Union of Egoists

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*

The Eagle and The Serpent

A Journal of Emersonian Philosophy and Sociology.

"The proudest animal under the sun and the wisest animal under the sun have set out to reconnoitre."

No. 10. JUNE, 1900. PRICE 1D., BY POST 2D.

PRINCIPAL ARTICLE.

CHAMBERLAIN AND RHODES FROM NIETZSCHE'S STANDPOINT:

by PETER GAST, H. LICHTENBERGER, THOMAS COMMON, W. A. HAUSSMANN, DR. HAVELOCK ELLIS, and J. M. ROBERTSON.

SHOULD THE EXPLOITING JEW BE EXTERMINATED?

Heine on the Rothschilds.

THE NEW HEROISM.

"*If I were a young man I should ally myself with some high and at present unpopular cause, and devote my every effort to accomplish its success.*"—JOHN G. WHITTIER.

"Exterminate the vermin."—*An English officer's command to his troops charging the Boers.*

"Our sympathies are with the Boers, but our commercial interests compel us to side with England."—*Senator Depew.*

"Jews live on the plunder of the general decadence. In order to be men in common with us, cease to be Jews."—*Richard Wagner.*

Richard Wagner said to the Jews: "Remember that there can only be one release from the curse which rests upon you: the release of Ahasuerus—destruction." "To become men *in common* with us is for the Jews primarily the same thing as to cease to be Jews."

"The Jew is indifferent to everything which does not directly refer to his own well-being. The Jews received by the grace of Jehovah the command to steal."—*Ludwig Feurbach.*

THE pleasure of being deeply shocked is a luxury which the editor can not often afford and rarely experiences, but of a truth we drank deep of this spring of emotion on opening a letter which began with the startling query at the head of this page. We accord our correspondent the freedom of our columns for the pleasure of refuting his positions. We have perhaps allowed our correspondent a greater freedom of expression than is proper in a free country, but there is a sublime saying (which is not necessarily a lie) to the effect, Truth is never offended but always defended.

PUBLISHED BY

WATTS & CO., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

ISSUED ON THE FIRST DAY OF EACH MONTH.

A REMARKABLE ANTI-SEMITIC LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

To the Editor :— In these last months all noble hearts must have yearned to exterminate the Jew. All noble hearts always yearn instinctively to exterminate the vermin enemies of the race. On what grounds do I base this sweeping characterisation? Let us hear what Heine said, in 1841, of the Jewish monarchs of finance, who are the real monarchs of the monarchs:

HEINE ON THE ROTHSCHILDS:

'Herr von Rothschild is, in fact, the best political thermometer, I will not say weather-frog, because the word is not sufficiently respectful; and certes! one must have respect for this man, be it only for the respect he inspires in others. I like best to visit him in his banking-house where I can as a philosopher observe how people, and not only God's chosen, but all other kinds, bow and duck before him. There you may behold such a twisting and bending of back-bones as the best acrobat could hardly equal. I have seen people who, when they drew near the great Baron, shrunk up as if they had touched an electric battery. Even while approaching the door of his cabinet many experience a thrill of awe such as Moses felt on Mt. Horeb when he saw that he stood on holy ground, and even as Moses took off his shoes, so more than one courtier or broker would fain remove his boots before entering the private cabinet of M. de Rothschild. That private cabinet is indeed a remarkable place, which inspires sublime thoughts and feelings, as does the sight of the sea or the starry heavens. We see here how small man is and how great is God. For gold is the God of our time and Rothschild is his prophet.

"Some years ago when I was about to call on Herr von Rothschild, a servant in livery crossed the corridor carrying the chamber-pot of the latter, while a speculator on the Bourse who was passing at the instant most respectfully took off his hat at the mighty pot. So far extends—with reverence be it said!—the devotion of certain people. I noted the name of that devoted man, and am sure that in time he will become a millionaire. When I told —— that I had lunched with Baron Rothschild in the inner apartments of his bureaux, he clasped his hands in amazement, declaring that I had enjoyed an honour which had hitherto only been granted to a Rothschild of the blood or to a few sovereign princes, and that he would give half his nose for such an honour. I will here remark that the nose of —— would be quite large enough even if diminished by half.

"The result of my researches as to the national wealth of the Jews is greatly to their credit, and covers them with illustrious honour. For Israel owes its wealth entirely and only to that sublime religion to which it has remained faithful for milleniums. The Jews worshipped a Highest Being who ruled invisibly in heaven, while the heathen, incapable of rising to the purely spiritual, made for themselves all kinds of gold and silver gods, whom they worshipped here on earth. Now, had these blind heathen changed into ready hard specie all the precious metal which they wasted in vile idolatry, and put it out to interest, they would have grown as rich as the Jews, who knew how to invest their cash much more advantageously—perhaps in Assyrian-Babylonian State loans, in Nebuchadnezzarian bonds, in Egyptian Canal shares, in five per cent. Sidonians, and other classic papers which the Lord blessed even as he blesseth the modern."

[Unspeakable blessing, Master Heine. Recent discoveries reveal the existence of great banking-houses, both in Assyria and Egypt! These blessed Shylocks impounded the nations of antiquity and ate their heads clean off.]

"The outbreak of a war is, for the time, delayed. . Our financiers especially see everything in the loveliest light of hope...M. de Rothschild, who for some time appeared to be ill, is now quite restored and looks sound and well. The augurs of the Bourse, who perfectly understand deciphering the physiognomy of the great Baron, assure us that the swallows of peace nestle in his smiles, etc."

So far Heine. If he, gifted with an almost divine penetration, realized the omnipotence of the Rothschild family, so long as a half-century since, who can say how much more fatally predominant that family has grown in our day? Horace Mann wrote, fifty years since: "The feudalism of capital is not a whit less formidable than the feudalism of force. The millionaire is as dangerous to the welfare of the community in our day, as was the baronial lord in the middle ages. Both supply the means of shelter and of raiment on the same conditions; both hold their retainers in service by the same tenure—their necessity for-bread; both use their superiority to keep themselves superior. The power of money is as imperial as the power of the sword; I may as well depend upon another for my head as for my bread. The day is sure to come when men will look back upon the prerogative of capital at the present time with as severe and as just a condemnation as we now look down upon the predatory chieftains of the Dark Ages."

No one, not blinded by self-interest, can fail to see that the great Armageddon is this eternal combat, Jews versus Humanity. It is indeed enough to stagger humanity to reflect what a mighty stream of gold every second of time drains from the wealth of the race to pour into the incredible and scandalous accumulations of Jewry. Others may believe that salvation is of the Jews, for the Jews, and by the Jews—to me that salvation spells damnation.

The attitude of the Jews on the present war is a damning proof that they stand by their race prejudice in despite of every consideration. Half the world at least, yes far more than half, is agreed in esteeming the war a hell-born quest of political and financial charlatans. Now, on the law of probability, if Jews were ever capable of throwing off their jesuitical loyalty to God's chosen, there would be found at least one Jew who disapproved of the British policy.

I defy you to name a single Jew who, rising above race-feeling, has ranged himself with the judgment of the disinterested world on this question.

Is this not a conclusive demonstration that the Jews remain still a *thoroughly* jesuitical race which considers the Chosen People first and the Gentiles afterwards?—I remain, yours faithfully,

THE CHAMPION OF AN UNPOPULAR CAUSE.

There are good reasons why the editor should apologise for inserting the above letter. More times than we like to think, some kind-hearted Jew has proven to our mutual satisfaction that a friend in need is a friend indeed. Many's the time we have asked help of the Jew, and never asked in vain as long as we had anything whatever to 'put up.'

When other helpers fail and comforts flee,
Help of the helpless, oh, divide with me.

Extermination is a game at which two can play, but it is not for this reason that we unreservedly repudiate the suggestion of our correspondent. Even in the case of the Jew Rothschild, Rosebery, Hugh Price Hughes, the editors of the *Mail*, *Telegraph*, and *Daily News*, those invaluable defenders of freedom and justice, and all such, we should object to extermination in obedience to the more vindictive policy of the Jacobin philosopher who said, "I vote against the death of Louis; I should like to see a king condemned to make a living by honest toil."

We confess that we ourselves cherish a dream of bringing out an expurgated edition of humanity, but we certainly could not "yearn to exterminate" a race that has given us a Heine, and a Mendellssohn.

We would fain exterminate all (Jewish, and non-Jewish) who practise the usurious exploitation for which Jewry has become altogether too synonymous. We would joyously devote ourselves to the extirpation, root and branch, of that system of finance which makes the will of a Nation depend upon the caprice of any capitalist. It must be humiliating to a people yet capable of pride to read such a statement as this, which appeared in the press last year on the occasion of all important Cabinet meetings, *After the adjournment of the Cabinet, Mr. Balfour held a long conference with Baron Rothschild.*

We think it incumbent on decent Jews to repudiate in the most absolute manner, as a matter of justice and self-vindication (or of self-protection if nobler considerations have no weight), all sympathy with those capitalists who have made their name an intolerable offence to honest nostrils, and who, as Wagner has said, can only be redeemed by annihilation. On those Jews who with honest race-pride still wish to segregate themselves from the accursed Gentiles, we think it equally incumbent to take steps to possess a Nationality of their own. In the future such a place may be far safer than the lands of the despised Gentiles, with all their flesh-pots. Let them seek a home of their own, nobly declining to be a parasitic or vermin growth on other nations, or rather, declining to make the nations their parasites.

We do not fault the Jews for assuming that they are God's chosen, for as a traveller in many lands we can testify that every people cherishes the same universal illusion.

Our editorial position is frankness itself. We indulge no illusory interrogatories—we ask, not Should the Jew be exterminated? but Does the Jew intend to exterminate us? We trust that grace of three months will be given us enabling us to redeem a few family heirlooms and to discharge a number of obligations due to our esteemed exterminator.

We confess that were it fully established that no Jew can be found who espouses the Boer cause, we should share our correspondent's sorrow. But is this really true? Our columns will be freely given to anyone able to refute this aspersion. Pending this refutation, we again, in justice to ourselves, repudiate all sympathy with the demand for the extermination of the Jew even though that demand be voiced by Richard Wagner himself.

[*The "Problem of the Jew" will be continued in our next number, ready July 1st.*]

NIETZSCHE, CHAMBERLAIN AND RHODES.

SYMPOSIUM :—Is the British Policy in South Africa a consistent exemplification of Nietzsche's Social Philosophy?

A German View.

PETER GAST, who was appointed by Nietzsche editor of his works and whom he called 'my best friend' answers our query as follows:

Dear Sir—You do me the honour of asking if I consider the present war policy of the British Government in South Africa a consistent exemplification of the social philosophy of Nietzsche.

By way of reply I should say that Messrs. Chamberlain and Salisbury would have evoked Nietzsche's sorrow, but not his admiration. The Nietzschean master-man, the Zarathustra-man, is an ideal with which the gentlemen in question have practically nothing in common. They both represent mercantile interests and so-called 'civilisation' as the Englishman usually understands it—the world of steam engines, of capitalism, of fashion, of comfort. But with all these, however perfect they may be, one may have a soul which does not count for much as regards higher humanity.

Some time ago, Wilhelm Jordan (the modern new-singer of our old Nibelungs' Song) stated that he had had the vision of the Nietzschean master-man much earlier than Nietzsche—in the character of *Hagen*! I gave him to understand however in the 'Frankfurter Zeitung' that the Nietzschean master man in the Nibelungs' Song is not the narrow-minded, coldly calculating *Hagen*, but *Siegfried*! It is in Siegfried that the virtues of the master-man are united—power and gentleness, sternness and love, heroic buoyancy and heroic magnanimity.

The English seem to have fallen into the same error as Jordan. Messrs. Chamberlain and Salisbury are Hagens, not Siegfrieds. If they were Siegfrieds they would be ashamed of the hundred years of cruel annoyance which Great Britain has inflicted upon the Boers. Instead of that, they have continued the terribly painful history in such a manner that all Europe (with the exception of some small equivocal nations) regards it with horror and detestation; continued it from motives which are clear as noonday to every child, and which the Nietzschean master-man would absolutely repudiate as unworthy of him. Understand me properly however, it is *not* owing to sentimentality, but owing to a certain nobleness of character that the Nietzschean master-man would desist from the heartless torture of a small, brave people, of European descent.

The Boer, who is unwilling to give the Uitlanders a voice in his state affairs (because if he did so he would immediately be lost) represents the master-man in Nietzsche's sense far more than the Englishman does. Indeed, as a man of honour, he is *unauthorised* and unable to acknowledge the suzerainty of Great Britain, the suzerainty of a power which for 100 years has known nothing better than to persecute him, to expel him and expel him anew, until he went into a country which excited more than ever the wanton envy of his persecutors.

What would England and the rest of Europe say if Germany perhaps sought to exercise suzerainty over Switzerland because there a number of the subjects of the German Empire reside, German capital is invested, and many taxes are paid by Germans? Europe would be perfectly justified in laughing at us and whipping our hands.

Nietzsche's doctrine and exhortations have to do especially with the sphere of the higher and highest impulses of the soul; the English South African policy has consequently nothing to do with them.

Things have not yet reached such a pass that the sacred name of Nietzsche is to be used as a cloak for a policy which is very low, even in comparison with the robber-baron policy of a Friedrich the Great or a Napoleon, and which, destitute of all higher humanitarian goals, has not attained the very appearance of chivalrousness.

I know that many thoughtful Englishmen have just the same sentiments, and I desire, like them, that the great reputation which Britain has enjoyed in Europe may not be still further debased by a wire-pulling stock-exchange mob.—Most respectfully, your obedient servant,

PETER GAST.

A French View.

The following is from Professor Henri Lichtenberger of the University of Nancy, the leading exponent of Nietzsche's philosophy in France. A German version of one of his books on the subject, "La Philosophie de Nietzsche," has recently appeared, furnished with a preface by Nietzsche's sister.

SIR.—It is certain that Nietzsche is not in any respect a humanitarian. He would not have been enthusiastic about the Peace Congress, because he regards war, not as a necessary evil, but as a good. The free struggle of rival and contrary forces seems to him a powerful instrument of progress; it discloses where there is physical and moral health, and where

there is disease; it causes what is decrepit and ripe for death to disappear. Nietzsche therefore proclaims it beneficent and salutary, whatever be its cause. He does not recognise 'just' or 'unjust,' 'moral' or 'immoral' war. Everything has its value in itself. 'Ye say that a good cause will sanctify war itself; I tell you,' says Zarathustra, '*it is the good war which sanctifies every cause.*' Is that as much as to say that Nietzsche would have approved of the present war against the Boers? I do not believe it; indeed, I am sure he would have blamed it, and for this reason: he would have thought it was not 'a *good war.*'

'A good war,' in the first place, should have an *idea* for its motive, it should be a sort of wager. 'Ye are to wage war *for your idea*,' says Zarathustra to the warriors. War is for Nietzsche one of the dangerous experiences which the wise institute in order to further life, in order to test the worth of an idea, a thought, a culture, with a view to the general development of humanity. But the Transvaal war seems to be a war of interests and not a war of ideas. It would be useless to say that the *idea* which this war discloses is the conception of Anglo-Saxon imperialism, which haunts so much the imagination of the English at present. Undoubtedly if England had launched into a struggle with Russia, for example, of which the stake would be the hegemony of Asia, Nietzsche would not have failed to admire such a war. But in the war against the Transvaal there is nothing sublime in English imperialism. Has not Cecil Rhodes said in a recent interview that 'Her Majesty's flag was the greatest commercial asset in the world.' The *aristocrat* Nietzsche would most certainly have discovered that a *commercial asset* is not an *idea*, and that a war, too obviously undertaken for a *commercial asset* is *without interest* and 'lacking in nobleness.'

Then again, a *good* war is one in which the adversaries are well matched. When it is a question of war, or a game of boxing, of football, or tennis, the champions require to be of nearly equal strength, otherwise there is no interest in the game. A player becomes disqualified when he plays against an adversary who is too weak. 'Ye must be proud of your enemy: *then the successes of your enemy will also be your successes*,' says Zarathustra. It is too true, however, that the disproportion between the Transvaal and England is too glaring. It is so great that it has not only been impossible for the English to applaud the successes of the Boers, but they have hardly had the right to be much elated over their own victories. Nietzsche would have admired without reserve the gigantic duel of Napoleon with the Emperors of Austria and Russia at Austerlitz, or that of Napoleon and Wellington at Waterloo, because at Austerlitz and Waterloo the contest was equal, or nearly so. He could not have the same reasons for admiring the capture of Cronje by Lord Roberts. From this point of view, also, the Transvaal war would have seemed to him lacking in interest and *unvornehm*; it would have been disagreeable to his aristocratic instincts.

Nietzsche, then, would have regarded the Transvaal war as a disagreeable event, destitute of nobleness, but I do not believe that he would have associated with those who make the war an occasion for insulting England and putting it, as it were, daily in the pillory. He would have thought that if it were true that the war was a 'disgrace,' a 'crime,' the disgrace was still worse for Europe than for England. According to Nietzsche's morality, it is perhaps base to commit a 'crime,' but it is all the more base to stigmatise a 'crime' with strong language, without doing anything to hinder it. The personage Pontius Pilate is the most contemptible of beings from the point of view of an aristocratic morality like that of Nietzsche. If he regarded the Transvaal war as an actual stain upon England, he would regard it all the more as a stain upon Europe, upon humanity.

I believe then, in *résumé*, that the attitude of Nietzsche with regard to the Transvaal war would be '*a mute, but very sincere disapprobation.*'

Accept, Sir, the expression of my most sincere sentiments. H. LICHTENBERGER.

Université de Nancy, Faculté des Lettres.

A Scotch View.

MR. THOMAS COMMON, unquestionably the ablest and most zealous of Nietzsche's disciples in Great Britain, the translator of several of Nietzsche's volumes, writes:

England's war policy in South Africa assuredly does not exemplify the aristocratic master-morality which Nietzsche advocates, but rather the reverse; it seems to exemplify almost exclusively the accursed slave-morality (the lowering, degrading, utilitarian, shopkeeper, plutocrat type of morals), which Nietzsche so thoroughly deprecates. It is the healthy and vigorous nation of the Boers, and not the British, which displays to a considerable extent the virtues of the noble, aristocratic morality, and justly refuses to knaves and the worst class of Jewish usurers the political privileges it bestows on those engaged in highly honourable pursuits like agriculture.

Owing to the unscrupulous class of adventurers and speculators of all nationalities finding more favourable conditions in England than elsewhere for their scheme of *appropiating* all the *real estate* in the world and *repudiating the duties* which belong to its possession, and owing to their gradual acquirement, by the most discreditable means, of control over most of the leading newspapers in South Africa and England, which manufacture 'public opinion' to order, they have in the end got control of the British Government, which, by the agency of the army, has now become a mere machine for the purpose of pouring gold into the coffers of the gang, which includes some of the most mischievous rascals that have infested the terrestrial planet. The government and the army have indirectly sold themselves to this gang, and appear to be quite ready to undertake any plundering expedition on behalf of the wire-pulling crew of whom they are the puppets, if only there is a chance of being successful. It is evidently owing to these causes that the British Government is now engaged in the wretched business in South Africa, which the great historian Dr. Mommsen speaks of as 'not only a calamity but an infamy, a repetition of the Jameson Raid by the English Government, dictated by banking and mining speculators.' The most pitiable thing in the whole diabolical affair is that the remnants of the true aristocracy which England once possessed, the officers of the army, have been duped to spill not only the blood of the Boers, but also the best of their own blood, for an unjust cause, for the dishonour of their country, for the sake of enriching rascals with no nationality, and, worst of all, for the *destruction* instead of the extension of the British Empire ; for assuredly this war, which is universally recognised as unjust and has been undertaken by the most vulnerable of all nations, is the signal for the destruction of the British Empire in a few years. The game of the big bully and the comparatively helpless victim which England is at present playing, is likely to be imitated with much appreciation by strong states in proximity to weak British colonies ; for example, by the United States with respect to Western Canada, where there are richer gold mines to be lost than any that can be gained in the Transvaal. 'When England seizes the Transvaal gold fields,' they will say in America, 'just because it is strong enough to do so, why should not the United States follow the good example and seize the Klondyke goldfields which England is too weak to defend?' Similar questions are likely to be asked about closing the Straits of Gibraltar and even the Straits of Dover to English ships. Events will move rapidly in the new century ; it is very probable, therefore, that even if England does succeed in seizing the Transvaal at present, it will have to be relinquished, along with the whole of South Africa, in the course of a few years.

It would be interesting to enquire what are the predisposing causes and circumstances which have made England, which was once great and noble, fall to such a lamentable extent into the hands of a surreptitiously scheming class of exploiters from all parts of the world? The insular position of England has doubtless, as in the case of the Australian continent, favoured the antiquated type of its social flora and fauna. The stultifying influence of excessive religious superstition and fanaticism has no doubt caused the English to be more readily duped and victimised than other nations. The more special cause, however, is the degrading materialistic conceptions and ideals of the English. The influence of the superficial theories of Adam Smith of 'Wealth of Nations' fame has probably been the most efficient cause of England being so excessively corrupted by slave morality as to be an easy prey to adventurers. Though he has the reputation of being a great man, Adam Smith merely formulated to some extent the conditions under which people obtain the means of supplying their wants in an abnormal, disorganised, *laissez faire* type of society, and palmed off his system upon the world, and especially upon Englishmen, as the theory of the highest possible social conditions under which human beings can exist. The equally superficial utilitarians who came afterwards generally endorsed Adam Smith's principles, and secularists, atheists and would-be freethinkers have followed suit. In the end Herbert Spencer comes forward and in plausible formulæ seems to give the sanction of evolutionary science to the semi-anarchic system of society which Adam Smith contemplated. Through these prejudicial influences, and owing to the corrupting seeds of Hegelism which the 'Green Parrots' from the Oxford bowers have scattered all over the country, England has been led far astray, and is now reaping some of the consequences of its errors. THOMAS COMMON.

An American View.

PROF. W. A. HAUSSMANN, Ph.D., the best known interpreter of Nietzsche in America writes :

The contention of certain apologists for the present war in South Africa that the policy of the British Government has been a consistent exemplification of the social philosophy of Nietzsche appears at first sight both sound and seasonable. What inferences could be more natural than that Lord Salisbury, the staunch protagonist of imperialism, is the very incarnation of Nietzsche's philosopher of the future ; that Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the consummate villain of the tragedy which is now being enacted on South African soil, is the embodiment, as it were, of a Dionysian force seemingly destroying a world, in reality, constructing

a new and better world; that Mr. Cecil Rhodes, the hero compounded of stock-jobberism, practical atheism and brutal egotism, is the indispensable advance agent of civilization who will certainly make a paradise of the dark continent; that the sacrifices now made by Great Britain and her colonies are made in the interest of mankind, of a superior type of man; in short, that the Anglo Saxon, by trampling upon the rights of Mr. Everybody Else, benefits not only himself, but also Mr. Everybody Else.

Vanitas, vanitatum, vanitas! Lord Salisbury is not a philosopher; Chamberlain does not embody a Dionysian force; Rhodes is not a civilizer; the war is not waged in the interest of a superior type of man; the Anglo-Saxon race is not a master race benefitting the conquered and enslaved. No, a thousand times no, this is not a case of the survival of the fittest. It is, alas, a clear case of *la vulgarite prévandra*. The mob, the worst kind of mob, the English mob, is on the eve of inundating another continent. Hunted down by an ignoble pack of hounds, the wild boar is at bay. The last bulwark of aristocracy is broken down. Not a master race but the mob-like mish-mash, composed according to Matthew Arnold "of an upper class materialized, a middle class vulgarized and a lower class brutalized," will shape the destiny of Africa,—and I shudder. We shall have a hundred African Londons before long,—and I shudder. We shall have Anglo-African mobs, newspapers, factories and filthy cities galore,—and I shudder. But Anglo-Saxon civilization? *Credat Judaeus Appella.* I have no faith in Anglo-Saxon civilization. For arguments I refer to the writings of Stendhal, Heine, Carlyle, Nietzsche. The Hottentot has more capacity for culture than a London mob.

The recent speeches of Lord Salisbury argue a petty soul; this scion of noble stock has degenerated and dwindled to a preacher of equality, to a mouth-piece of the mob; Mr. Chamberlain, his helpmate, is a spectacled Lucifer at best; Mr. Rhodes identifies culture with commercial assets. The means of this trio—printed falsehoods and mob soldiery—are bad; the end—mob rule for Africa, for the world—is ignoble; and to claim for the trio that they are either conscious or unconscious disciples of the great European philosopher, is folly. Mob versus aristocracy, Englishman versus Boer, that is the whole story.

Want of space prevents me from expatiating on this tempting theme. The following excerpt from a petition prepared by myself in conjunction with my friend, Professor H. M. Ferren, of Allegheny, Pa., endorsed by hundreds of American Societies and submitted to President McKinley, may serve as a close:

"It would be useless to deny that our nation is all but unanimous in condemning the war of extermination now being waged by the Government of Great Britain against a people who are inferior to their adversaries only in numbers, and whose heroic struggle for independence in the face of overwhelming odds has won for them the sympathy and admiration of the entire civilized world.

The argument that the Boer is unprogressive and incapable of culture, because he has thus far resisted English enterprise, is in our opinion utterly fallacious. The sceptical attitude of the Boer toward the breathless material development so characteristic of modern civilization, the proverbial stubbornness with which he clings to his own customs and traditions, his determination rather to perish than to surrender those institutions upon which alone he bases his hopes for the future, are but traits such as we may expect to find in the early history of every nation which has thus far succeeded in working out a culture of its own. To insure the steady and harmonious growth of a nation it is essential that no one factor of its development be unduly and prematurely emphasized. There is nothing which so tends to stultify a people, especially one in a formative state, as an excessive amount of industrialism. By holding out the prospect of immediate wealth, it lures into mercantile pursuits that talent which should devote itself to higher problems. It does not, as is frequently maintained, lay the foundation for a superior civilization; on the contrary, by absorbing the energy of the best individuals, it not only fails to evoke the latent genius of a nation, but also destroys the very leaven of a truly human life. The precipitate haste and feverish activity which it entails are incompatible with the repose so indispensable to culture. An exclusively commercial policy will inevitably lead to that fatal state of affairs where stagnant multitudes and mushroom cities are mistaken for progress, where every sense of beauty and proportion is blunted, where the eye for the future is wanting, where a reckless generation not only poisons its own existence, but also does irreparable harm to its posterity. A people's culture must be deeply rooted in the past, and it is a grave error to suppose that a community whose highest ideal has hitherto been a life of luxury and ease can by means of its acquired wealth suddenly produce, as if by magic, that which presupposes centuries of rigorous self-discipline and creative effect.

"Disregarding minor issues, we are convinced that, if the Boer loses his autonomy, a nascent culture with infinite possibilities will be suppressed. Far from being the sworn enemy of progress, he is but opposing a shortsighted policy which, for the sake of realizing a few temporary advantages, sets at naught questions of the most far-reaching consequence. Where the destiny of an entire continent is to be shaped, a master race is needed, endowed

with that penetrative wisdom, deliberate foresight, plastic power, in short, endowed with those rarer qualities which men whose ambition culminates in the building of railways, in the operation of mines and in the establishment of centres of trade do not possess, but which the elite of international intelligence almost without exception concede to the Boer.

"Therefore, we feel justified in saying that the Boer, instead of being a retarding factor, is indispensable to civilization and that this age will be held responsible for one of the most heinous crimes ever perpetrated against mankind, if he be allowed to perish from the earth. It is doubly painful to us to observe that a nation with whom we have lately been on the most friendly terms should have permitted itself to be plunged into an ignominious war by the insidious wiles of a few selfish individuals."

W. A. HAUSSMANN.

We have received the following comments on the above Symposium;

I am obliged to you for showing me the proofs of the interesting communications you have received. I find myself more especially in sympathy with the remarks of M. Lichtenberger. Here and always he is an intelligent exponent of Nietzsche's attitude. I am personally a little sceptical as to "good wars," but M. Lichtenberger's remarks on the present war coincide very closely with my own opinions.—Yours faithfully,

HAVELOCK ELLIS.

Broadly speaking I prefer to reach and support my views on the war by other methods than that of asking what Nietzsche would have thought of it.—Faithfully yours,

JOHN M. ROBERTSON.

Personal Notice.—*Will the recipient of a marked copy of this Magazine, kindly submit to the Editor, for publication, his comments on the subjects indicated by the Editor's pencil?*

Now Ready.

Bound Volume of THE EAGLE AND THE SERPENT, being a complete file (10 Nos.) from th beginning. *Price* 5*s.*

Also, Complete File (save No. 1). *Price* 4*s.*

[Both volumes contain the first part of Nietzsche's "*Thus Spake Zarathustra*" in full.]

No. 1 is 1*s.* Nos. 2 to 9 are 3*d.* each.] Nos. 1 to 10 contain 16 pages. Back issues should be ordered by the uumber.

Sample Chapters of "Zarathustra," 3*d.*

Sample Copies of EAGLE & SERPENT, giving complete contents of all Nos. 3*d.*

Reply to Nunquam's "Merrie England." 1*d.*

"The Martyrdom of Percy Whitcomb:" the story of how an Altruist-suicide became an Egoist on his death-bed, with an introduction by Bernard Shaw. 4*d.*

For the above, address:
EAGLE--SERPENT, 4, Avondale Road, West Green, London, N., England;

American address:
V. F. GORDON, 525, West Capitol Ave., Springfield, Illinois, U.S.A.

***Communications for the Editor and Subscriptions,* should be sent to the London Address above.**

The Price of the New Series of THE EAGLE AND THE SERPENT *is* 1D. *from all Newsdealers,* 2D, *or* 4 CTS. *by post. Per Year* 2/- *or* 50 CTS. *Two Years to U.S.A. for a dollar bill.*

TRADE ORDERS TO
WATTS & CO., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, E.C.,
who supply all Back Numbers at prices given above.

Printed by The Zarathustra Press, 4, Avondale Road, West Green, London, N.