

This file archived at 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*



CRT Rec 10.8 50p

# MINUS ONE

MAX STIRNER  
JOSIAH WARREN  
JAMES L. WALKER  
RENZO NOVATORE  
JOHN HENRY MACKAY  
E. ARMONO  
ALBERT LIBERATO  
MATRENA PRISIAZHNIK  
LYSANDER SPOONER  
RAGNAR REDBEARD

No 31

EDITOR Sid Parker

Spring 1973





EN MARGE

S.E.Parker

### More Attacks on St. Max

After years of virtual neglect by the moral pundits, Max Stirner is suddenly receiving marked attention - as the villain of the piece in the melodrama of "decadent Britain". David Holbrook, poet, educationalist, moral crusader and erstwhile member of Lord Longford's gang bang on pornography has levelled a series of accusations against the author of *The Ego and His Own* in *Peace News* and *The Freethinker*. Holbrook brackets Stirner with de Sade, Brady (a child murderer) and the inmates of Broadmoor Prison for the Criminally Insane. He writes tearfully of "the whole ghastly slide into neo-fascism, as audiences demand their Stirnerian right to see women humiliated and abused and to indulge in sadistic cruelties and perversions." He also claims that *The Little Red School Book* is "Stirnerism for children" and that "Stirner, the egoistic nihilist, denied that one needs to feel concern for anyone".

Not to be outdone, the communist daily *The Morning Star* recently published two articles by the novelist Jack Lindsay in the second of which Stirner is singled out as the voice of "the nihilist anarchism which is the dominant value in our permissive society". Indeed, Lindsay assures his readers that "at the heart of it all lies Stirner's bourgeois nihilism, because the situation is one of bourgeois decay, not revolutionary activity" and he warns all good comrades to "be aware of the omnipresent pressure of egoist and nihilist anarchism, which is capitalism's parting gift of venom as it feels the overdue death pangs steadily corroding its carcass" (No, I have not made up the last quote!)

Lindsay's ostensible reason for singling out Stirner as the scapegoat for his moral spleen is "The harm done by the fundamental dehumanisation, the reduction of sex and human life to a thing. The classic definition of the state of mind to which such products tend to reduce their addicts was given well over a century ago by the anarchist Max Stirner: 'Let us seek in others only means and organs....For me no one is to be respected...but solely an object. The 'other' is - my food.'"

What Lindsay leaves out of his quotation is significant. The full quote should read:

"Let us not aspire to community, but to one-sidedness. Let us not seek the most comprehensive commune, "human society", but let us seek in others only means and organs which we may use as our property! As we do not see our equals in the tree, the beast, so the presupposition that others are our equals springs from a hypocrisy. No one is my equal, but I regard him, equally with all other beings, as my property. In opposition to this I am told that I should be a man among 'fellow-men'. (Judenfrage. p. 60); I should



'respect' the fellow-man in them. For me no one is a person to be respected, not even the fellow-man, but solely, like other beings, an object in which I take an interest or else do not, an interesting or uninteresting object, a usable or unusable person.

"And, if I can use him, I doubtless come to an understanding and make myself at one with him, in order, by the agreement, to strengthen my power, and by combined force to accomplish more than individual force could effect. In this combination I see nothing whatever but a multiplication of my force, and I retain it only so long as it is my multiplied force. But thus it is a - union."

As can be seen this puts Stirner in a rather different light.

Nonetheless, Holbrook and Lindsay can still argue against Stirner's view of other individuals as "objects" and claim that such is the nefarious result of his philosophy of conscious egoism. Indeed, it is. But the consequences are not what they say they are. The conscious egoist certainly looks upon others as "objects" and his consideration of them is for his sake, not their's. However, just as a craftsman has to take into account the kind of tools he uses and the nature of the material with which he has to work, so will the egoist take into account what kind of individuals his "objects" are.

This is not to equate human beings with wood or stone or metal. No such equation can be made because they are not the same. It is simply to openly acknowledge that an egoist looks upon others from the point of view of what use he can make of them without indulging in any Kantian eyewash about individuals as "ends in themselves" (and these "others", in turn, will look upon him/her in the same way - and so create atemporary mutuality)

It is not surprising that Holbrook, the humanist, and Lindsay, the communist, make Stirner their arch-villain. After all *The Ego and His Own* is not only the most outspoken exposition of amorality in the history of philosophy, but also one of the most powerful vindications of individualism ever written - and neither of these things would be to their taste. Their hysterical outbursts over Stirner's allegedly necessary "unconcern" for others, however, have no greater foundation than their heated imaginations. While Stirner certainly denied that one must feel concern for other individuals, he never argued that one should not feel concern. Indeed, even a cursory acquaintance with the relevant passages of Stirner's book would show that the conscious egoist, as he describes him, cannot be glibly bracketted with de Sade, Brady or the wretched inmates of Broadmoor, nor made responsible for every "decadent" manifestation of the "permissive society".

When he was alive Stirner opened fire with great effectiveness on the sacred shibboleths of the humanists and socialists of his time. Their outraged descendants have apparently not forgotten his crime. They will find, however, that his onslaught still has



its defenders and that the battle is not over yet.

(Postscript: In the April issue of the literary magazine Books and Bookmen David Holbrook again uses Stirner as his bogeyman and gives R.W.K. Paterson's book The Nihilistic Egoist: Max Stirner as his source. It is noticeable that he shows no sign of having read Stirner himself. Paterson's book is useful for any student of Stirner, but it is basically a hostile work and cannot be relied on for even a moderately impartial account of Stirner's philosophy.)

XXXXXXXXXXXX

## GENERALITIES

Wm. Flygare

Generalities

don't own the itches and twitches  
of particularities.

Their half-and-half  
slurping-and-burping  
permit no laugh.

They bleed no blood;  
their claws can't sense  
the clutch of Mother Mud.

They know no pain:  
as norm, they urge men mad  
to purge them sane;

as perfected goal,  
divide the individual  
to make him whole.

XXXXXXXXXXXX

From JOURNEY NOT TO END

by Paul Herr

Being your <sup>own</sup> man is the most serious crime of all today.

I consider God as one of those dangerous abstractions like The State, Freedom, Truth and Justice, that cause us to behave worse than the beasts of the jungle.

(Published as a paperback in Britain by Panther Books 1964)



# WHAT DO INDIVIDUALISTS WANT? A 1920 MANIFESTO.

by The "Reveil De L'Esclave" Group of Paris.

Individualist! There is a misunderstood name...

One affects nearly always to believe that the individualist is a monster of egotism and wickedness; that he possesses all the faults; that he thinks of nothing but his personal satisfaction and that he is ready to wipe out the whole world in order to live better.

This is not only false, but it is stupid.

In effect, if the individualist would oppress and exploit his fellows he would not urge them to rebel. Is not the best means of ensuring servitude to use pompous and empty words?

When we say to the individual: be yourself, think for yourself, live for yourself, do not let yourself be duped, robbed and massacred by and for others, far from wanting to deceive those who listen to us, we show them, on the contrary, the only means by which they can never be deceived by no matter whom.

We do not want to be tyrannised, but we do not want to be tyrants either.

We are against all parties, because they all serve the privileges and interests of a handful of intriguers.

We are against all evangels and creeds, because they rape the intelligence and atrophy the will.

We are for free examination, independent criticism, and individual initiative.

At the same time we reject the patriotic lie, religious dupery, capitalist resignation, socialist regimentation and the communist chimera.

Only the individual counts. He alone feels, vibrates, suffers. All the rest is secondary to him.

Society is always the enemy of the individual. We rebel against: moral and material servitude, against the customs, the "Everybody does it" of imbecilic public opinion. We want to live, love, work in our own way, as we please, without depending on anyone and we have the right because we do not inconvenience the tastes and aspirations of our neighbour.

The individualist does not want to live like a beast in the country of the bourgeois. France and Germany are nothing to him.

He does not want to spend his energies enriching a boss.



He does not want to disappear in the communist herd and be imprisoned by the vexations of the "dictatorship of the proletariat".

All dictatorships revolt us!

We are for complete liberty of the individual, because there is no happiness in submission.

That is why we fight.

The bourgeois, insolent parasite and gross possessor, repels us.

But the worker disgusts us as well for he is the same as the bourgeois. And often, when he is successful, he exceeds him in greediness.

We do not look to the mockery of the vote, nor count on the great revolution of the ignorant mass.

It is by education and individual action that we would transform the social milieu and free our lives as much as possible.

If you would be a man and live consciously leave all the parties, all the sects, and liberate yourself, free yourself, educate yourself, react with all your force against stupidity, without awaiting the orders of anyone. Put your acts in accord with your ideas: it is by this that one recognizes the libertarian individualist and rebel.

XXXXXXXXXX

RENZO NOVATORE - Outlaw Anarchist.

by Daniel Giraud.

There are various types of men, but one can make a straightforward distinction between those who "are" and those who want to "be"....The first live from day to day and only bother about "understanding" themselves after "being". The latter spare no effort to affirm in a peremptory manner the grounds of their doctrines. Only in the most favourable circumstances are they bent on putting their theories into practice. They do not perform the act in a natural way before reflecting on it, but rather define it before carrying it out.

Renzo Novatore (Renzo Ferrari) favoured the spontaneity and violence characteristic of Martucci (Enzo da Villafiore). He did not worry about "putting anarchism into practice", but "was" in harmony with himself (therefore in disharmony with the world) and had no ethical or philosophical scruples about it.

With realities suspended and truths hard to find, goals are illusory and Novatore did not believe in a hypothetical change in man and society. Only the roads which lead to an illusory goal -



6

which loses its function as a 'goal' because it appears to be something inapprehensible - can sometimes seem to be true, and in fact the approach can be an inexhaustible source of truth.

In November 1922 the "illegalist" Renzo Novatore succumbed to the bullets of the carabinieri near Arcola after a life full of, or rather fertile in, adventures of all kinds. Death is sweet when one has lived intensely. Some achieve an intense life by means of change, travel, madness, creativity or even by means of dreams and imitation. Others, more impulsive, seek bloody adventures, murder is on their road.....but what does it matter? If the choice is voluntary and the criminal is alone "there are no innocents", only puppets to eliminate if they block your way (isn't that so: Larcenaire? Bonnot?) to the top of the mountain where Zarathustra-Dionysus roars at life.....

Novatore did not have the morality of a slave and would be amazed by today's outraged exclamations from pacifist-humanist weaklings. The blue helmets of UN soldiers and the grey hats of the Salvation Army proliferate beneath the promises of disarmament and the anaesthetic negotiations of the Sovereign Pontiffs. The apparent peace is a sign of the times. Today in France we do not die from bombing, we burst with suffocation - it's less showy and more magnanimous.....

For Novatore, freedom was spontaneity. Decadence precipitates catastrophes and destruction. The world declines with more and more bombs, disasters and explosions because progress = the end of the road. Our civilization is no longer tottering on the edge of disaster - it collapsed long ago and only the corpse staggers on, its exterior concealing the emptiness within. The dangers of the environment are undermining it at its very roots and the first nuclear war will bring it down once and for all.

All this is quite normal and in the order of things. The world is occupied by corpses who do not know themselves and who pretend to live by playing with lighted matches just like little kids. While you wait listen to Renzo:

"Listen, o listen! It is my laughter which rises and echoes furiously in the heights...."

But the zombies cannot hear and the bullets of the carabinieri are my end.....

May 1970.

XXXXXXXXXX

Right - is a bat in the belfry, put there by a spook; power - that am I myself, I am the powerful one and owner of power. Right is above me, is absolute, and exists in one higher, as whose grace it flows to me; right is a gift of grace from the judge; power and might exist only in me the powerful and mighty.

Max Stirner.



SOLE PUERTO RICANS HAD A SPECIAL FONDNESS FOR THE 33rd PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

by Joffre Stewart - advocate of the Anti-Christ.

I write in contradiction of praise given to a famous man: Harry S. Truman.

Because there is no such thing as a good government, there is no such thing as a good President, and the Truman name will live in infamy for the decision to drop three atomic bombs on Japan, provided, of course, that the cold war does not turn hot and evaporate all the historians in the next twenty minutes. People in Viet Nam are branded war criminals for doing a hell of a lot less than Hell-Bomb Harry.

And if it is a case of leukemia you got, then it may well have started with the nuclear decisions of Truman.

And it was this Truman who saddled the country with the second peacetime draft, that of 1948, a draft law I pointedly broke at the time by refusing to register. Owing to this draft registration law, thousands have been sent to jail, and it has obtained the deaths of millions in imperialist adventures like Korea and Indochina. Rather than praise famous men, we should learn how to honour those who know how to break the law for peace without making victims.

Truman said that "Old Ten", meaning Prendergast, never told him to do anything wrong, but politics is rooted in fraud and crookedness, as Ten Prendergast so ably demonstrated, and it is from this immoral muck that Senator Truman got to the White House to do crimes of a higher order.....

It was said that Truman was not rich. Neither was Hitler.

And it was said that he was a "remarkable rare man". On the contrary, Truman was all too common a man, the kind of person who is patriotic not because s/he is stupid, but stupid because he is patriotic.

But we should not be too hard on Hell-Bomb Harry: in the last analysis he was but a good and faithful servant of the Council on Foreign Relations which designs the global strategy of the U.S. ruling class. Truman, as President, merely held to agreements that had already been set. Truman admits that when he became President he was not familiar with foreign affairs. Like any gung-ho patriot, this Bible-kissing NATOnik may have been a dupe of the ruling class without at all realizing it.

Puerto Ricans tried to shoot him. However, the nonviolent way to get rid of statesmen is to get rid of the State:

Don't Pay Taxes



The current cliché viable  
means, apparently, liable.

[illegible]

By being victims, victims are the ones responsible for victimization!

In a recent black book: Pp. 12-13.

Not Neutrality  
but Neutrality's neutering  
was the central cause  
between the wars.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Raffaele Valente



## REVIEW

by Egoist

Libertarian Broadides No. 3 is a new reprint of Lysander Spooner's famous attack on the U.S. Constitution "No Treason: The Constitution of No Authority", together with his "A Letter to Thomas F. Bayard - challenging his right - and that of all the other so-called senators and representatives in Congress - to exercise any legislative power whatever over the people of the United States".

Drawing on his professional knowledge as a lawyer, Spooner sunits the claim that the U.S. Constitution is binding on the inhabitants of the U.S.A. to an exhaustive and withering examination. By the time he has finished there is little left of this oft-cited and much used excuse for governmental invasion and exploitation. Present day individualists will be prone to reject Spooner's invocation of "natural law" in favour of the egoistic "might makes right", but they will nonetheless acclaim his tronchant and iconoclastic critique of the notion that the U.S. government is one "by consent". As James J. Martin writes in his afterword:

"Spooner surely ought to be helpful to those who are just beginning to perceive the basic frailty of anonymous parchment guarantees of security of 'life, limb, and property', and the essential feebleness of documentary restraints on the exercise of political savagery. When the will to rob, imprison, and/or kill once more asserts itself in the form of State policy somewhere, disguised as usual as a heroic gesture in behalf of 'public safety', 'National security', 'safeguarding the State', 'ensuring the public welfare'; or any other score or more of other related verbal reflexes designed to conceal the realities of statecraft from those whose lot it is to do the paying, the bleeding and the dying, familiarity with Lysander Spooner should provide enlightenment as to why in these 'crises' the impact of paper and ink limitations on the wielding of power is almost imperceptible in the face of politico-military bureaucratic initiative."

"A Letter to Thomas F. Bayard" is a handy summary of Spooner's views on "constitutional legislation" written towards the militant end of his long life.

("No Treason" is priced 85 cents and published by Ralph Kyles, Publishers, Inc., Box 1533; Colorado Springs, Colorado 80901, U.S.A.)

XXXXXXX



JAMES L. WALKER

by Leland Schubert

James L. Walker was an individualist's individualist. It was largely through his contributions to Benjamin Tucker's journal, *Liberty*, that the kind of unflinching egoism which Max Stirner had expounded in Germany became familiar to American intellectuals. And his treatise, *The Philosophy of Egoism*, first published in 1905 after his death, was an invaluable contribution to the libertarian tradition in this country.

Walker expressed the very soul of egoism when he wrote, "Be sure that Egoism has nothing sacred." And he meant nothing. Justice was not sacred. Nor right. Nor truth. No idea of morality was sacred. In fact, at the end of the treatise, he declared that "the real living Egoism is the fact of untrammelled mind in this or that person and the actions resulting, the end of the tyranny of general ideas." To understand the meaning which that statement assures is to understand the crux of Walker's brand of philosophical egoism.

Central to this concept of egoism is Walker's attack upon the idea of morality. The egoist, he maintains, makes no attempt to justify his ideas or actions in terms of morality. His egoism is not a claim for rights. It is simply "the exercise of the powers of individuals at their pleasure." Walker regards the idea of morality, which is based upon the assumption that the individual must keep his pursuit of pleasure within certain bounds, as a holdover from religion and theology. He points out that many atheists of his time, although violently rejecting religion, replaced religious morality with an equally oppressive humanistic morality. To Walker it makes no difference where the moral code comes from. Whether it is derived from the idea of God, the idea of natural law, or any other idea, it is the enemy of the sovereign self. What it comes down to is whether there is any standard to which the individual is obliged to conform his life. The individual whom Walker would call an egoist must answer that there is none. To such a person, the words "good" and "evil" never express anything but appreciation. Therefore, the same thing is quite inevitably as "good" by those who like it and "bad" by those who don't. The terms are and must always be completely subjective, because there is no objective fact for them to refer to. But of course they have been used as objective norms throughout history. The reason is quite simple. Something is branded "good" by those who like it, in order to convince others that they are obliged to do it. Something else is branded "evil" in order to develop a sense of guilt in others, so that they will not do it. Thus the cornerstone of all moralism is the desire to encourage obedience. The greatest practitioners of control over others have always been churches and governments, both of which have always established moral codes as means of justifying their demands for obedience.

The specific obligations which individuals owe to any standard



of morality are what we often call "duties". James L. Walker regards such a concept of duty as pure superstition. There simply is no such obligation. The only valid meaning of duty is that which is owed under some sort of agreement or contract. In other words, no one can force it on you without your consent. If freedom from general ideas constitutes egoism, duty is one of the major general ideas from which to be freed. "The domination of a fixed idea," Walker says, "begins when one admits something due and yet not due to any person or something due without benefit coming to one in return."

The man who accepts the idea that he has duties other than those freely accepted in return for some benefit develops a method of self-intimidation. That method is called conscience. Like duty itself, conscience is regarded by the egoist as a superstition. Since the egoist "does not judge himself by reference to any standard of duty" he never has a guilty conscience. All he has is "satisfaction or regret." with what he has done. The man who reaches this stage achieves "the serenity of the self-conscious, sovereign, intelligent Ego." That is why he is called an egoist.

Besides what is called morality, there are several other general ideas which men have erected as tyrants over each other and which many men have been deluded into accepting as tyrants over themselves. They are truth, right, and justice. They are erected as deities and worshipped as a veritable Holy Trinity. The first which Walker examines is "right". He considers a man's right to be nothing more than the most direct way to achieve an end. "Wrong" is nothing but the frustration of one's efforts. The wrong way is the ineffective way. To the egoist, right is nothing but right. He adds any other, supernal sort of right to his list of popular superstitions. The moralist supposes that right refers to some superior authority. He thinks there can be some claim on him that conflicts with his pleasure. The egoist does not.

While the moralist tends to see conflicts between individuals in terms of "right" and "wrong", the egoist never considers either adversary right or wrong in any moral sense. Each is simply pursuing the fulfillment of his own desires, and if the conflict cannot be resolved otherwise, it must be settled by force. For, make no mistake about it, in repudiating the idea of morality Walker makes no exception for force. Nor does he draw any distinction between the initiation of force and retaliatory force. Either type is used for the achievement of one's personal goals, and to Walker there is no law to which the individual must subordinate his will. He proclaims his belief with total candour: "I have a right to what I can take and openly keep, and another has a right to take it from me if he can." For him, there is no abstract question of whether the end justifies the means. There is only the question of whether a given means is an expedient way of pursuing a given end.

The idea of justice shares the fate of the idea of right. The egoist has no use for it. Whatever he does, he does for protection



or convenience. If he is threatened by anyone, he chooses his means for dealing with the person solely in terms of effectively defending himself. He does not worry about using more force than is "justified". He uses as much as he finds safe and economical. But the idea of justice is not just a bugaboo in the realm of personal relationships. It is also "the mask of social tyranny." In a clear indictment of government, Walker argues that governments exploit the idea of justice by setting themselves up as the sole legitimate guardians of justice. The result is that anyone who seeks justice through his own efforts is branded as a criminal, since he has violated the governmental monopoly on justice.

Another false god to which people pay foolish homage is the idea of truth. Here, an important distinction is made. Truth in the sense of "the agreement between thinking and thing" is accepted as just as desirable as accuracy in any other mode of perception. Seeing things as they are is obviously useful. But truth in the sense of honesty, or telling the truth, is entirely a matter of expedience. It can greatly aid communication between intelligent people. But when it is not expedient, it can become a wasteful fixation.

Such are the major concepts which James L. Walker advances in "The Philosophy of Egoism". In addition, he expresses a number of specific attitudes which mark him as a man well ahead of his time. Especially impressive is the fact that he was, in the nineteenth century, a firm advocate of women's liberation. He abhorred the popular double standard which assumed that it was somehow natural for women to be monogamous but for men to be polygamous. He viewed marriage as "an agreement among men in a given state to respect each other's property in one or more women." And, when speaking of Max Stirner, the one aspect of the man's character that he chose to emphasize and praise was the fact that Stirner "recognized in the woman the individual, as free as she cares to be, precisely as he did in the man."

It is that total respect for the individual human self, not as anyone says it should be, but as it freely chooses to be, which determined the nature of James L. Walker's philosophy of egoism. He was a highly civilized man who clearly hoped that human beings would pursue their individual goals in rational ways. He did not advocate useless violence or cruelty or unnecessary interference with others. But the quality which made him so vitally different from the overwhelming majority of human beings was his total, ruthless, uncompromising defence of the sovereignty of the ego. There have never been many people who could perceive the human self as he did. Perhaps there never will be. But it seems clear that anyone who does must experience the phenomenon of being alive in a way in which very few have ever experienced it.

(Reprinted from New Libertarian Notes, December, 1972. 3 U.S. dollars a year. Cheques payable to Samuel Edward Konkin III, 235, East 49 Street, New York, N.Y. 10017, U.S.A. The Philosophy of Egoism is published by Ralph Myles Publishers, Inc., Box 1533, Colorado Springs, Colorado, 80901, USA. 1 doll.35 cents)



## OUR PLEASURE IS OUR "PERFECTION"

James L. Walker

Moralism reaches its acme in the craze for a supposed perfection the opposite way from individuality. Even when philosophy has pronounced that its aim is to lead man to find himself, the spirit of perversion is such that it takes Man, the general idea of the species, as an ideal for the individual and teaches individuals to torture their personal mind in order to conform to the idea formed about the species. Thus it is said that our "mission" is to be true men, more perfect men, more perfect women. This notion prompts to imitation of what has been exemplified in others, not to the development of that which is most genuinely myself or yourself. If I am to be a conforming man, striving to be something set before me, I cannot be I. As Stirner remarks, "every man who is not deformed is a true or perfect man, but each one is more than this. He is this unique man." What he is that another is not, we cannot say in advance of knowing him. Egoism is this: that this man acts out himself. Every woman may be assumed to be a true or perfect woman, and she is cheated if taught to assume otherwise. That is not the aim; that is the starting point with us egoists. Be easy about perfection of Man. The individual needs first to be free from any yoke or assigned task, in order to normally possess, enjoy, develop and exhibit himself or herself. I shall develop the species, if I have nothing more distinctive to develop. A woman will be merely a "true and perfect woman" if she has nothing of her own, only of the species. The very moment, however, that she knows herself to be already a "true and perfect woman", as the zero or horizon of individuality, that moment is the individual energy set free to work out whatever it takes pleasure in, - or as free as conscious reflection can make us while old habits and affections persist in some degree. To come to ourselves, to find ourselves, is to know that what we have of the species is ours, so far as it suits us to keep it and that we have neither obligation nor mission but what each one may give himself.

## The Philosophy of Egoism

XXXXXXXXXXXXX

SIREN - a newsletter of anarcho-feminism - is a women's lib publication that is concerned with exploring the anarchist aspect. Generally "anarcho-socialist", it is open to individualist contributions. Pithy comment from issue 8: "Good-bye Truman and LBJ. Both men proved that almost any white male, raised in the most humble, good ole Amerikan Way can grow up to be President and learn to make war. Both Truman and LBJ were country boys, and both were responsible for keeping down the population explosion in Asia."



by Domenico Pastorello

It is evident that if you are persuaded of the innumerable differences existing among individuals the logical result, if you desire it, is to accept others as you desire to be accepted by them.

In India, where class differences are the result of religion, Brahmin and Mohammedan, there is at this moment a strong effort being made by the atheists to convince their fellows that they can be equals without one god or the other. They are having some success because by accepting atheism one loses the heavy obligation to oppose one to the other: the Muslim versus the Hindu.

It is touching to read of the long list of towns where common meals are being held at which pork and beef are being eaten, those meats being forbidden by one or the other religion. This is a very singular rite to the fraternity of different races and religions and the hope of uniting the untouchables, the Brahmins and the Mohammedans.

In the villages custom requires that married women wear a particular ribbon to advise others of their condition. If some desire to show their equality with the pariahs, it is sufficient to forget to wear the usual ribbon. This requires courage and astonishes those who know them.

Not all women are for equality. Two Brahmins returning home from a pork and beef dinner found the doors of their homes closed against them as traitors to their race. Not only were their wives against them, but also the wives' families who were armed and ready to use violence to keep them from their homes. Only after three weeks of discussions and arrangements were the husbands and wives reconciliated.

To understand the equality proposed by atheists in India is not easy, but even the most trenchant individualist must be moved by this effort to unite instead of divide individuals, even if his philosophy is not totally satisfied.

XXXXXXXXXX

## LITERATURE

The Revisionist Press, G.P.O. Box 2009, Brooklyn, NY. 11202, announce the publication of the first full length study of "Germany's Poet-Anarchist: John Henry Mackay" by Thos. A. Riley (Price \$16.50) and "The Anarchists" by John Henry Mackay (Price \$15.95)

XXXXXXX

MINUS ONE -- an irregular review for individualists, anarchists and egoists -- is edited and published by S.E.Parker, 2 Orsett Terrace, London W.2., England. Six issues 50p (U.S. \$2.00) Retail price 6p per copy.