist if this system did not please me? There remains to me only one expedient: to integrate or to perish. It is held that, "the social question" having been solved, there is no longer a place for non-conformism, recalcitrance, etc.....but it is precisely when a question has been resolved that it is important to pose new ones or to return to an old solution, if only to avoid stagnation.

If there is a "Freedom" standing over and above all individuals, it is surely nothing more than the expression of their thoughts, the manifestation and diffusion of their opinions. The existence of a social organization founded on a single ideological unity interdicts all exercise of freedom of speech and of ideologically contrary thought. How would I be able to oppose the dominant system, proposing another, supporting a return to an older system, if the means of making my viewpoint known or of publicizing my critiques were in the possession of the agents of the regime in power? This regime must either accept reproach when compared to other social solutions superior to its own, or, despite its termination in "let", it is no better than any other regime. Either it will admit opposition, secession, schism, fractionalism, competition, or nothing will distinguish it significantly from a dictatorship. This "let" regime would undoubtedly claim that it has been invested with its power by the masses, that it does not exercise its power or control except by the delegation of assemblies or congresses; but as long as it did not allow the intransigents and refractories

*2) Apparently, he does not even believe in freedom of expression & information! J.E.*

to express the reasons for their attitude and for their corresponding behaviour, it would be only a totalitarian system. The material benefits on which a dictatorship prides itself are of no importance. Regardless of whether there is scarcity or abundance, a dictatorship is always a dictatorship.

*→ What benefits? J.Z.*

It is asked of me why I call my individualism "anarchist individualism"? Simply because the State concretizes the best organized form of resistance to individual affirmation. What is the State? An organism which bills itself as representative of the social body, to which power is allegedly delegated, this power expressing the will of an autocrat or of popular sovereignty. This power has no reason for existing other than the maintenance of the extant social structure. But individual aspirations are unable to come to terms with the existence of the State, personification of Society, for, as Palante says: "All society is and will be exploitative, usurpacious, dominating, and tyrannical. This it is not by accident but by essence." Yet the individualist would be neither exploited, usurped, dominated, tyrannized nor dispossessed of his sovereignty. On the other hand, Society is able to exercise its constraint on the individual only thanks to the support of the State, administrator and director of the affairs of Society. No matter which way he turns the individual encounters the State or its agents of execution, who do not care in the least whether the regulations which they enforce concur or not with the diversity of temperaments of the subjects upon whom they are administered. From their aspirations as from their demands, the individualists of our school have eliminated the State. That is why they call themselves "an-archists".

But we deceive ourselves if we imagine that the individualists of our school are anarchists (AN-ARCHY, etymologically, means only negation of the state, and does not pertain to other matters) only in relation to the State - such as the western democracies or the totalitarian systems. This point cannot be overemphasized. Against all that which is power, that is, economic as well as political domination, aesthetic as well as intellectual, scientific as well as ethical, the individualists rebel and form such fronts as they are able, alone or in voluntary association. In effect, a group or federation can exercise power as absolute as any State if it accepts in a given field all the possibilities of activity and realization. *Only if it can suppress individual sectionalism & competing organizations like States, police forces, armies & unionists do. J.Z.*

The only social body in which it is possible for an individualist to evolve and develop is that which admits a concurrent plurality of experiences and realizations, to which is opposed all groupings founded on an ideological exclusiveness, which, well-meant though they may be, threaten the integrity of the individual from the moment that this exclusiveness aims to extend itself to the non-adherents of the grouping. To call this anti-statist would be doing no more than providing a mask for an appetite for driving a hard of human sheep. ??? *To each the government or non-governmental society of his or her dreams! Experimental freedom for ALL volunteer groups! J.Z.*

I have said above that it is necessary to insist on this point. For example, anarchist communism denies, rejects and expels the State from its ideology; but it resuscitates it the moment that it substitutes social organization for personal judgement. If anarchist individualism thus has in common with anarchist communism the political negation of the State, of the "Arche", it only marks a point of divergence. Anarchist communism places itself on the economic plane, on the terrain of the class struggle, united with syndicalism, etc (this is its right), but anarchist individualism situates itself on the psychological plane, and on that of resistance to social totalitarianism, which is something entirely different. (Naturally, anarchist individualism follows the many paths of activity and education: philosophy, literature, ethics, etc., but I have wanted to make precise here only some points of our attitude towards the social environment.)

I do not deny that this is not very new, but it is taking a position to which it is good to return from time to time.

(First published in the Bulletin of SIA, 1957. This translation by Richard DeHaan first appeared in Views and Comments, No. 25, New York)

EN LARGE

by S.E.Parker

Revolution, Individualism and Stephen Halbrook.

"Revolution, which promises to change All, changes only the personnel, not the System - the guards and prisoners exchange status as in a children's game of musical chairs. A man can only liberate himself by himself and for himself. There is no other way - all else is madness or collaboration."

from "Journey Not To End" by Paul Herr.

In the Los Angeles libertarian journal "Libertarian Connection" Stephen Halbrook has been writing on the need for libertarians to make a revolution. His articles in Nos. 9 and 10 exhibit in all its superficiality the mindless militancy one usually finds on the "Left". This time, however, it is in the name of free trade and laissez faire.

His article in No. 9. ("Zap The Right, Revise The Left, Then You Can Off The Pig") begins with a vitriolic personal attack on Ayn Rand which would be a credit to an old-time Stalinist hack busy smearing a Trotskyist. I have some fundamental disagreements with Ayn Rand's philosophy and even more with her politics, but I cannot take seriously a critic whose case against her is so impoverished that he can only resort to threadbare name-calling. If this kind of spleen is the only criticism that Ayn Rand has to face, then she has little to worry about on an intellectual level. What is more disturbing is what would happen if "revolutionaries" sharing Halbrook's attitude were to have their way. "Zap The Right" could easily be transformed into "zap the wrong" - in other words, "zap" anyone who disagrees with the Halbrook line.

The rest of the article is concerned with the so-called "libertarian aspects" of Marxist-Leninism. No tangible proofs are given for this. There is a mention of that pious platitude "the withering away of the State", an undocumented reference to an interview with a Yugoslav economist (I wonder who pays his salary?) and a few words about "beautiful happenings in Cuba" (like free speech, maybe?).

One of the "proofs" that Marxism can be libertarian which is invoked by Halbrook is that catchphrase the "desire to replace government of man by administration of things". Halbrook makes no attempt to tell us what this means. And I am not surprised, for this is simply an attempt to change the nature of a thing by changing its name. The thought is: we can abolish government by calling it "administration". The fact is, however, that if the "things" I need in order to live are "administered" by persons other than myself then I am dependent upon their will for my well-being. How then will the replacement of "government" by "administration" alter my present subordinate position vis a vis others? It matters little whether these others threaten me with a gun or starvation - my will to be my own is limited to the extent that they can make the threat effective, and I have no reason to believe that the "People" will be any more benevolent than the oligarchs.

It is of such myths that socialist dreams are made. I am surprised that it is now proposed that individualists accept them.

In his article in No. 10 Halbrook tries to present a "general theory of revolution". It is a poor attempt, relying on unsupported predictions and dubious analogies with past revolutions. He blithely assures us, for example, that "in Russia, the czar and semi-czar Kerensky were both deposed with little violence - indeed the violence came in the civil war caused by white counter-revolutionaries financed by the imperialist Allies." Apart from the fact that his account reads as if it had been lifted straight from "The History of the CPSU (Bolsheviks)", it is strange that he neglects to mention

that the outcome of this facile deposing of czars was a despotism more bloody and efficient than any czar had managed to achieve. Not only this, but from its earliest days the bolshevik secret police butchered thousands of dissenters who were in no way "white counter-revolutionaries". But then, someone who can believe that "The March 22nd Movement in France 68 demonstrates that the modern industrial state.....can be paralysed and abolished from below" (my emphasis) will believe anything. England is much closer to France than is Florida, and I am in fairly regular contact with French individualists, but this is the first time I have ever heard (and I am sure this goes for them as well) that the French State had been abolished in 1968.....

Halbrook concludes with a Blanquist-Bakuninist fantasy about a minority of revolutionaries liberating the masses from the State. He writes: "In a sense, this means guiding the rev(olution) from above, but contrary to popular myth this does not mean at all that the vanguard will create a new State. For this cadre will be composed primarily of extreme idealists who would be too dedicated to commit such an atrocity".

This piece of political delirium really needs no refutation for anyone who knows anything about the history of revolutions. Robespierre, Lenin, and their ilk, were all "extreme idealists" and their "dedication" served them well in the "atrocities" they committed. One can only speculate that the astonishing naivety displayed by Halbrook is either the product of profound ignorance, or a clumsy effort to disguise the manoeuvres of yet another gang of would-be political saviours.

Halbrook's articles are an example of that infatuation with "Revolution" which has recently possessed certain people in the USA who used to be "right-wing individualists". Carried out of the "libertarian Right" by the logic of their laissez faire principles they have come into open opposition to the State and thus the Establishment apparatus. Reacting violently against the often hysterical anti-communism of the latter they have fallen for the revolutionary legends peddled by the "Left". As a result, as Tibor Machan has pointed out, "....those who ask for revolution and see in it the only road to improve their lives....want to turn around the process of improving the culture by improving individuals. They see (in) society and its goodness the ultimate source of their own good life."

Individualists, however, see the source of "their own good life" in themselves, not in "society", or "the morrow of the revolution". They concern themselves with self-liberation, not the "liberation" of the mass by a "dedicated" minority who, if successful, would end up as new oligarchs. They concern themselves with the defence of the individual against the encroachments of collectivism - present or future, Right or Left, Halbrook and his comrades believe in the old fallacy "my enemy's enemy is therefore my friend". Hence their search for allies amongst the socialists. I wonder how many more times victims will have to change places with executioners before they come to understand that the legend of the liberating social revolution is part and parcel of the Social Lie used to ensnare the individual into subjection to the collectivity, and that only in the permanent insurrection of the individual is there any hope for his liberation?

*Parker has still not understood the revolutionary, reformist & liberating potential of the anarchist model.*  
Despotism and Individualism. *J.E.S.S.F.*

During the early part of this century the young Giovanni Papini wrote a critique of Herbert Spencer in which he accused Spencer of being an "empty and half-hearted" individualist. Like Georges Palante, Papini pointed out that Spencer opposed the tyranny of the State over the individual, but said "not a word against the far more powerful tyranny of society. Social dogmas, precisely because they are not fixed in laws and regulations, are more oppressive and more irresistible than the principles of State control. Against the latter there is some

defence: they are matters of law. Against social dogmas, reinforced by public opinion, there is no resource save useless and solitary revolt."

I do not agree with Papini that solitary revolt is necessarily useless, but I do agree with his remarks regarding the tyranny of social dogmas. His criticism applies not only to Spencer, but also to anyone else who rebels against the vertical authority of the State in order to replace it by the horizontal authority of Society.

Where I part company from Papini, however, is over his confused view of the relation between individualism and despotism. He states that: "Despotism is the only practical ideal of anarchy. Alexander the Great.....was far more free than any citizen of modern Europe, precisely because he stood alone in the power to command and to possess. True individualism, then, consists in counselling subjection, not rebellion; in making slaves, not revolutionists; instruments, not critics."

Can individualism be identified with "the power to command" - in other words, the exercise of authority?

Let me make it clear that I do not regard the ruler as "evil", or the ruled as "good". As Tucker once pointed out both society and the individual have the same "right" to coerce each other if they have the might. The incompatibility of individualism and rulership is rooted in other soil than the barren wastes of morality. It is rooted in the nature of each.

Rulership is not simply a one-way relationship in which a "free" despot makes merry with his serfs. It is a reciprocal affair which binds ruler and ruled alike and destroys the independence of each:

"He who, to hold his own, must count on the absence of will in others, is a thing made by these others, as the master is a thing made by the servant. If submissiveness ceased it would be all over with lordship." (Stirner)

".....the moment that 'to be master of myself' means 'to be master of others', the moment my independence does not derive from my autonomy but from the dependence of others on me, it becomes obvious that I remain bound to the others and have need of them if only to reduce them to nothing." (Maurice Blanchot)

Individualism means self-determination, not other-determination, whether from above or below. "Individualism", writes Papini, is "the affirmation of full personal power." Agreed. But no matter how strong I am, no matter how shrewd a "Machiavellian", I can only effectively rule others if I take into account their demands. Once they come to believe that I can no longer satisfy them I can end up in bitter exile like Napoleon, or hanging head first like Mussolini (himself no stranger to individualist ideas). The ruled may depend on me for their direction, but I am equally dependent on them not only for my position but also my "raison d'etre" as a ruler. As Stirner said, at bottom it is the servant who makes the master.

It is certainly true that rulers as a class have always enjoyed power and privilege at the expense of the ruled as a class. But although this may interest the aspirant to authority who takes a dynastic view, or who is enraptured by some belief in a historical dialectic, it is of no value to the individualist who has before his eyes his own life as a mortal being. To confuse the conscious egoism of the individualist with the blind, or one-sided, egoism of the would-be despot leads only to confusion. It has been remarked that the astute ruler finds out which way the herd wants to go and places himself at their head. An individualist, however, is interested in his direction, not that of the herd, and wants to be free to change his direction as he wills, not as others will.

I suspect that much less would be heard of the belief that individualism can equal despotism if it were not for the persistence of the social democratic fiction that the ruled many are the innocent and deceived victims of the ruling few. This populist poppycock not only distorts the vision of its upholders, but also that of some of their critics who conclude that if one does not wish to be ruled the only alternative is to become a ruler. Hence the contradictions of Papini and the muddled politicking of many Nietzscheans. The power of the ruler certainly reflects the powerlessness of the ruled (individually speaking), but just as an electric current needs both positive and negative elements in order to flow, so does the ruler depend on the ruled as they depend on him. The way of the individualist is outside of both. He is an anarchist because he is an egoist.

XXXXXXXXXXXX

#### DEFINITIONS

by Melaclypee the Younger, K.S.C.

Egotists are a pain in the ass, yet some self-centred individuals are resolutely not. How come this anomaly? Language.....capital L Language. And in as much as it is my Language, I herewith offer up for grabs a few distinctions that I find useful:

EGO is my "me".

EGOCENTRICITY is that I relate my experience to myself, resulting in the psychologically inescapable fact that it is I who am doing the experie-ning.

EGOISM is when I tell others that being consciously aware of one's selfhood is a gas.

BENEVOLENCE is when you like other people too.

EGOTISM is that bastard who tries to impose his self on mine.

ALTRUISM is when somebody tries to pretend to be everybody else.

SELFISHNESS is when somebody forgets that he is not alone.

The EGOTISTIC ALTRUIST says: "I am the centre of the Universe, and hence know better than you about your welfare, and you had damn well better thank me for it."

The BENEVOLENT EGOIST says: "I am the centre of my universe, and if you're not the centre of yours then you're missing the point.

XXXXXXXXXXXX

#### COMMENT

from Mike Muir

A comment on Benjamin Best's article and your reply. I do not like definitions so I disliked the article. But most of all I despise the use of the words "Stirnerist", "Stirnerite" and "Stirnerian". Because no man has ever or will ever be so great that I would label my ideas as his ideas. To use his phrase on him, Stirner's ideas are not my ideas. I like many of his ideas, but now the ones I choose to be my own are my ideas that belong to I, not Stirner. But this is no criticism of Stirner for he was a "Stirnerite", the only "Stirnerite". As far as I am concerned the people I criticize are the would-be individualists who dent their I in the definition of "Stirnerite". This also goes for people like "Randites", "Christians", etc.

## IN PRAISE OF CHAOS (Continued)

by Enzo Martucci

Anarchy is the aggregation of innumerable and varied forms of life lived in solitude or in free association. It is the totality of experiences of individual anarchists trying to find new ways of non-gregarious living. It is the contemporary and polychromatic presence of every diverse mode of realization used by free individuals capable of defending their own. It is the spontaneous development of natural beings.

In it one will find that everything is equivalence and equilibrium: conflict and agreement, the brute and the genius, the solitary and the promiscuous - all will have the same value. One can designate opposites with the same word: "altus" can be top or bottom, height or depth.

In substance anarchy would mean the victory of polymorphism which is opposed to the monism of all social systems, including libertarian communism.

Some maintain that in the absence of government or law we would have the complete triumph of bellum omnium contra omnes: the war of each against all. They are mistaken.

In a free world there would always be struggle, which is indestructible because it is natural. But it would be a struggle between the approximately equal forces of men strengthened by naturalism.

During a long polemic he had with me between 1948 and 1950, Mario Marieni tried to demonstrate that in a condition of anarchy war among men would increase: "If today a man has no fear of attacking his fellow and the policemen who stands behind him, he will certainly have no fear if I eliminate the policemen. Algebraically speaking, if A has no fear of B despite C, he will have even less fear if B is alone."

My reply was: Today A has no fear of B despite C because he knows that both lack decision and force. B relinquishes them because he relies on C to defend him. And C protects him not because he has any lively feeling or strong interest, but only because it is his trade. Therefore he does not inspire much fear. Hundreds of police in Paris failed to capture Jules Bonnot, the illegalist, alive and had to launch an attack on his house in order to kill him. It is true that behind this protection there is the apparatus of social repression with formidable means at its disposal, but today's delinquent underrates the collective's organization and always hopes to escape it or avoid detection.

Again, if A finds B as resolute as he, then their forces will be equivalent. The case is clear and does not allow illusion. At that moment the dispute between them will be resolved.

Anarchy, then, is neither continual warfare which would weary everyone, nor social harmony which would weaken everyone if it were possible (which it is not, due to the diversity of individual types and their conflicting needs and aspirations)

If history is not an infinite process, as I firmly believe, then when it exhausts its cycle it will disappear opening the way to anarchy.

If, on the other hand, history endures, then anarchism will remain - that is, the eternal revolt of the individual against a stifling society. Thus proving the immortality of that "tendency to chaos" that the lawyer d'Anto finds so deplorable, but which is to me worthy of every praise.

Between association and organization there is the same difference as between a free union and marriage. The first I can dissolve when I wish, the second I cannot dissolve or dissolve only under certain

conditions and with certain permissions.

It is not by organizing into parties and syndicates that one struggles for anarchy, nor by mass action which, as has been shown, overthrows one barracks only to create another. It is by the revolt of individuals, alone or in small groups, who oppose society, impede its functioning and cause its disintegration.

(Translated from the Italian by Stephen Marletta)

XXXXXXXXXX

THE ROAD TO HELL.....

by W. Millis.

To all egoists, conscious or otherwise.

I have pleasure in informing you of the recent twenty first anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In the light of this I feel it only fair that the pages of MINUS ONE be utilised to send all our fellowmen belated greetings at the coming of age of our recognised rights.

The theme of human rights is not new. Now, however, it has become a definite statement, functioning on a universal level through the U.N. This super-State should not, of course, be confused with lesser attempts: The League of Nations, the Treaty of Versailles, the Hague Conference, the Geneva Convention - to name but some of the recent attempts by progressives at forming a cohesive structure for human action.

Not that I decry progress! Heaven forbid! I realize that this word has magical connotations, the very mention of which will conjure up visions of an El Dorado just around the corner. "Back to the caves, then?" Well now, you people that live under the protective oak of civilization, you know where the acorn came from, don't you? The troglodytes that you remain aloof from are, when all's said and done, a simpler version of your more complicated culture. They were tribal too, and you have the group-mentality just as they had.

But you cultured ones will not grasp that it is not us who are trying to get back to the past, but you who are trying to escape it. Your history is a vortex that you hide from. The curtain is flimsy and slips from time to time to show the true spirit of the mob. The occasional riot that erupts is the mob desperately clutching for more stable institutions and consequently a stronger leader.

Indeed, it was the need-to-belong mentality that was to come under the ruthless magnifying glass of Nietzsche: "All-too-many are born: for the superfluous the state was invented. Behold, how it lures them, the all-too-many and how it devours them, chews them, and ruminates."  
(Zarathustra: "On The New Idol".)

What was true in the 1600s is just as much the case today. The cold monster of the State is still with us, only people's attitudes are modified to fit the new environment that inevitably comes into being with a new archy.

Here we are on the way into another decade, so console yourselves that, despite your activity, what happened before will happen again.

The progressives who scream for a universally accepted norm become tame when faced with the task of explaining why, if one is as equal as the other, we are different in personality, shape, colour and ability. If each is unique, wherein lies our equality? It is a mental-image, an Ideal.

To end on a Stirnerian note: "My power is my property. My power gives me property. My power am I myself, and through it am I my property."

## NOTES ON THUS SPOKE ZARATHUSTRA (Concluded)

by Wm. J. Boyer

(All the sentences enclosed by quotation marks are from Nietzsche's Thus Spoke Zarathustra)

"Where shall I find my equal? All those who give themselves their own will and renounce all submission, they are my equals."

Now we have it. Zarathustra has two systems of philosophy. The great mass of men are natural followers. These men are used. They are given commands to test who are the stronger. Many will not recognize the snares and poisonous hotchpotches Zarathustra has prepared. A few will use their own minds. They will recognize the evils for what they are, and either avoid them, or use them very carefully. Those, in a general way, become Zarathustra's equals. They are their own.

"I am a railing beside the stream: he who can grasp me, let him grasp me! I am not, however, your crutch."

The distinction between Zarathustra's equals and lesser men is that his equals test, analyze, select. Lesser men accept blindly the good and the bad. The bad leads them to their ruin. This is the intention of the snares and hotchpotches in Zarathustra's doctrine. Your success or failure depends on how wisely you make your selections.

"Truly, it draws us ever upward - that is, to cloudland: we set our motley puppets on the clouds and then call them gods and supermen -

Alas, how weary I am of all the unattainable that is supposed to be reality. Alas, how weary I am of the poets!"

The idea of the Superman serves various purposes. It offers a spur, an ideal, and a goal for lesser men to strive towards. To the egoistic philosopher it is no more than a useful tool to be manipulated like the old god. If he speaks of sacrifice "it is merely a ruse in talking and verily a useful folly! Here aloft I can speak freer."

The philosopher does not sacrifice himself. He only sacrifices those who offer themselves up as sacrifices. He allows them to sacrifice themselves. The egoist places himself even before the Superman. He sacrifices himself to nothing. The Superman is merely a useful folly to talk about. He will have no more reality in the future than he has now. Here and there, now as well as in the past, there are individuals who are so far in advance of the rest of the human race that we might call them Superman. I see no point in the rest of us worshipping them. I leave this Superman worship to others.

There is more to Zarathustra than this - very much more. I offer this as a mere introduction.

XXXXXXXXXX

## LITERATURE

Anarchism and Individualism by E. Armand. 1/4, inc postage  
 O Idios by Jean-Pierre Schweitzer. 1/4, inc. postage  
 Individualist Anarchism: An Outline by S.E.Parker. 12 for 1/6, inc. post.  
 The False Principle of Our Education by Max Stirner. 5/-, inc. postage.

XXXXXXXXXX

## CORRECTION

In the last issue it was announced that copies of The Ego and His Own by Max Stirner were available in hard back from Relpth Myles Publisher, Inc. (P.O.Box 1533, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80901, USA) at 6 dolls. 95 cents, plus 25% shipping. This should have read: plus 25 cents shipping. Apologies for any inconvenience caused.

MINUS ONE is edited and published by S.E.Parker, 2 Orsett Terrace, London, W.2., England. 8/- for six issues ( \$1.25 in the U.S.A.)

## APOLOGY

MINUS ONE 17 (Jan/Feb 1967) contained an article entitled "Total Freedom", allegedly by Jim Duke. Earlier this year I discovered that this was in fact copied word for word from a passage in "Introduction to Existentialism" by Marjorie Grene. I am sorry to have published a plagiarism, but the article was accepted in good faith from Jim Duke as being his own work. S.E.P.

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

## APPEAL

Unfortunately I no longer possess a complete file of MINUS ONE. The makeshift file I now have lacks numbers 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, and 21. I would be pleased to hear from any reader who could help me obtain these. S.E.P.

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

## A POEM FOR MINUS ONE

by Mike Muir

\$	IF.OO	
	YOU.OO	
	WA.NT	COUNT
	.TO	ME
	COU.NT	
\$	OOO.ME	

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

## METHOD TO MADNESS

by Malaclypse The Younger, KSC.

Life is mine. I was born here and I belong here. / I once knew a sparrow who was the wisest man in the world. / I enjoy the universe thru multiple eyes—now your game, now his game, sometimes three games, sometimes none. / So speak to me now of the Universal and yet I know myriad particulars, uniquely total and totally real. So then play with Particulars and yet I am of the universal that dissolves them. To change a window. Have you a window? Pray let me look. Multiple eyes. / Anarchy only in politics? So too, social anarchy. Yea, and philosophical anarchy. "Asophy!" ("Without wisdom"....so, what the hell.) / In all honesty, of a universe crammed full of realities, only two are fundamentally important to me: the mystic totality, so called "universe"; and the particularized self, so called "me". Is the crescent concave or convex? On the inside looking out there is only I playing with sensation/self as I see fit. This is god. On the outside looking in there is only All in total undifferentiation. This is god. (And who is there to read the babblings of a solipsist? And is God such a good listener that he talks to himself?) And, dear reader of different insides than I, we share the same All, do we not? "God" equals "A". "God" equals "B". Poor Aristotle. / Joy to the lowly window washer. That I should declare a politics? That I should declare a philosophy? Bull shit. Gods don't declare. Nor do sparrows.

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Why are there still rulers on thrones? Because there are still subjects. When this social misery? Not because some raise themselves above others, but because the others renounce themselves. On our lives rests the curse of an entirely unnatural idea: the Christian idea. We have cast off some of the externalities of the religions. But little is yet noticeable of the blessings that would result if we threw overboard the idea of religion..... John Henry Mackay.