

This file archived at UnionOfEgoists.com.

Union of Egoists

This item was provided by **University of Michigan Library, Joseph A. Labadie Collection**, the oldest publicly accessible archive of its kind in America. Though its original focus was on anarchism to also encompass atheism and free thought, anti-war and pacifist movements, civil liberties and civil rights, LGBTQ movements, New Left, and many more.

We thank them for their support.

For more information see the “Contributor” page at UnionOfEgoists.com

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*

EEEE N N M M AAAAA RRRRR GGGGG EEEEE
 E NN N MM MM A A R R G E
 EEEEE N N N M M M AAAAA RRRRR G GGG EEEEE
 E N NN M M A A R R G G E
 EEEEE N N M M A A R R GGGGG EEEEE

EN MARGE

Number Two

September 1996

In the Winter 1995 issue of the New York journal Anarchy there appears a piece by Michael William entitled Whatever Happened To L'Unique et son Ombre? Mr William is upset that the editors of this French publication, Dominique Fauquet and Alain Ajax, while claiming to be admirers of Max Stirner, have committed that most heinous of politically correct sins of writing some sympathetic words about Jean Marie Le Pen and contributing to "a far-right anti-free market journal" called Nationalisme et Republique. Not only this, but Dominique Fauquet has compounded the offence by arguing in "an extremely long text" that nationalism can be useful as a barrier to global homogenization and quoting Stirner to support her view. "What is this crap?" demands Mr William angrily.

In his Anarchy article Mr William contends that the quotation from Stirner used by Dominique Fauquet has been taken out of context and made to appear to support its opposite meaning. The quotation reads: "But the Germans will come into unison, unite themselves, only when they knock over their beehood, as well as all beehives; in other words when they are more than-Germans: only then can they form a 'German Union'." Mr William retorts that "the thrust of Stirner's argument on the page of his book in question is clearly anti-nationalist: 'And yet only individuals can enter into a union with each other, and all alliances and leagues of peoples are and remain mechanical compoundings, at least so far as the "peoples" are regarded as the ones to have come together, are destitute of will.' Stirner mocked nationalism."

It is certainly true that Stirner mocked at nationalism and wrote of it: "This is the token of all reactionary wishes, that they want to set up something general, abstract, an empty, lifeless concept, in distinction from which the self-owned aspire to relieve the robust, lively particular from the trashy burden of particularities." However, while Stirner rejected the German nationalist creed, it is interesting to note that he did not at the same time reject nationality. The passages referred to by Mr William appear on pages 231-232 of The Ego and His Own (Dover edition). Had he turned to pages 244-245 he would have come across the following: "There is to be found a vast difference between pride in 'belonging to' a nation and therefore being its property, and that in calling a nationality one's property. Nationality is my quality, but the nation my owner and mistress ...The Nationals are in the right; one cannot deny his nationality: and the humanitarians are in the right; one must not remain in the narrowness of the national. In uniqueness the contradiction is solved; the national is my quality. But I am not swallowed up in my quality - as the human too is my quality, but I give to man his existence first through my uniqueness."

It would seem, then, that Dominique Fauquet was not all that wrong in looking to Stirner for support, for if she regards her nationality as her property and sees the parrot-cry "mankind is one" and its implication of universal standardization as a threat to her property, why should she not look around for allies in its defence? That some of these allies regard the 'Nation' as a kind of spook and worship with mumbo-jumbo does not affect their functional value as barriers against the threat she fears.

xxxxx

During a brief correspondence with Michael William regarding his article on 'L'Unique et son Ombre' he kindly sent me a translation by Doug Imrie of a text by Alain Ajax, the companion of Dominique Fauquet, called 'Unique One or Zombie?'. In it I found the following passage which presents a most interesting interpretation of the 'Stirnerian' conception of property:

"...the property of the Unique One is of a totally different sort to the social and material property on which so many theories have flowered and all of the revolutionary projects have failed. If, during my walks, I find a tree that I encounter beautiful, it belongs to me, without for all that belonging to me materially and therefore juridically. It belongs to me because I am the one who can at that moment appreciate all its beauty, and because it arouses a unique emotion in me that has no social meaning. If you encounter the same tree at some other moment and are moved while looking at it, it belongs to you at that precise instant, and yet it is not common to both of us - your relationship with it is just as unique. Neither of us need to possess it materially to enjoy it.

"In the same way, if I appreciate the facade of the pretty 17th century house situated on the Ile Saint-Louis in Paris, it matters little to me that its legal owner is someone else; it belongs to me through my eyes and my imagining of its interior, which I will undoubtedly never see. And it pleases me that this house is there, always there, when I loiter on the banks of the Seine. The calamity for me would be for it to disappear, replaced by some anonymous block of concrete, not that its material and legal owner is a bourgeois who has the money that I lack. And if I dream of possessing it more fully, it is never a dream of social conquest.

"If this text interests you, if it simply makes you think, or if you translate it and publish it, it belongs to you without ceasing to be mine for all that, but it does not belong to the indifferent or hostile reader who has not taken any pleasure in it."

xxxxx

In his memoirs of Kenya, *Black Laughter* (1924), Llewellyn Powys writes: "Deep in his heart every Masai feels nothing but contempt for Europeans. Unlike the Kavirondo and Kikuyu they can never be persuaded to wear any article of the white man's dress. They hold that we have conquered them not by superior courage but by the invention of tricky weapons." It is true that the conquering white men may not have been superior in "courage" - that is, fighting ability - to the conquered Masai, but they, or rather some individuals among them, were superior in the mental ability to invent the "tricky weapons" by means of which they won. What the Masai did not understand is that power is not something that is confined to physical prowess. It is also intelligence. Therein lay the superiority of the white men.

xxxxx

If I have might I need claim no "right".

xxxxx

Submission is not the result of powerlessness, but of insufficient power to be dominant.

xxxxx

En Marge is written and issued by S.E.Parker from 19 St Stephen's Gardens, London W2 5QU, England.