See page 7

MINUS ONE

No 25 One Shilling December 1969

WHO'S FOR THE ANTHILL?

by Jeff Robinson

There is a debate raging in Britain as to the merits of the new system of comprehensive schools compared with the old system of having a variety of types of schools. For the benefit of readers abroad, I will explain that a comprehensive school is one run by the State and which all children of a locality (except those who at present go to other types of schools) attend irrespective of differences in sex, intelligence, willingness, etc. The long-term aim of the comprehensive lobby is that eventually all children will go to this type of school - all other types having been abolished.

In this matter I am firmly in the reactionary camp. I dislike comprehensives and the idea of them being the only type available fills me with dread. Not that I am an admirer of the old system, which had many faults. But it did have one great virtue: different types of schools produced different types of people. The old system led to variety, the new system tends to standardisation.

However, there is one aspect to the debate that has not received the prominence it deserves. It is this: opponents of comprehensives have pointed out that children are born with differing levels of intelligence, varying between that of a Mozart, who composed symphonies when he was ten, and that of children who are born mentally sub-normal, and that therefore it is a good thing that there are different types of schools to cater for the different intelligence levels.

This "inherited intelligence" view has been flatly denied by some advocates of a fully comprehensive system and is implicitly denied by the rest. They argue that we are all born with precisely the same intelligence, aptitudes etc. (mental sub-normality, the only exception they allow, is ascribed to physical causes) and that the reason there are differences now between, say, five-year olds, is due to faulty child care in infancy - weaning, toilet training, etc. - but these differences will eventually all be ironed out by child psychologists - and that Mozart just happened to have parents who, by some fluke, put him on his potty at just the right time..

In other words, advocates of comprehensives actually want full standardisation, not just at school, but before school (and probably in other aspects of life too, but they haven't said so - yet). What happens to initiative, variety, and individualism in such a grey world? Why should one make friends with one person rather than another? Why choose this person as a sexual partner rather than that? The questions are many and alarming. The only differences between individuals (if the dreams of the "fully comprehensive" lobby come true) will be physical - and no doubt there will be plastic surgeons ready to take care of that.

However, I don't think things will come to quite this pass, because I believe that children are born with varying mental characteristics, the same as they are born with varying physical characteristics, inherited from their forebears, and that environment merely influences tendencies that have been present since conception. But the standardised environment of a fully comprehensive system would tend to produce standardised people. The really frightening thing is that so many influential people are in favour of standardisation. They actually want an anthill.

NOTES ON THUS SPOKE ZARATHUSTRA

by Wm. J. Boyer

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

"This - is now my way: where is yours? Thus I answered those who asked me 'the way'. For the way - does not exist!"

Since Nietzsche's Zarathustra first came into my hands it has exercised a strong fascination over me.

"I love Zarathustra, so it often seems to me, for the sake of my own evil spirit."

I threw the book on one side a good many times before admitting I had been conquered. Once this admission was made, I went to work to try and find if there wasn't some way of avoiding the many slavish commands found therein. This little essay is a partial result of my investigations.

"But why does Zarathustra speak to his pupils differently - than to himself?"

The scamp! Wonder what's up his sleeve? It appears that Zarathustra has different teachings for different people. But why? Let us see - let us see. There's a nigger in the woodpile somewhere.

"Many a poisonous hotchpotch has evolved in our cellars"

Home brew. What else? He is going to poison his pupils with home brew. Or perhaps is it with doctrines which have the same effect as home brew - doctrines which they crave, but which can be disastrous to them if not used wisely.

Ah, I almost forgot. He mentions something about a Superman, and sacrifice, and - it is beginning to dawn on me now. Here it is. He strews poisonous doctrine all up and down his pages. The weak won't recognise them as poisonous - they drink, and are eliminated to make way for the Superman. The wise reject them for what they are - doctrines to destroy the unwary. Let us look some more.

"You had not yet sought yourselves when you found me. Thus do all believers: therefore all belief is of so little account. Now I bid you lose me and find yourselves; and only when you have all denied me will I return to you. Truly, with other eyes, my brothers, shall I then seek my lost ones."

What a hell of a prophet! How can he gain disciples that way? It seems he wants disciples only to destroy them with poisonous doctrines - and only admires those who reject him and find their own way. Let us look further.

"There are preachers of death: and the earth is full of those for whom departure from life must be preached. The earth is full of the superfluous, life has been corrupted by the many-too-many."

And so they are given doctrines that are supposed to destroy them. He praises war. But we have lived through two world wars and a number of minor ones. Perhaps they slowed up the population increase - just a little. Evidently things do not always turn out the way philosophers want them to.

"Rather would you run into the forest and lay snares for evil beasts."

Aha! Could this mean the forest of philosophy? And is it philosophical snares for evil human beasts that he means? I think he does.

(To be continued)

A STATEMENT AND TWO NOTES ON TERMINOLOGY

By Benjamin Best

About 20 months ago I printed an announcement in Free Trade "withdrawing" my "sanction" from Stirner. As a result of quite a few extraordinary experiences in rapid succession I was intensely paranoid and imbued with the vision of a rapidly approaching future in which the world was divided into the Establishment and the Anti-Establishment, the latter group consisting of a multitude of street rioters, assassins, Bonnot Gangs and the like. The former was taking intensely vicious steps to institute "Law and Order" with far less than the usual pretentions of maintaining Liberty. I imagined that within 10-15 years time known "Stirnerists" (anarchists in general) would be being hunted down by the State in reaction to plunder and murder.

There are several things which Stirner says that I disagree with, and there are more things which simply disturb me - an example of the latter being: "I am entitled[a] by myself to murder if I myself do not forbid it to myself, if I do not fear murder as a 'wrong'." While I recognize that phobias are irrational, I cannot bring myself to want to eradicate the profoundly negative response (even fear) which the idea of murdering arouses within me. But my desire to not be a known associate of people who would loudly (stupidly) boast of not possessing such phobias (especially in the neo-Inquisitorial times of my phanta~~n~~sies) was the primary consideration motivating me to try to "improve" my "image". Does not an egoist bow and smile to the policeman pointing a loaded gun?

a) by whom? how? whereby? why? By what means? J.Z.

To those sophisticated in such matters it is probably a commonplace observation that present-day followers of Leon Trotsky repudiate the label "Trotskyite" and try to singularly use the word "Trotskyist" (when they aren't calling themselves "Socialist Workers'" something or other). Enemies, naturally, prefer the term "Trotskyite". The distinction (supposedly) is that the "Trotskyites" are people who make a personality cult (with hero-worship) of devotion to Trotsky, whereas a "Trotskyist" would be a person who has been enlightened by many of Trotsky's ideas and has integrated (them) into his life-view.

Similarly, I see the terms "Stirnerist" and "Stirnerite" used interchangeably and I suspect many are using the term "Stirnerist" advisedly. Anyone who has penetrated to the core of Stirner would naturally be a "Stirnerist" (if, indeed, that term did not seem overly fawning), though I expect that there are a few "Stirnerites" around. I would also regard anyone who accepts Stirner's ideas totally (on authority) as being probably in the latter category.

Definitions:

<u>Socialist Anarchist</u>: Someone for whom the ideal of a non-governmental society exalts society as a whole at the expense of the (troublemaking) individual.

<u>Individualist Anarchist</u>: Someone for whom the ideal of a non-governmental society is based upon the inviolability of individual rights.

<u>Stirnerist</u>: Someone who rejects all authority over himself including that of the State or of "rights". He is not an anarchist as he has no ideals of social organization. While some environments are more pleasant than others, he sees energy devoted to social transformation as a cup of pure water lost in a salty ocean and devotes himself instead to adapting to his condition to the maximum advantage of his ego. He will not sacrifice himself to any degree to prevent society from going to Maoism, Mutualism, Mafiaism or Manure. 2

(As I have pointed out in these columns before, I do not regard the term "anarchist" as necessarily involving a belief in the possibility of a non-governmental society. For me, therefore, it is quite possible to be both an individualist anarchist and a "Stirnerist" (Why not throw "Stirnerian" into the pot as well?) Indeed, I agree with Victor Basch's view that the latter is the proper basis for the former. S.E.P.)

THE TRUE FACE OF MARXISM

by Gerald Muller

A misunderstanding of J.Z

Capitalism is the starting point for the Marxist theory. From this follows, more or less automatically, the revolution, which then makes necessary the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat. The distatorship of the proletariat is the initial phase of Communism and is called Socialism.

Basically, this dictatorship represents a quantitative inversion, but no change of system: those who were oppressed under capitalism are now oppressing those who were their oppressors! So the structure of class, the structure of capitalism, remains.

But it does not stay the same in relation to negative points - it is more negative. (State Socialism) (Even it has "Municipalism.") J.Z.

? There is no socialism, but centralism. There is no common socialist action, but the whole administration (including that of ? the State) is in one hand: it is the greatest dependence between the leaders and the oppressed masses ever known in history.

So all men who want to work are functionaries, employees of the State, whether they want it or not.

? It is complete oppression, and thus surpasses the suppressive system of the Nazis.

The people will be delivered to an almighty ? state-machinery that is, in reality, a dictatorship.

One can easily find examples in the Spanish Civil War, in Bulgaria, last year in Czechoslovakia, and so on, and so on.

The Marxists now call this dictatorship of the proletariat a necessary evil on the way to Communism. In the state of Communism all people would live without a State, naturally in equality, ?? freedom and peace.

To reach that condition it is necessary to abolish egoism - and the Marxists have recognized that fact. So egoism will be abolished in the development of Communism and will be abolished in the condition of Communism!

And that is impossible! As long as a man lives, he is always an egoist - consciously or unconsciously.

So Marxist-Communism is impossible to realize with mankind as it now exists. To make Marxist-Communism possible one must change mankind chemically and biologically. The result will be a being who is not a human being!

And some Marxists have recognized this fact. Herbert Marcuse speaks about a "new type of human being", without whom only Socialism will be possible - not Communism.

So the future state of Marxism is not Communism - that remains a Marxist lie and is also impossible to realize with human beings - but is instead the dictatorship of the proletariat. THIS IS THE ? ? TRUE COLLECTIVISM - IN WHICH NO INDIVIDUAL CAN EXIST!

They are still found e.g. on the black market, in concentration camps & as corrupt & powerous ([illegible]) bureaucrats! J.Z. over the proletariat - & all others, even c.p. members. J.Z.

0096

IN PRAISE OF CHAOS

Enzo Martucci

Translated by Stephen Marletta

Libertarian communism is also known, particularly in Latin countries, by the name of "anarchist communism". It is not. On the contrary, the two words are a contradiction in terms.

Communism signifies a social condition in which the means of production and all material goods belong to the mass of the people who identify themselves with the totality or majority of society. Everyone has their goods disposed of according to the way decided by those who govern and whose law all must obey.

Anarchy signifies the absence of government: that is to say, a state of things in which the individual is not held in obedience to anyone, lives as he pleases, and is limited only by the extent
? of his power. He uses moral and material goods in the particular manner he prefers without having to get the approval of his fellows. By THIS "definition" all unlimited or sovereign rulers are anarchists practising anarchism among themselves - at the risk & expense of their subjects! NOT! J.Z. 6.8.97.

One hypothesis has it that the universal realization of anarchy would return man to nature. It would create an equilibrium - however unstable - between individuals who, urged on by the free life, the need to survive, and strengthened by struggle, would be able to contain each other and live without government.

Communism, on the other hand, even if it is not authoritarian and Marxist, but libertarian and Kropotkinist, would be a society in which the legislative and executive power would be exercised either by acephalous mass assemblies (populism) or by delegates elected by the masses (democracy). Both would mean that the individual would always be governed by the many.x And this would be a government worse than any other, whether by one or a few, ~~beacuse~~ because the mass is stupid, ferocious, tyrannical, and worse than the lowest individual. x Rather, one or a few individuals would govern the many, as before, but applying ever worse "principles". J.Z. 15.8.97

How could libertarian communism be brought about?

It could be by means of absolute conformism to the industrial-machinist society that man has already achieved. This would reduce all to a mechanical equality, feeling, thinking and acting identically - in this way making control and repression by the State
? unnecessary . Then there would be a standardized anarchy.

Or it could be by means of a new organization: individuals united by categories into federations, the federations into communes, the communes into regions, the regions into nations, the nations into the International. At the head of each a directive council invested with the authority and power to make itself respected by ? F any individual dissenting from the decision of the majority. Hence a State that would not call itself a State, but would be one nonetheless complete with a hierarchy, laws, and police. F) Rather: obeyed. J.Z.

And also with prisons. Malatesta wrote in his essay Anarchy that prison-hospitals would exist in which delinquents, considered as insane, would be "confined and cured".

I remember that in a polemic I had with him in Umanita Nova in 1922, he wrote: "Martucci, in the name of the sacred rights of the individual, does not want that there remains the possibility of harming a ferocious assassin or a ravisher of children."

I replied that the assassin and the ravisher could be left free in a remote district or on an uninhabited island, but not made to suffer imprisonment which would be unanarchist. In my book The Banner of the Antichrist I wrote:

"The pretence of curing, rectifying or correcting is extremely odious because it compels an individual who wants to remain as he is to become what he is not and does not want to be.

Is there a RIGHT to remain an aggressor, not interfered with, not stopped, killed etc.? J.Z.

"Take a type like Octave Mibeau's Clara (see his Garden of Torture), tell her that she must undergo a cure to destroy her perverse and abnormal tendencies which are a danger to herself and to others. Clara would reply that she does not want to be cured, that she intends to stay as she is, risking every danger, because the satisfaction of her erotic desires, excited by the smell of blood and the sight of cruelty, gives her a satisfaction so acute, an emotion so strong, which would be impossible if she was ? changed into a normal woman and restricted to the usual insipid lusts.

"A man who killed women in order to rape them so that he could obtain the spasm of his pleasure with the spasm of their deaths, confessed that 'In those moments I felt like God and creator of the world'.

"If one had proposed to this man a cure to make him normal, he would have refused it, knowing intuitively that normality would not give him a sensation so intense as that offered by his abnormality."

Nor are normal individuals basically good as libertarian communists like to believe. Man by nature is a skinful of diverse instincts and opposing tendencies, both good and bad, and as such ? he will remain in any kind of environment or society. F

Libertarian communism is no more than a system of federalism and like all social systems would oppress the individual with moral and juridical restraints. Only the superficiality x) of a Proudhon could give such a system the name of "anarchy" which, on the contrary, means the negation of all government by ideas or by men.

Anarchists are opposed to authority both from below and from above. They do not demand power for the masses, but seek to ? destroy all power O) and to decompose these masses into individuals who are masters of their own lives. Therefore anarchists are the most decisive enemies of all types of communism and those who profess to be communists or socialists cannot possibly be anarchists.

F) Some kind of institutions, principles & practices tend to bring out & maintain the worst in man - & some others the best. (To be continued)

J.Z. 15.8.97.

x) Monetary freedom & replacement of ~~.........~~ status by contracts, in all other spheres, would make a fundamental & great difference. J.Z.

What of equal liberty? Egoism is interior liberty, which of course makes for equal liberty of Egoists. But this is on the basis of their common abilities, whereas democracy and aristocracy have a common principle in the affirmation of birthright. In democracy liberty is the sacred right of every man. In aristocracy liberty and privilege are the right of those born or admitted to aristocratic rank. The spirit of democracy is, to fashion each individual on its model, and endow him with political equality in contradistinction to class privileges, but as a member of the democracy into which his passport is his humanity, not his personal assertion and demonstration of his power and will to command equal liberty. Aristocracy commands its members to maintain their rank. Democracy commands its members to maintain an equal status for all. Egoism awaits the coming of the free, who will recognize each other, but not by virtue of any birthright.

O) Not Stirnerites! J.Z.

from The Philosophy of Egoism
by James L. Walker.

The great political superstition of the past was the divine right of kings. The great political superstition of the present is the divine right of parliaments.

Herbert Spencer.

HERR HELMS AND HERR STIRNER:
A Critique of Hans G. Helms' "The Ideology of the Anonymous Society"

by Kurt Zube

translated by Robert H. Beebe

At first one thinks that Helms is joking when he unmasks Stirner as the ideologist of the middle class who strongly influenced its consciousness in the first thirty years of this century, promoted the craze for voluntary political self-interdiction, and proved himself a forerunner of fascism. Then one thinks he intends to follow the recipe of the Abbe Galiani who, by means of grossly absurd theses against that which he attacks, in reality seeks to win the reader over to it. But it soon turns out that Helms' grotesque theses are in fact meant in dead-earnest and are the painful cry of a Marxist ideologist whose sacred feelings are injured. Indeed, Helms cannot do anything else but pull Stirner down to his own level and show as an ideologist the anti-ideologist <u>par excellence</u> - the great annihilator of trite talk.

One could leave the whole thing alone with Lichtenberg's dictum: "When a book and a head collide and it sounds hollow, then the book doesn't need to be blamed for it." Or, even more fitting, perhaps, for the undying work of Stirner, Lichtenberg's other dictum: "This book is a mirror. When a monkey looks in, no apostle looks out".

But one result of Helms' assiduous work deserves honest admiration. This is his 105 pages appendix, which includes not only a well-nigh complete bibliography of the various German and foreign-language editions of Stirner's work, but a really impressive listing of writings about Stirner, including many newspaper items. In addition to this, there is a really extensive bibliography of anarchist literature and the <u>free</u> economy teachings of Silvio Gesell. The interested reader will find true gems in this, many of them out of print or remaining unknown. For the sake of the bibliography Helms' book deserves to be most warmly recommended.

The rest of the book is unfortunate - despite many citations not only from Stirner, but also from secondary literature - because of the downright foolish way in which Helms turns completely uside down in his mind that which is torn out of context. In addition to which, there are often other unfair suppositions and aspersions in the manner of "revolver journalism".

A relatively harmless example: Helms cites Stirner's rediscoverer and biographer, John Henry Mackay (who was not, as he asserts, an "early expressionist writer") who found out that Stirner's chief work, The Ego and His Own, had been immediately seized in Leipzig, its place of publication, only to be released a few days later by the Ministry of the Interior, because it was "too absurd" to be dangerous. Mackay remarked: "While the most harmless scribbling was put under observation and banned, the most radical and most 'dangerous' of that or any time was allowed to go from hand to hand - at that time and still today." Helms writes: "peevish about such insolent attacks upon his idol, he (Mackay) raged against the censor and the world. How little it soothes his wounded pride as an evil 'revoluzzer' that only a little, peripheral and half-hearted persecution is substantiated."

And in response to Mackay's assertion that "in Prussia, so also in Mecklenburg-Schwerin, the 'Ego' was, moreover, forbidden even before Christmas and the ban was, as far as can be determined, never lifted again", Helms writes in a really silly way, "One can well imagine how Mackay, this vest-pocket revolutionary, believing himself surrounded by spies, called at the Berlin magistrates' office and was sorely disappointed by the portly government officials because they demonstrated complete political and legal disinterest in his hero. The 'Ego' has never been de facto persecuted in spite of the ban and even Mackay's strong denunciation did not result in the desired status-symbol of an auto-da-fe."

In another place, Helms comments on an illustration from a French individualist-anarchist paper: "The picture shows 'what individualists want'. Satisfied with themselves, they want to watch how the masses behave in the service of church, state and capital. While some work, they want to ramble." Actually the picture unequivocally shows the protest of the individual against the mass, and the text leaves no doubt that he by no means exhausts himself "watching and rambling".

This, and even more absurd and malicious falsifications, result, however, not from the personal meanness of the author, but from such an unlimited prejudice that it often misleads him to self-disclosures that are almost pitiful. Now and then he acts like a blubbering child who, against better judgement and aware of his defeat, reacts with a spiteful kick.

This happens with such illogical sullenness and emotion that Helms actually appears to be a Saul desperately defending himself against something which has already gripped him most profoundly. Thus, inspite of his intentions, the effect of the entire book on the half-way critical reader is just in the sense of the Abbe Galiani: where Helms means to refute or discourage he awakens interest and provokes thought - where he does not refute himself.

One can readily forgive Helms for the grotesque bowdlerizing of what Stirner said and meant, for Stirner had to explain himself with vague words in a confused world of conceptions and is not always easy to understand nor always to be taken literally. He often makes merry over various ideologies and jeers at their representatives as he in good-natured mockery plays catch with their fixed ideas. For the completely humorless Helms, however, ideology is, because of the all powerfulness of its relation to production, a tenet of faith and a substitute for religion which he defends in a blind rage, reproaching Stirner for a serious lack of proletarian class-consciousness.....

It would have been better if he could have explained how, according to the Marxist conception, it could come to the murders mentioned by Kruschev in his secret report for the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party and what are, in a state in which there is officially only one class, the "class-determined causes" for the Stalinist terror, the cult of personality and other "fascist" incivilities.

It was not Stirner, despite Engel's accusation, who drank blood like water. Helms should explain why his political friends in Moscow have not realized their avowed ultimate goal of the disappearance of the State in a half-century of unlimited power and have, instead, developed a new ruling class. He does not understand that the spirit that he grasps, or means to grasp, in Stirner's work is not Stirner's spirit and that the latter has nothing to do with the former, which clings to slogans which were put into circulation by misapprehending Stirner's interpreters.

The most popular misunderstanding of Stirner is that of his "egoism". Stirner, however, unequivocally condemns "egoism" in the ordinary sense of the word, that is, ego-mania as a natural drive, as well as ego-delusion (ego-mania disguised as altruism or "idealism"). Nor is his work the revelation of a new ideology or an advice to others, but an assertion, a proclamation, a manifesto of an until then unheard of boldness. He spoke of his ego, his ego, which had delivered itself from all the bonds which those possessed by fixed ideas tried to put upon him. Stirner was also a realist who saw the conditions of power, not just the ratio of production, as the reality. However, he did not bow before them, but rather tried to succeed against them. There are many places in his book (Helms also turns these upside down) where Stirner recommends for practical purposes the combined efforts of those who have achieved consciousness of their individuality and state of uniqueness. And he does this in an anarchist sense - refusing power over others and, at the same time, refusing to be dominated by others.

This is what is socially new about his work. That which is philosophically new is that he created no further ideology, but declared a practice. And he is not irrefutable simply because of that. One could even take him for a religious mystic, if it was not that with this conception one was bound to an obligatory system.

Stirner became conscious of his inner self, commented upon this and arrived at nearly the same kind of formulation used by Bo Yin Ra, who asserted that he possessed the most heart-felt recognition of eternal reality: each individuation is one-of-a-kind, a unique emanation of eternal being and life cut off from the rest. In the same way, one could put Stirner's work in a nutshell even if Stirner had not preferred to make only a subjective statement, without setting up a system encompassing others. At various times in his work he leaves it to one's discretion to follow his example. Poor old Helms, however, as a class-conscious atheist - according to Stirner a duped egoist - is never clear about the "circumstances of production", which, in a hundred thousand years of human development, have played a role for only a relatively short period of time. Indeed, for much less time than the consciousness of the individual, and Helms brings the numerous mistakes and crazes of this consciousness against the heretic Stirner, who lacks respect for Helms' idol.

Helms'falsification of Stirner is like that of Marx who, in a good half of the first chapter of the Communist Manifesto, sings an enthusiastic song of praise for the historical mission of the bourgeoisie - explaining this to the convinced bourgeois. Helms understands as little as Marx that the circumstances of production are only a function of the situations of authority.*) Stirner, for the first time, unmasked every authoritarian ideology and declared himself in opposition, while Marx only announced a new ideology of authority as he saddled the proletariat with the alleged "mission" of the bourgeoisie and made himself Pope of the new religion. *) Rather: are largely dependent upon the circumstances of exchange. Monetary freedom, rather than monetary despotism, would make a great difference. J.Z. 15.8.~~77~~.

The ersatz religion of fascism is made according to the same recipe and the competition between it and communism is therefore embittered in the same way as that within the communist priesthood, in which the struggle of the "right-believers" and the "deviators" is carried on with fascist methods and the unrestrained calumny of communist tactics.

Helms betrays his communistic training in the accusations he makes against those who do not believe in the communist ideology Against Mackay, the biographer of Stirner, who was regarded as a model of propriety by all who knew him, Helms asserts: "I suspected, moreover, that Mackay has either falsified or suppressed material that did not suit his conception." Yet he himself declares that the Mackay Stirner Collection, the fruit of a 30 year enthusiasm, which includes 1100 volumes and over 300 handwritten pieces, is to be found in the Marxist-Leninist Institute in Moscow! Verification, therefore, would have been easy. Other ? Stirnerians, like the free economist Hanns Timm, with his Wara-? aktion, he represents, against better knowledge, as swindlers.

In another chapter he bitterly turns against those of his Marxist fellow-believers who, like Max Adler, rightly said that Stirner's teaching was "thoroughly democratic" and that "also all of Stirner's ardour stands on the side of the proletariat". Helms clings to the term "lumpenproletariat" - coined by Marx and meant to be insulting - that Stirner snatched when he recommended to the 'lumpe' not to let themselves be oppressed any longer, but to become self-conscious and to struggle alongside of others for their freedom. Helms makes out that it was Stirner, not Marx, who was contemptuous of the individual proletarian and only granted him any value insofar as he let himself be moved as the willing object of his theory.

The spook of fascism was the real descendant of the ghost that Marx had described in the Communist Manifesto, for it arose directly from the theory of the class struggle. To investigate this, for which purpose he would have to have laid aside his blinkers, would have been a more significant task for the author than his awkward fishing for Stirner as the agent of capitalism's connection with fascism - a fiction not made any more productive by his setting up as witnesses several "Stirnerites" who had misunderstood Stirner in the same way as he himself had.

However, he has, and one can call this the irony of the story, performed a dubious service for his cause, for most of those who will read his book, namely, his communist partisans, will only become incurably infected with the Stirner bacillus, as he is himself. Let us wait for the incubation period to pass. Helms has, already, founded a Stirner Archive in a meritorious manner.

(Die Ideologie der anonymen Gesellschaft. By Hans G. Helms. Köln: Verlag M. DuMont Schauberg. 1966)

BRIEF STATEMENTS

by Renzo Ferrari

translated from the French

Obedience is the mother of command. Like a degenerate she has many children and gives her affection to the worst of them.

Do you claim that all men are equal? But suppose you met someone who agreed to be your equal, how would you distinguish between yourself and him?

It is by being that one lives. It is by being that one gives a meaning to life. That is why the poet and the metaphysician never meet.

Altruism is a false sentiment of piety which tends to perpetuate suffering and humiliation - its symbol is the cross. Egoism is an exile from conventions, an expression of sincerity which is life.

Imagine a flower on the nose of a pig, then think of liberty in the mouth of a politician.

One speaks to me of "good" and "evil" - to tell the truth these words are incomprehensible to me. This may be due to my thick head...

We are in the century of collective hallucinations: the sheep and the shepherds look the same.

Sin is the salt of life - without it everything would be colourless.

To govern is the art of the mediocre. Great hearts and great spirits have always detested authority.

Falsehood, crime and corruption constitute the order legalizing society and perpetuated by morality. That is why a superior spirit is always a rebel.

(Renzo Ferrari is a son of Renzo Novatore, Italian individualist, illegalist and poet, killed by police in 1922 - Ed.)

BOOK REVIEW

by S.E.Parker

(Contemporary Political Ideologies: A Comparative Analysis by Lyman Tower Sargent. The Dorsey Press, Homewood, Illinois. 194 pp. No price given)

Lyman Tower Sargent's first book, Contemporary Political Ideologies, is an attempt to see the essential features of some political ideologies "objectively and understandably". Evidently designed as a text-book for university students, it is also a handy compendium for the general reader who wants a useful summary of political theories. Unfortunately, like most text-books, it suffers from being written in that flat and emasculated style to which academics seem particularly prone. After the first few dozen pages one longs to come across a shout of joy, an explosion of disgust, or even just a four-letter word, as proof that the author is a living individual behind his disembodied words. From his letters to me I know that Lyman Sargent is alive, so why the refined burial?

Perhaps one reason is his desire to be objective and avoid expressing any 'bias'. But the effort to be objective does not mean that one must be without 'bias'. In the foreword to her book, Stalin's Russia, the French scholar Suzanne Labin wrote: "I claim that I have studied communism with total objectivity and this very objectivity leads me to a total condemnation. I am objective, but not neutral." Maybe in his next book Lyman Sargent will junk his neutrality, cheer the things he likes, lash out at those he dislikes, and also explain just what there is in democracy he sympathizes with....

Between pages 171 and 173 he deals with individualist anarchism.

He begins by quoting Pat Parker's poem "ask the help of great god" which, as he says, can be seen as expressing "the feeling of individualist anarchism", the feeling of someone overwhelmed by seemingly suffocating forces, yet determined to assert his or her self against them.

He then quotes at length from my 1965 leaflet, Individualist Anarchism: An Outline, as expressing "the philosophy of individualist anarchism". So far, so good. But when he comes to summarize what he considers to be my differences with "right-wing individualism" I think he sweetens my views too much. What he attributes to me may well have been true of my early individualist days, when I was still influenced by the vestigial remains of a former humanism, but is not the case now.

He is right, for example, in stating that I am sceptical of "anarcho-capitalism" as a projected social system, while at the same time I reject collective ownership, but I do tend to believe these days that there is far more hope of a consistent individualism emerging from the "free-market" approach than from the "free-communist" approach, most of whose advocates are heavily sold on collectivism.

Again, when he acquits me of Social Darwinism, he is wrong in believing that I see other individuals "as worthy of consideration" simply because they are "other individuals". I respect some individuals because I value them, because of their specific uniqueness in my eyes - a uniquenes which is not merely genetic, but is expressed as a conscious, or at least manifest, individuality. I do not accept the Kantian view of treating others as ends in themselves. I am a utilitarian in regard to them and I respect them, am indifferent to them, or reject them, according to their usefulness to me in my "struggle for survival". Nor do I think that competition and "respect" are necessarily incompatible. Sometimes they are, sometimes they are not. I might respect a "potential competitor" more than someone who is co-operative. Everything depends

MINUS ONE is edited and published by S.E.Parker, 2 Orsett Terrace, London, W.2. 8/- (1 doll. 25 cents U.S.) for six issues.

---

on the circumstances and individuals involved.

But what I have written should not stop anyone from reading Lyman Tower Sargent's book for themselves and comparing their biases with mine.

LITERATURE

"Anarchism and Individualism" by E, Armand - 1/4 post free
"O Idios" by Jean-Pierre Schweitzer - 1/4 post free.
"Individualist Anarchism: An Outline" by S.E.Parker - 5d. post free (12 for 1/6)

E. BERTRAN

Cahiers Des Amis De Han Ryner, September 1969, reports the death at the age of 92 of Leon Rodriguez (E. Bertran). They write: "He was well-known by our Parisian friends who found him at each of our meetings. A short illness took away from us his lively presence. He evoked for us the memories of his adventures in the mordant words of an old and impenitent individualist. He escaped from forced labour after the trial of the Bonnot Gang. He was one of the pioneers of the Costa Rica experience (an attempt to found an individualist colony - S.E.P) and contributed to the publications of E.Armand." He also contributed several articles to Minus One, the last of which gave his reflections on his illegalist "career" (No. 23)

DONATIONS: A.T. £2; L.K.W. 3/-; F.E.£3; E.B. 5/-; J.H. 4/-; S.H. £2; D.P. 6/4; W.M. 10/-; H.C. 10/-; W.B. 24/-. (Donations since No. 21)

PUBLISHER'S ANNOUNCMENT

About a century and a quarter ago a profound upheaval was sweeping the Western world. It concerned an immense change taking place in the basis of organized education and involved the beginnings of the system which with varying local details dominates the nations of the Western state order today: compulsory, universal, bluntly or sophisticatedly authoritarian, and state-supported by way of levy of taxes upon all. And like the educational structures which preceded it, this contemporary order is in an extremely precarious state today. The struggle over who is to control it, and whose views and philosophy is to prevail and be taught in it, are of first rank in bringing about the situation which might result in collapse sooner than most people think.

At the height of the European phase of the great educational dispute of the early 1840's there appeared an essay by the German individualist philosopher Marx Stirner titled The False Principle of Our Education. It has now been translated into English for the first time by Robert H. Beebe, and is preceded by a useful historical and critical introduction by James J. Martin. It is priced 60 cents from the publisher Ralph Myles Publisher, Inc., P.O.Box 1533, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80901, U.S.A. The same publisher also has a number of the hard bound 1963 edition of The Ego and His Own by Max Stirner for sale at 6 dolls. 95 cents per copy, plus 25% shipping.