

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*

ninepence

MINUS
ONE

nineteen

july 1967

0251

DIVORCE, DUTY AND THE BISHOP

S.E.Parker

Once upon a time Christian divines simply invoked the Will of God and that was enough for all purposes. Now they have to take a more circuitous route to put over their beliefs by professing concern for the social welfare. Somewhere along the line, however, they usually let the cat out of the bag and show that behind their new concern lie the same old preremptory demands: Thou Shalt, Thou Shalt Not.

The Bishop of Bath and Wells, for example, was very worried a few years ago about the divorce rate. Speaking on "The Christian Family" at Weston-super-Mare he stated (according to the Bristol "Evening Post"): "Between five and seven of every 100 marriages in the country ended in a divorce court. Last year (1961) 26,360 decrees were made absolute, the highest number for six years." He continued that the "people of this country do not want easier divorce. They look over the ocean and see the situation which exists in America and they recoil. There are 42,000 marriages and 39,000 divorces a year in California." He also claimed that sociologists and others rejected the idea of divorce by consent.

Which people in this country do not want easier divorce the bishop did not say. Presumably they do not include those who remain in a suffocating marriage because neither husband nor wife have the courage to commit an appropriate "offence" with which to convince a divorce court. Nor those who, while-separated, are stopped by religious humbug from forming a new alliance. The bishop was just as vague as to who were the "sociologists and others" who rejected divorce by consent.

No tears need be shed over the bishop's worries. Indeed, were legal restrictions less heavy, the economic position of women better, or the concept "till death do us part" abandoned altogether, he would probably have even more cause to worry about the divorce rate. Love usually thrives on variety. When it is confined in the cage of monogamy, it tends to wither and die.

The crunch of the bishop's complaint, however, was to be found in his objection to certain young people who "greedily and selfishly.....forget their duty and what they owe to the community to which they belong."

So what his talk of statistics and sociology boiled down to in the end was the ethical imperative of "duty" - a moral spook that has terrorised millions of poor wretches who have succumbed to its blandishments. It will be worthwhile taking a look at this spook since even some professed anarchists are still under its influence.

✓ I did not choose to be born into this society. I was thrust into it by an act of my parents. When I became aware I found that I was expected to conform to a way of life in whose shaping I had no voice. I was supposed to fulfil the obligations it imposed upon me, whether or not these were to my taste or in my interest. How, then, can it be assumed that I owe a debt to the "community"? I have made no pact, signed no agreement - by what "right" is my obedience demanded?

✓ I may be told that the "community" provides me with food, shelter, education and work, and that these put me in its debt. Ignoring the "services" I have to give in return for these, the fact that the "community" provides me with them does not therefore put me under obligation to it. The slave-owner gave his slave food, shelter and clothing - was the slave under any obligation to stay with his master if he could escape? Even the Bishop of Bath and Wells would probably say he was not, particularly since "slavery" is now out of fashion. Since the slave was forced into that position he is considered to be under no obligation to remain there.

✓ Is the position of an individual in present society fundamentally different to that of the slave? He has been given no choice, forbidden certain acts on pain of prison or death, hemmed in by laws and customs which make him an object for domination and exploitation. It is as ridiculous to pretend that he has any more "duty" to this "community" than the slave had to his owner, or the sailor to the press-gang that conscripted him. Anyone who says that he has is only concerned with his subordination to the collective and with decorating this with impressive-sounding words.

It is the job of a priest to utter empty phrases about duty and sacrifice. If he did not, he would soon cease to be a priest. But to the individualist anarchist, who cherishes his autonomy, the concept of duty as a sacrosanct entity, a mysterious something that must be done whatever his personal wishes, is no more than a piece of mumbo-jumbo designed to sanctify authority. *Parental obligations.*

J.E.

BANDIERA NERA is the latest "numero unico" published by Enzo Martucci. It contains articles by Martucci, Pomodoro and a translation of an article on Martucci by Stephen Marletta that first appeared in MINUS ONE. It can be obtained from Martucci at Via Carducci 98, Pescara, Italy. Price: 50 Lire.

The demagogue is one who preaches doctrines he knows to be untrue to men he knows to be idiots. The demaslave is one who listens to what these idiots have to say and then pretends that he believes in it himself.

H.L.Mencken.

LETTERS

It is unfortunately all too true that letters are more often provoked by disagreement than inspired by agreement, so before launching my polemic I want to say how much I enjoy MINUS ONE and how much I admire your lone dissent and battle against the legions of collectivist anarchism in England. In the ultimate sense, I do not believe that the collectivists are really anarchists at all, since they have to turn over what amounts to State power to their communes and collectives, and woe betide he who dissents from the collective plan or decision.

My own dissent is inspired by your article "Slings and Arrows" in your Jan/Feb issue. While I have substantial disagreements with the positions of Robert LeFevre and especially with Herbert C. Roseman, I must stand with them in upholding the importance of systematic thought. If we go back to the classical individualist anarchists: Warren, Spooner, Tucker, etc., we find a total emphasis, and a sparkling emphasis at that, on systematic thought. One of the great problems of twentieth-century anarchist thought, whether individualist or collectivist, has been a mindless emphasis on feeling and whim as a replacement for systematic analysis. Why is it that all the supposed followers of Tucker in the present day have forgotten his brilliant method of "plumb-line" rigour?

Let us take, for example, your thesis that true individualism cannot be compatible with any sort of social system, even Tucker's. You say that only the individual's ego and his on-going counts. Alright, now suppose that Mr. A's ongoing expansion of ego, according to him, involves the invasion and suppression of the ego of Mr. B. What then? If you grant Mr. A the right of oppressing Mr. B then you grant him the right of subjugating the ego of B; what then becomes of B's individuality? If, on the other hand, you say that A has no right to interfere with B's ego, then you are out of Stirner and into a social "system"; in short, then, you are admitting that each man has the right of equal liberty, has the right to have his person and property unmolested or invaded by anyone else. From these premisses can flow an entire "social system"; even though a system, however, it would, in contrast to other systems, allow full freedom to each individual. Within the framework of not suppressing anyone else's individuality and freedom, each person then has full freedom to do anything he wishes, a freedom which is, of course, compatible with all sorts of social arrangements, including pure capitalism, mutual banking, voluntary communes, or whatever. It is not compatible with the existence of a State, because the very essence of a State is living by coercive exploitation and invasion of the person and property of its subjects.

You are also being grossly unfair to Mr. LeFevre. LeFevre is not interested in imposing the horizontal authority of "Society"; he is only interested in arriving at a world where no individual

would wish to aggress against the person or property of another. It is unfair, also, to use this "moral authority" as some sort of dividing line between "individualism of the right" and "individualist anarchism". You must know full well that Benjamin Tucker was all in favour of private police and private courts combatting and punishing theft and invasion; in fact, Tucker went beyond us all in believing that each child is the absolute property of his parents! What price "moral authoritarianism" now?

When all the flimflam of feeling and paeans to the individual has been peeled away, you and all other Stirnerites must take a position on the question: where do you stand on the individual who wishes to aggress against another's individuality? Benjamin Tucker, facing the issue squarely and rationally, took his stand with liberty, with the right of every man to be defended against the invasion of his rights. Which side are you on? Or better yet, when are you going to face the issue?

i.e. back to the old Roman notion, when a father could sell his children into slavery - up to three times, if they were released by their slave masters!
J. E.

Murray N. Rothbard
Editor "Left and Right"
(Box 395, Cathedral Station,
New York, N.Y. 10025)

(The "Stirnerite" stand on "aggression and invasion" is described by Enzo Martucci in his essay currently appearing in this review. All I want to say about it, therefore, is that I neither grant nor deny Mr. A the "right" to subjugate Mr. B. What Mr. A does to Mr. B and vice versa only concerns me if my interests are threatened and then I act in self-defence, not from any standpoint of "right". As Tucker once wrote: "It is agreed, then, that, in Anarchism's view, an individual has a right to stand aside and see a man murdered. And pray, why not?"

Robert LeFevre may sincerely desire the kind of world Murray Rothbard says he does. The fact nonetheless remains that he wants this world to be governed by "moral training". In other words, the authority of the State and/or God will be replaced by the authority of conscience - the external punishment of prison or hell will be changed into the internal punishment of guilt. This is the "horizontal authority" of a "moral society".

Much as I have learned from and enjoyed Tucker's writings, I am not a follower of his, so it is of no use using him as a stick to beat me with. Tucker's efforts to reconcile the utopianism and moralism of Proudhon with the individualism and amoralism of Stirner resulted in neither fish nor fowl, but only in confusion. Tucker never established why any conscious egoist should accept the "social expediency" of his concept of "equal liberty".

"L'individualisme du droit" means liberal "individualism" based upon the idea of "natural right". It does not necessarily mean "right-wing individualism". It certainly describes LeFevre's views, but hardly those of Ayn Rand.

Firstly, on E. Bertran's "Notes on Individualism".

By and large, what the writer has to say makes sense, and in a measure I agree with him. However, he writes: ".....admits that he does not know anything for sure, and has become a complete a complete sceptic, placing himself outside the believing world. This man then, who knows that truth does not exist, has accepted individualism." This statement, as the smallest examination will show, is self-contradictory. Also, the latter part of the statement is untenable, as we have at least one axiomatic truth - cogito ergo sum - on the very axiomatic truth of which Individualism is based. Therefore, all we can say is that we know that at least one truth exists; and we may or may not believe that others do.

Secondly, on Alistair MacHenry's "What About This?"

If this note is written tongue in cheek, I apologise, but must admit that it fooled me. If not, then it is perhaps time that the writer learned a few basic scientific facts. The device he describes is, in theory and only in theory, possible. An X-ray Laser (the word means Light Amplification by Stimulated Emission of Radiation) would simply be a Laser which, instead of producing a light or infra-red beam as ordinary lasers do, would produce a coherent beam in the x-ray region. (To the best of my knowledge, and I have a fair amount of current scientific literature passing through my hands daily, no such device has yet been constructed) However, such a device would not constitute a weapon until it was made sufficiently powerful - say with the output of a million million watts. The largest Lasers we are at present able to construct - and these are the easy ones, not this x-ray thing - produce a mere thousand or so watts of power.

If Mr. MacHenry needs a secret weapon to worry about, why doesn't he choose something more practical - say a huge mirror in space to focus the sun's rays on his helpless towns. That is both technically feasible, and a lot cheaper. It would probably do the job more effectively, too.

P.W. Goddard

Alistair MacHenry's reflections on the works of Krishnamurti ("Minus One", May 67, p.6) were rather misleading, and it would be a pity if they discouraged any one from reading Krishnamurti for himself. According to MacHenry, Krishnamurti "argues that individuals should always be serene"; and MacHenry objects that hardly anybody would want to be serene all the time, since that would leave no place for music, poetry, sex, etc. "Count me out", he says.

I have read all the six volumes of Krishnamurti's writings published by Gollancz, and have found no suggestion anywhere that individuals should always be serene. On the contrary, Krishnamurti stresses over and over again that a life of perfect, unshakeable

serenity without any kind of psychological disturbance, is quite unattainable (although such a life is what most of us are seeking, consciously or unconsciously). There is no such thing, according to Krishnamurti, as total psychological security, except in death or the lunatic asylum. The truly intelligent man is he who realizes that very fact; and who - purely as a result of that realization - is passively aware of each psychological disturbance as it arises, without putting up any psychological resistance. That doesn't mean he lives in permanent serenity, but it does mean that his whole psychological process is observed, watched, and understood - not just intellectually, but radically; and in that way his inner conflicts may be resolved, and a state of ? serenity and mystical insight may come into being.

No doubt many of us don't really want to understand our psychological process, or to have our inner conflicts resolved. Although we long for security and permanent tranquillity, at the same time, in our confusion, we are afraid of missing the endless turmoil and distraction of so-called normal, civilized living. Distractions are exciting, they make us feel alive, we think we should be lost without them. Krishnamurti doesn't condemn us for that. He just points out that a life without self-knowledge is really mental torture; that it results in all the chaos and misery that we see everywhere in this brutal world; and that the cessation of distraction is not such a dreadful thing as we fear it is. If we don't wish to listen to this message, nobody is compelling or urging us; so there is no question of "counting ourselves out". Either we listen or we don't.

As for music, poetry, and sex, I have found no passage in Krishnamurti's writings where these things are condemned as such. On the contrary, Krishnamurti states that "sex has its place" ("The First and Last Freedom", p. 231.); the three volumes of "Commentaries on Living" contain many beautiful descriptive passages with great poetic impact; and, on pp. 107-108 of the third of those volumes, there is a remarkable description of a performance of Indian classical music (and of a mystical experience that occurred during that performance). However, Krishnamurti does point out that music, poetry, and sex, - particularly sex - are commonly used as escapes from the misery of a life without self-knowledge; and in that case the results are harmful, because we can never solve, but only aggravate our problems by merely stupefying ourselves. Happy, creative, loving people would enjoy music, poetry, and sex without the ulterior motive of escape. Indeed, they would live without a motive of any kind, naturally and spontaneously.

Although Krishnamurti - like Tolstoy, Stirner and other anarchist philosophers - does not actually call himself an anarchist, to my mind he is perhaps the greatest anarchist philosopher of all. "The following of authority," he writes, "is the denial of intelligence. To accept authority is to submit to domination, to subjugate oneself to an individual, to a group, or

to an ideology, whether religious or political; and this subjugation of oneself to authority is the denial, not only of intelligence, but also of individual freedom. Compliance with a creed or a system of ideas is a self-protective reaction. The acceptance of authority may help us temporarily to cover up our difficulties and problems; but to avoid a problem is only to intensify it, and in the process, self-knowledge and freedom are abandoned." ("Education and the Significance of Life", p. 60) That is just one of many, many passages that must surely sound like music in the ears of any true anarchist; and if we read Krishnamurti with attention we shall, I think, see more clearly than ever before the essential validity of the anarchist case. I would recommend his works to any serious person.

Francis Ellingham

It has not been demonstrated, nor can it be, that man, as Aristotle said, is a "political animal". The fact that, after 20,000 years of gregarious living and influences, we still have individual needs and sentiments shows that by nature we are not gregarious. *Most of us are both: gregarious & loners, in some respects. No does gregariousness need to lead to territorial isolation or a single society. 7.2.13. 8.97.*

"If man," says Max Nordau in his book 'The Meaning of History', "was indeed, by nature, a social animal, one would feel invincibly attracted towards others, and our relations would not have the minimal reserve they do have. We would not want to retire into the most intimate recesses within ourselves and we would never feel the need for solitude and differentiation."

Psychology negates the idea of the original gregariousness of man. How can this be reconciled with the existence within us of natural needs that cannot be satisfied, in any kind of society, without conflict with those of others?

For the rest, if it is true, as Darwin said, that man descended from the solitary gorilla, who lived with his females and did not seek relations with other animals, it cannot be maintained, as does Kropotkin, that humanity began as a herd.

Then how did men become gregarious?

Not because of an invincible impulse that drove them to union and organisation, or because of any natural or necessary law, but because of a deviation caused by an accident.

This was the product of a glacial period which, by an unexpected cooling and worsening of their surroundings, forced men, in order to survive, to permanently unite with their fellows and collaborate with them so that they could be better equipped to fight against nature which had now become an enemy.

Thus gregariousness was probably born from an expression of cosmic chaos which disturbed normal development. This view I have put forward as an original hypothesis in my unpublished book "Il Diavolo Ha Vinto".

If man in society has acquired gregarious habits and feelings he remains deep down an egoist and an individualist. Various philosophers, among them Ward, say that even today man has no sentiments that are really social. Therefore he can return to a free and individualist life.

Consequently, if some new fact supervened, such as a third world war fought with nuclear weapons, this terrible fact, by its internal violence, would re-awaken all the primordial instincts and bring them from the subconscious up to the surface, permitting the few survivors to initiate a general life of individualist anarchism.

If this does not happen humanity will become more and more gregarious, mass-society will become more and more suffocating, and the individualists will remain a minority - a-normal and above - who will fight against it in every way.

Enzo Martucci

APPEAL RESULT

The following readers have so far responded to the appeal made in the May number:

B. 10/-; S.M. £1; L.K.W. 4/-; D.T. 10/-;
F.E., £2; H.C. £1; J.J.M. £1-14-2; A.T. £1.

Thanks to their generosity and the income from sales this issue has appeared.

AGCOM DIRECTORY No. 2. is now on sale. It is published by Agoric Communications, Box 5116 Ocean Park Station, Santa Monica, Calif. 90405, U.S.A. Price 1 dollar (7/-). It lists many publications of interest to individualists, and classifies MINUS ONE as belonging to the "libertarian centre" (Shades of our revolutionary "past"!) Editor Raul Santana. Assistants: Kerry Thornley, Cara Leech, Omar Ravenhurst.

IN DEFENCE OF STIRNER

Enzo Martucci

2

"Zoccoli," continues Serafini, "rightly says that the Stirnerian ethic is far removed from any possible application and merely has 'a sad, speculative interest as the sophisticated and delirious manifestation of a fortunately solitary thinker.' And I agree with his judgement. Only if we returned to the life of the caveman could Stirner's teachings come true. You will have to agree also, Signor Martucci, that this is impossible."

I do not agree at all. I do not regard history as an infinite process. I believe that it must end one day. In spite of what philosophers from Aristotle onwards have said about the social tendency of man, history is nothing but the treatment of the organized and directed history of mankind, which has created conditions contrary to, and causing degeneration from, our natures. Either man will disappear, and with him history, or he will react healthily, destroy history and return to nature, gaining new strength as did Antaeus when he touched the earth. Man is capable of evolution and improvement, but only by following his natural inclinations, not by suffocating them and transforming himself into a sheep or, worse still, a robot.

Education does not develop the individual, but depreciates or subdues him. "Education" says Callicles in Plato's 'Gorgias', "takes the innate vigour from children and renders them weak. It makes them all alike and trains them for servile obedience. We take the best and strongest children and train them like lion-cubs. We stun and fascinate them with our chattering and train them by teaching them that they have to be the same as all the others, and that the beautiful and the good consist of this equality. But if there were a man who had sufficient force, he would shake off and break through, and escape from all this; he would trample underfoot all our formulas and spells and charms and all our laws which are against nature, then he who was our slave would reveal himself as the master."

But would civilization disappear? It would be better if it did. It also contributes to keeping man in shackles and it would be a good thing if it vanished. Besides, there does not exist only one civilization that presents a straight and evolutionary conception of history. As Spengler has so well shown, there have existed distinct and separate civilizations, which have all had a birth, a youth, a maturity, a decline, and a death. And all of these civilizations - except, perhaps, the Greek at the time of Pericles and the sophists - have tried to crush the originality and spontaneity of the natural individual, burdening his mind with dogmas and imposing laws on his conduct. One has done it in one way, another in another, and for different reasons, but all have agreed at least in this: the need to bridle the individual. Thus a new

type of human being - who would be similar to Stirner's Unique of Nietzsche's Overman - would be unable to adapt himself to a civilization, but would want only to live in the free and luxuriant bosom of nature.

Despite this ethic which, according to Zoccoli, even the cannibal would reject, but which, according to Serafini, the caveman might accept, Stirner, "breaking his rigid individualism", endeavours to have it accepted by a social class: the proletariat. And for Zoccoli Stirner does this in order "to pay a necessary debt to the Left Hegelian school of thought from which he came, pointing out that as it was possible to use the individualist premiss as a preparation for his own egoism, so it was also possible for the same consequences to find a more organic elaboration among the writers and successive movements of revolutionary communism."

It seems to Serafini that this is yet another contradiction in the author of "The Ego and His Own", but in fact it is not. In 1845 the proletariat was not the organised, guided, well-paid and powerful proletariat of today, but a crowd of down-and-outs, unorganised and dissatisfied, who were champing at the bit and in whom Stirner tried to arouse their egoism so that they could oppose it to that of their masters, and take from them their wealth. And this not in order to create a new society, but solely to satisfy the needs of the oppressed individual, who can, if necessary, resort to crime to obtain his own ends. Then he will become master of that which is his own - that is to say, that which he has the might to make his own. The State, which exists only to protect the interests of the property owners against those of the expropriated, would be abolished, but there must not be created a communist society in which everyone would belong to the organised collective and the individual would be unable to own anything, not even that which he is able to conquer and keep. "When the proletarian shall really have founded his purposed 'society'," says Stirner, "in which the interval between rich and poor is to be removed, then he will be a ragamuffin, for he will feel that it amounts to something to be a ragamuffin, and might lift "Ragamuffin" to be an honourable form of address, just as the (French) Revolution did with the word "Citizen". Ragamuffin is his ideal; we are all to become ragamuffins.

"This is the second robbery of the 'personal' in the interest of 'humanity'. Neither command nor property is left to the individual; the State took the former, society the latter."

Stirner, then, tends towards individualist anarchy and this always follows from his premiss whether he is urging the individual to realize his value in relation to others, or the proletariat not to respect the property of the rich and to destroy the State, but not to create a communist society. He is against collective property, which is sacred and inviolable, and against individual property conceived as a right with the corresponding duty to

respect it on the part of the destitute. He defends the egoistic property of the individual who has conquered and keeps it, and who no longer remains the owner when he allows other to take what he has gained.

Before Nietzsche announced the death of God, Stirner declared the end of the Sacred:

"In crime the egoist has hitherto asserted himself and mocked at the sacred: the break with the sacred, or rather of the sacred, may become general. A revolution never returns, but a mighty, reckless, shameless, conscienceless, proud - crime, does it not rumble in distant thunders, and do you not see how the sky grows presciently silent and gloomy?"

The individual has to destroy in himself the ghosts which dominate him - God, Morality, Humanity, Society, etc. - and which impose duties, renunciations, and chains. He must understand that these ghosts do not represent any Superior Beings or Objective Entities, but are his own thoughts and creations projected outside and above him which he regards with timid reverence. But when he becomes aware of the real origin of these presumed supreme beings, and of the damage they cause - oppressing his spirit and impeding his actions - then he will repudiate them, and, since they were his creations, destroy them. He becomes a self-owning individual.

This self-owner, who, in Zoccoli's opinion: "acts with the aim of considering others as means, is faced with the actions - not associated and therefore not multiplied, it is true, but numerically additional - of all those others who invert the role regarding him. The absolute autonomy of the individual is obliterated by the absolute autonomy of all others."

This is not true. It would be if all the other self-owners simultaneously acted against me. But since they would not be organized this could not happen. They could only attack me singly or in small groups. Therefore I could defend myself, possibly with success. In more dangerous situations, I could resort to free alliances with others who, at that time, would benefit from supporting me, or in fighting my enemies. In brief, the struggle would not develop out of proportion and if I were overpowered today I could compete again tomorrow. And if I should die I would do so with the satisfaction of having tried to conquer a full and free life for myself. I would not have cowardly resigned myself to the chains of slavery and been content with the little others would allow me to have.

Today, in the civilized society Zoccoli so admires, if I do not want to adapt myself to a maimed and faded existence and rebel against it, I have all of organized mankind (a force far superior to mine and with far more formidable means) against me and, in spite of my heroism, would soon be crushed as were Jules Bonnot, Renzo Novatore, and Severino di Giovanni (Illegalist anarchists who were killed by the State in France, Italy and Argentina - S.E.P.)

I agree with Zoccoli about one thing only and that is where he recognized the perennial topicality of Stirnerian philosophy. In fact, after having established an ideological point of contact between Stirner and Hobbes, Zoccoli writes:

"While the doctrine of Hobbes is now recognised by scholars as evidence that cannot be ignored, so the doctrine of Stirner, while constructed on an erroneous and transcendental egoistic antinomy, as has been pointed out, still preserves a current importance and gives birth to many advocates."

(To be concluded)

LITERATURE...

E. Armand: "Anarchism and Individualism".	1/3
Pat Parker: "Some Poems".	1/3
S.E.Parker: "Individualist Anarchism - An Outline". (Bulk rates: 25 for 2/3; 50 for 4/6)	4d.
Jean-Pierre Schweitzer: "O Idios - Three Essays on Individualist Anarchism".	1/3
Max Stirner: "The Ego and His Own".	15/11

All prices include postage. Obtain from S.E.Parker, address below.

MINUS ONE - an individualist anarchist review is edited and published by S.E.Parker, 2 Orsett Terrace, London, W.2., England. Subscription rates: Home 6/- for six issues; Abroad 6/6 (One Dollar, U.S.)

Duty is what is due. I ought is I owe or I owed. Some duties I assume for duties assumed by others towards me. This is reciprocity. Some alleged duties the moralist tells me that I ought to acknowledge and perform from a sense of Duty. If I then say that it is a superstition he perhaps severs himself for the moment from the superstitious crowd and claims that it is only a generalization, meaning fitness, saving tiresome repetition of analysis; it is my interest after all. He is somewhat disingenuous here, for if it be only my interest embodied in a thought-saving generalization, it will bear analysis and always come out as my interest. But he has the "social organism" in mind, to the preservation of which my individual welfare is to be subordinated, according to his idea. The "social organism" idea has captured him and he is using deoy argument to obtain from me a sacrifice of myself to his idol, his spiritual monster.

James L. Walker