

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

M	M	I	N	N	U	U	SSSSS	00000	N	N	EEEEEE
MM	MM	I	NN	N	U	U	S	0	O	NN	N E
MM	MM	I	NN	NN	U	U	S	0	O	NN	NN E
M	M	I	N	NN	U	U	SSSSS	0	O	N	NN EEEEE
M	M	I	N	N	U	U	S	0	O	N	N E
M	M	I	N	N	UUUUU	SSSSS	00000	N	N	EEEEEE	

Minus One,
Number Thirty Seven, Nineteen Seventy Six.

10p

ANARCHISM, AUTHORITY AND POWER

S.E.Parker

Among a bundle of literature sent to me from Amsterdam recently was an essay by Michael Tobin entitled "Obedience to the State: The Greatest Menace Facing Our Mankind". This is a summarization and criticism of a book by a psychologist, Professor Stanley Milgram, on "Obedience to Authority", which is based on experiments carried out by Milgram at Yale University and repeated elsewhere. These experiments took the form of a series of volunteers ('teachers') who were placed before an electric shock generator having a line of switches ranging from 15 to 450 volts. This generator appeared to be connected with electrodes attached to the wrists another volunteer ('learner') who was strapped into a chair. The 'teacher' was ordered by the psychologist ('instructor') to read out a sequence of word pairs to the 'learner'. If the 'learner' replied wrongly the 'teacher' pressed one of the switches and gave him an electric shock, increasing the voltage each time this happened. What the 'teacher' did not know was that the 'learner' was not a volunteer, but an actor who did not actually experience a shock - he only simulated the agony of receiving one.

According to Milgram, the result of the experiments was to establish the fact that the majority of 'teachers' continued to obey the 'instructor's' orders and administered shocks even when the danger mark was passed and the 'learner' was screaming to be released or feigning heart trouble and unconsciousness.

"Many subjects will obey the experimenter", writes Milgram, "no matter how vehement the pleading of the person being shocked, no matter how painful the shocks seem to be, and no matter how much the victim pleads to be let out." The 'teachers' were not sadists, he continues, "The ordinary person who shocked the victim did so out of a sense of obligation - a conception of his duty as a subject - and not from any peculiarly aggressive tendencies."

Milgram was astonished at the number of individuals who violated their professed moral standards in obedience to the authority of the instructor. He observes that "the force exerted by the moral sense of the individual is less effective than a social myth would have us believe". It does not seem to have occurred to him that at least one reason for this is that "moral principles" themselves are forms of authority. They thereby facilitate obedience to other forms of authority because the basic thing is not what is forbidden, but obedience to the dictates of an authority. Milgram himself supports this view when he records that

"Although a person acting under authority performs acts that seem to violate standards of conscience, it would not be true to say he

he loses his moral sense. Instead it acquires a radically different focus. He does not respond with moral sentiment to the actions he performs. Rather his moral concern now shifts to a consideration of how well he is living up to the expectation that the authority has of him." (My emphasis)

Milgram's final conclusion is that this "fatal flaw" of obedience to authority makes the future survival of the "species" questionable since it paves the way for a very probable global nuclear war. Indeed, although acutely aware of the consequences of authority, he does not believe that it will ever be possible to dispense with it. Like the poor it will always be with us.

Michael Tobin disagrees with Milgram. He believes that all authority can be abolished and a world-wide "anarchocommunist" society created. His reasons rest on - "belief". "We are full of hope and optimism", "we are certain", "we believe passionately", etc., etc. He presents not a tittle of cogent evidence for his hopes, certainties and beliefs. It is clearly for him a matter of "faith" and like all "faiths" his rests on - the "faith" of the faithful one. As such it can be passed by.

The most significant result of these experiments, however, is what they reveal about the nature of authority. There is a tendency, particularly amongst anarchists, to identify authority with external coercion. But they are not the same. The volunteers in Milgram's experiments were not coerced by any external power. They took part freely and could depart any time they wished. Nonetheless, the majority carried out the instructor's orders to the end, even though some did protest. Their obedience was motivated by the authority they saw as inherent in the person of the instructor. It was not power, but authority that they obeyed.

In his book, "In Defence of Anarchism", Robert Paul Wolff writes: "Authority is the right to command, and correlatively, the right to be obeyed. It must be distinguished from power, which is the ability to compel compliance, either through the use or the threat of force. When I turn over my wallet to a thief holding me at gunpoint, I do so because the fate with which he threatens me is worse than the loss of money which I am made to suffer. I grant that he has power over me, but I would hardly suppose that he has authority, that is that he has a right to demand my money and that I have an obligation to give it to him. When the government presents me with a bill for taxes, on the other hand, I pay it (normally) even though I do not wish to, and even if I think I can get away without paying. It is, after all, the duly constituted government, and hence it has a right to tax me. It has authority over me. Sometimes, of course, I cheat the government, but even so, I acknowledge its authority for who would speak of 'cheating' a thief.....To claim authority then is to claim the right to be obeyed."

A leader of a religious sect, for instance, may have no apparatus at his disposal to compel obedience to the practices he lays down for his followers, but he can nonetheless command obedience by virtue of the authority he claims. Of course, there are examples in which authority and coercive power are combined in one body, the State being the most prominent and most dangerous contemporary of these, but, as Milgram and robber gangs show, the mystique of authority and the reality of superior force do not always coincide. And even when they do, as in the State, it is an open question whether the apparatus of coercive power is intended or able to deal with any other than the

recalcitrant individual or minority. Authority is the cementing force for the fabric of organized collectivities, whether it is exercised vertically as in the State, or horizontally as in the most primitive societies (and as it would be in certain projected future societies mistakenly called "anarchist").

In his book Wolff remarks that "it is the rare individual in the history of the race who rises even to the level of questioning the right of his master to command and the duty of himself and his fellows to obey". This is profoundly true, and one could add that those individuals who carry this questioning to a thoroughgoing repudiation of any "duty" to obey authority are even rarer (even Wolff believes in the duty to be bound by "moral constraints"). Indeed, there appears to be no valid reason to suppose that their numbers will significantly increase. History has shown that the human sheep who accept the authority of their shepherds are always the largest class.

As an anarchist-individualist having no faith in Tobin-like apocalypses or the nebulous dreams of educational gradualists, I know that such anarchy as I am likely to experience will only be here and now, not there and then. My anarchism, therefore, takes the form of denying the legitimacy of any claim of authority over me, not in denying that there are and will remain "social forces" more powerful than I which can compel my compliance to their demands, even though I grant them no authority to do so. Anarchy thus becomes, not a future place, but a present "state of mind", an individual perspective, not a future social practice. Nonetheless, if I have not the power to overthrow these "forces" which claim authority and /or demand compliance, I will evade them where possible, assert my individuality when I can, and when all else fails take refuge in what James Joyce described as "silence, exile and cunning".

XXXXX

SONG FOR GOVERNMENT

Raymond Holden

Write a contract with the grass,
Take a tithe from metal earth,
Bind the cloud to dare not pass
Unless it pay what passing's worth.

Sell the birds a lease on air,
Issue franchises to cod,
Tax the lion and the bear,
Gather tribute from the sod.

Levy imposts upon reasons,
And incorporate the soul,
Furnish permits for the seasons,
Licence field-mouse, charter mole.

Why be limited in scope,
Governing for men alone?
What are stones that they may hope
To remain unlevied stone?

(From "Sweet Gherkins",
Vol. 11. No. 7)

THE MYTH OF MONISM

Scepticism

"MONISM. a. The doctrine that there is only one kind of substance or ultimate reality, as mind or matter. b. The doctrine that reality is one unitary, organic whole, with no independent parts."
(Webster's Collegiate Dictionary)

Once upon a particular time, there was a distinguished monistic philosopher in India named Shankara - according to his philosophical opponents, the reason he became a monist was because he had never learned to count beyond one on his fingers! Anyway, having established his reputation in the great debates of the time, a rajah invited the sage to deliver a short series of lectures to him in his palace, concerning exclusively his doctrine of the illusoriness of the universe and (by implication) the unreality of plurality, change and individuality. Shankara lectured very successfully, but the rajah began to entertain doubts about the soundness of the monist's propositions. After all, there was the great man, spouting about "All is One, there is nothing but the featureless Absolute which is beyond plurality, beyond predicates" - and yet, he was NOT identical with Shankara, and vice-versa. So, when the time for the concluding lecture in the series arrived, our budding pluralistic rajah played a little joke on the sage - when he saw Shankara arriving in his courtyard he had a rut-crazed elephant released which made straight for the hitherto imperturbable advocate of the theory that the universe is some kind of divine hallucination. The sage took one look at the pachyderm and - took to his heels. After a few hours calm was restored and the sage returned to the palace to deliver the lecture a little late. Before he opened his mouth, the rajah asked him: "Honoured sage, if you deny that variety and difference are objectively real characteristics of the world, why did you run away so fast from that elephant?" The sage, without hesitation, answered: "Dear King, you should know that, ultimately, you do not exist, I do not exist, the elephant does not exist - no diversity, only homogeneity. Consequently, an illusory entity (yourself) saw another illusory entity (myself) running away from a third illusory entity (the beast). It is all only a phantasmagoria, an imagination, there is only an apparent cosmos, o Rajah."

I have begun with this story because it serves to effectively illustrate how certain minds can operate on two mutually exclusive levels, without thereby perceiving any inconsistency! The number of monists, pantheists and absolute idealists in the West is daily increasing, due to barrowloads of books now being published which present us with the familiar claims of the "All is One" brigade that unity is real, diversity unreal, that everything is simply a manifestation of some extra-cosmic, impersonal "Mind", that science has rejected the "anachronistic" atomic theory and theoretically dissolved the universe into a sea "of pure, undifferentiated energy", that we need only abolish the separative self and "merge with it all", bla, bla, bla. In addition to books, we have any number of gurus arriving from all points West, North, South and East, delivering their addresses to packed audiences who (they tell us) are "disenchanted with soulless Western materialism". Occult movements proliferate, and most of them give out the standard monistic and pantheistic propaganda - some going so far as to claim that God converted himself into the world to play hide-and-seek (how can one person play it?), though he is presently suffering from transcendental amnesia and thinks he is you and me and the cat next door (poor guy)!

Folk read books by mystics in which we hear about the "Super-essential Nothingness" that is the "Ground" of everything. We have the Buddhists, who claim that "There is only the Void, the One Mind, plurality is simply in our heads". Above all, we find them all appealing to science to confirm their "oceanic" view of the universe, as against the old atomic or "granular" view. The fact that physics tells us that diversity is real at subatomic levels - each electron being separate from every other electron - that they ignore. The fact that we are not (experientially) ONE with other beings, since we cannot eliminate their pain by a mere act of will, or see through their eyes, or know either THEIR minds - this is all put down to "illusion", the fact that we are so deluded as to actually believe that the "fragmented" world of discrete objects, with spatial, temporal and causal features, is real. As it is, every living entity APART from monists seem to have fallen for pluralism because they all behave as if there were innumerable OTHER objects, entities, and events in the world!

I ignore the first definition of "Monism" at the head of this article and concentrate on the second. This is the life-outlook of all the amateur contemplatives who wander from Guru to Guru, drinking in the (often expensive!) words of wisdom. If they meet someone, they immediately mutter to themselves: "Plurality is an illusion, I am he and he is me". (Not so much a case of "mistaken identity" as "NO identity".)

This, of course, is laziness - they haven't the time to deal with you, as YOU ARE, they choose a sort of existential "Lowest Common Denominator" ("Ultimate Oneness") and then everything is thrown together into the receptacle of "Unity". The cosmos is an entity or object to them, and we "mere individuals" are but cells in the bloodstream of Divinity, waves on the limitless ocean of "Pure Energy".

As against Shankara, another Indian philosopher called Madhva asserted that "bheda" (difference, distinctiveness) was not an illusion, but was, in fact, the foundational characteristic of everything. Ignoring his theism, he maintained that one creature was different from another, one atom different from another, even the most momentary occurrence (e.g. a lightning flash) completely "real", concluding with the idea that we never experience "Absolute Oneness" anywhere, anytime. Since Shankara had brought forward the stale old Parmenidean and Platonic notion that only the "changeless" is real, Madhva countered by claiming that change is of the essence of the material world, and that the world, as experienced spatially, temporally, causally (personally) can be pronounced quite...substantial and objective. Thus, vindication of pluralism.

We may listen sympathetically to a materialist when he says "All is Matter". That sort of monism doesn't deny the testimony of the senses, and it admits (therefore) that diversity and flux are basic characteristics of the real world. On the other hand, the contemporary "monists" (basing themselves on Indian philosophy of the Shankara type, as well as Zen Buddhism, Taoism, etc.) are fanatically opposed to any recognition of an objectively existent variety of things, persons, events. We even have a doctrine like the "Universal Interpenetration" doctrine of later Chinese Buddhism, according to which every "separate thing" is actually IDENTICAL with every other "separate thing". The galaxy contains the atom, the atom contains the galaxy. There is no "self", everything is just a manifestation of the "Hidden Oneness" behind the Puppetshow of Space-Time. This nonsense seems to be enthusiastically received by

gullible adolescents, who then walk around the streets with a beatific smile on their faces, realizing that the men, women, dogs, cars, jets, shops, raindrops, sunbeams, aren't "true", just "apparent", and that it is...as you might have guessed..."All One". (Though they still avoid being run over, be it noted!)

As I mentioned earlier, physics confirms that plurality exists at the subatomic level - sensory experience gives no hint of some "Unity of All Things" in which everything melts and comes together. Then we have an example of "uniqueness" in the reaches of space, the much-discussed "Black Hole", a sort of cosmic plughole which can swallow anything within its range, thus denying the monistic idea that no object is really "independent" of another (i.e. the "Black Hole" is obviously discontinuous with - different from - anything else, following only its OWN tendencies, a "Max Stirner" of the stars!) Again, physicists now tell us that energy is not homogeneous, a great "sea of oneness" stretching everywhere, but is, on the contrary, "granular", distributed in DISCRETE bundles throughout space. In society, attempts to standardize human beings (the political and psychological implementation of monism!) prove disastrous, and there is nowhere in the world where the monist can shut his eyes to the basic, undeniable fact that PLURALITY IS OBJECTIVELY REAL.

(A word on the sense of "oneness" mystics claim to experience. I think this is simply the result of allowing the mind to withdraw from external things, thus creating a security and peace which suggests to the meditator or mystic that he has "gone beyond" the separate self. What he has done is to simply experience HIMSELF, HIS mind, though in a slightly different way from when we are rushing around engaged in so many external activities. So - the mystic claim of the dissolution of the self and the subsequent union with the "One" is simply a misinterpretation of a state of great serenity in which the individual is still...himself)

XXXXXXXXXX

TWO JINGLES

Wm. Flygare

Night and Light

Can those who would own you
only to disown you,
disdained in their aims,
lay claim to have known you?

Can you, the betrayed,
in refusing to compete
in the games of the street,
ever be dismayed?

Person to People

if
everybody
did as I,
what wd happen?

as
everybody
is no I,
how shd I know?

STIRNERIANA

Wm. Flygare

Max Stirner: Oeuvres Completes. L'Unique et sa Propriete traduit par P. Gallissaire, Et Autres Ecrits traduit par A. Sauge. Lausanne: Editions l'Age d'Homme, 1972. £5.15; unsewn paperback handsomely printed; 440pp.

On the back cover, the translators write, "We present a new translation of his chief work, The Ego and His Own, because all the (French) translations to date seemed unsatisfactory, stuffed with alterations, indeed with errors..." a statement to which I can attest as reliance on a faulty translation had led one extravagant group to print up bumper-stickers which sounded more marxian than maxian (we-ish than I-ish), which action, in turn, led to a polite altercation by correspondence. The guilty source: "Darum wird der Nichtbesitzende den Staat als Schutzmacht des Besitzenden ansehen, die diesen privilegiert, ihn dagegen nur --- AUSSAUGT." (My No. 17.47).

In an earlier translation, this passage had been rendered: "Aussi celui qui ne possede pas considere-t-il l'Etat comme une puissance tutelaire de ceux qui possedent; CET ANGE DES CAPITALISTES EST --- UN VAMPIRE QUI LUI SUCE LE SANG." (tr. Reclaire, 1899; reprint, 1960, p. 105).

The Italian translation in Gli Anarchici below reads: "Percio il nullatenente considera lo Stato alla stregua di una potenza che potegge i possidenti, che concede a costoro dei privilegi, mentr' egli ne viene DISSANGUATO (= de-blooded)." (p. 429).

Byington's version: "Therefore the non-possessor will regard the State as a power protecting the possessor, which privileges the latter, but does nothing for him, the non-possessor, but to --- SUCK HIS BLOOD." (p.115)

P. Gallissaire renders it: "Aussi, le non-possedant voit-il l'Etat comme une puissance protectrice du possedant, qui privilegie ce dernier alors qu'elle ne fait que L'EXPLOITER, lui, jusqu'a l'epuisement" (p. 174)

No angels, no vampires, no blood as in my other capitalizations; rather an improvement, for AUSSAGEN only means to "suck out, to drain, to exhaust, to impoverish."

One instance may not be a fair sample, but it can be illustrative in a brief space.

In the preliminary note, the translators point out that some of the Kleinere Schriften gathered by Mackay (1914) are of doubtful authenticity and, lacking Stirner's tone, they contribute little to understanding his work, any more than his translations, or that compilation, The History of the Reaction. Therefore, A. Sauge has translated: A Reply to 57 Berlin Pastors on Sunday Observance, The False Principle of Our Education, Art and Religion, Some Provisional Remarks on The State Founded on Love, 'The Mysteries of Paris', and, following The Ego and His Own, Replies to Feuerbach, Szeliga and Hess.

P. Gallissaire and A. Sauge are highly to be commended.

Max Stirner: Le Faux Principe de Notre Education/Das Unwehre

Prinzip Unsere Erziehung et/und L'Anticritique/Rezensenten Stirners: introduction, traduction, notes d'Henri Arvon. Paris: Aubier Montaigne, 1974. Appr. £2.75; sewn paperback; 186pp. Excellent; the solid work of a reliable man.

Brawo, Gian Mario (ed). Gli Anarchici, Vol. 1 of Classici Della Politica (directed by Luigi Firpo). Tprino: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1971. £9.02; hansomely bound; 1200pp.

This fine piece of Italian book-making is a bargain for readers of Italian. The works included in this volume are: Wm. Godwin's Political Justice, Stirner's The Ego and His Own, Wilhelm Marr's Anarchy or Authority?, Carlo Cafiero's Anarchy and Communism, Johann Most's The Religious Pest, Errico Malatesta's Anarchy, and Francesco Saverio Merlino's Socialism or Monopolism? (Other works appear in other volumes). Four portraits and four facsimile frontispieces of original editions comprise the illustration. The presentation is scholarly with a 72 page introduction, including 6 pages of bibliography, an introduction to each author, the whole being well documented and annotated.

Penzo, Giorgio. Max Stirner: La Rivolta Esistenziale. Torino: Marietti, 1971. £2.56; sewn paperback; 384 pp.

I could only afford a hasty impression, namely that G. Penzo deals with Stirner a la Paterson as a proto-existentialist and that the work similarly seems to be the off-shoot of a doctoral dissertation, anarchism now being one of the hunting grounds for that sort of thing.

Max Stirner. Scritti Minori e Risposte Ai Critici Dell Unico. Roma: ennEsse editrice, 1969. Pp. 381 in 2 pb vols. £2.21. An attractive pocket edition of the A. Treves translation. (L'Unico also appears in this format but I have not yet seen it)

I have long awaited the following title and am now beginning to suspect that it is a still-birth and would appreciate hearing about it: Max Stirner. Kleinere Schriften Und Seine Entgegnungen Auf Die Kritik Seines Werkes "Der Einzige Und Sein Eigenthum". Fromann, 1972, later announced as due to appear in Autumn, 1974.

It is rather sad to think that, but for "The False Principle of Our Education" (translated by R.H.Beebe, Libertarian Broadside No.1.) the remaining 5 essays recently translated by A. Sauge have yet to make their appearance in English; the short samples given by John Carroll in his Stirner selection should make their importance apparent.

It is still sadder to think that, instead of full texts of The Ego and the Lesser Writings, only H.G.Helms' selection is available in the original language. This may be part and parcel of an even yet sadder reflection: That the birth-house of Max Stirner should have been torn down in April, 1970, for the sake of a gasoline-petrol stand may be indicative of the state of affairs in that part of the world.

NOTES ON PARKER AND ELLINGHAM AND STIRNER

Robert E. Sagehorn

First, I refuse to believe that either religion or government were invented or initiated by exploiters and oppressors to further their own ends. I do not state this in defence of either, but rather because I see no evidence of the exploiters having any capacity for originality, and such complex designs are simply beyond their competence.

Government grew out of mutual assistance compacts, for trade and defence and general co-operation, and the motto 'death to tyrants' is an ancient one. And this code did not apply simply to tyrants at the higher levels, but at every social level down to the lowest - death to tyrants and exploiters of every sort. I will defer for another time the question of whether we are more humane or more evolved today because we no longer do this, but instead suffer the tyranny and exploitation.

Religion began with an attempt to understand the full range of the human condition in an environment that could only be partially controlled or understood. Both religion and government have been taken over by the exploiters, and it is not always clear in any historical instance what began where, but clearly this has been the pattern, and I know of no evidence of an original fabrication of either religion or government by resident or invading or any other exploiters.

Mention is made in this exchange of the duality of microcosm and macrocosm as known by modern science, such as man and microbe, or man and molecule. There is another and equally important that even the 'primitives' are aware of: the relation of finite microcosmic mortals of this earth to the macrocosm of the (to us) infinite universe. And at their best philosophy and theology and metaphysics only attempt to order these relationships, to give them proper relevance and meaning, for the man and the moment, for both thinking and acting in our existential immanence of daily living. Within this double tension of micro and macro, man contra atomic or sub-atomic particles of matter/energy, then again as man contra the cosmos, the individual is both everything and nothing. Each mortal is a unit of matter possessing self awareness and volition, each has its hour in the sun, so to speak, each is unique, and few approach their full potential, or are even aware of that potential.

Both Stirner and Nietzsche have represented this both rationally and symbolically, and inspired others to realize at least a bit more of their uniqueness and capacity. Which is to the good, and not at all at odds with some of the simpler aboriginal religions or philosophies (call it folk wisdom if you prefer), or the essential perspective of more cultured and sophisticated peoples with their more complex (and often more obscure) philosophy and theology. And as Parker notes 'mystagoguery' is not reserved exclusively to the formal religions or the other spirit-believers - the camp-followers of science often display a pitiful true-believing religiosity.

Now as for the question in dispute. What did Stirner mean by calling himself the sole ego, how are we to take that? I don't really know, or much care. Stirner advanced, or perhaps in this post-medieval epoch, restored would be more accurate, the concept of the ego and its innate individual worth. And as so often happens with genuine individuals his life came to nothing, but his work could not be ignored, and despite the labours of Marx and others to refute it, the effect continues, though he is still denied the academies and official recognition. It has been done before and it can be done again, and that is the real and singular worth of the individual. To me the rest is pointless disputation.

ANOTHER NOTE ON LAURANCE LABADIE

Herbert C. Roseman

The death of Laurance Labadie of lymphatic cancer is indeed sad for us at Revisionist Press. Friend and mentor he was largely responsible for the inspiration which led to our re-publication of Tuckers's "Individual Liberty", John Henry Mackay's "The Anarchists", Redbeard's "Might Is Right", "Selected Works of Voltairine de Cleyre", and our first original publication Thomas A. Riley's "Germany's Poet Anarchist: John Henry Mackay". Laurance Labadie is really quite irreplaceable.

Eventually we hope to publish the complete writings of Laurance Labadie, including his remarkable correspondence. We are also going ahead with a project that Labadie was especially interested in, namely a full exposition of Stirner's life and work. To this end we are now preparing for publication a series in four volumes by Dr. Philip Dematteis. The first volume will be Dr. Dematteis' "Individuality and the Social Organism: Max Stirner vs. Karl Marx" which was Dr. Dematteis' doctoral dissertation. The second volume will discuss Stirner and Proudhon, a third volume will explore Stirner's influence in Europe and America, and the fourth volume is a discussion of Stirner's critique of natural law and natural rights.

Also we are making steady progress in our translation of the complete works of Stirner and Mackay. Any readers of MINUS ONE wishing to keep fully posted on the publication dates of any of the above works can write us at GPO Box 2009, Brooklyn, NY 11202, and we will send full details.

What stage has been reached by now?
Who holds all the unpublished material? J.Z. 20.8.1977.
XXXXXXXXXX

A NOTE ON MY EDITION OF THE WILL TO BONDAGE

Wm. Flygare

It is of little benefit either to the writer or to the reader to answer criticism, especially when that criticism, but for being helpful on one or two points of detail, is prompted by resentment (however understandable) and charged with absurdity (however impassioned). In this case, however, I am obliged to point out some accidents in publication for which I can hardly be held responsible.

On format: Taking the publications of The Loeb Classical Library (Heinemann) for my model, my intention for La Boetie's text was straight prose (I had typed my manuscript in a manner meant to be helpful to an unlettered printer several thousand miles away who doesn't even have a Greek font; vain effort!: a poet friend of mine even tried to scan the stuff!). The markings were intended as running titles to help the reader (the present placing only bewilders him; it even bewilders me). The foot-notes, distributed on the facing pages were not written as end-notes (which I loathe; two copies of a work are required to use them); furthermore, my notes were jumbled together with those of 1735, the result being a mess. I am in no position to know the difficulties encountered in Colorado; they must have been "essentially a collective phenomenon."

On information: Working between three continents by post and without a London, Paris, or New York library close by is quite a stunt; the "critic" should try it some time. I trust that Jim Martin will forgive my citing a sentence from his letter to me 21 Apr 73 as it exercised

a considerable influence on my work: "The circulation of the ANARCHY 63 edition could not have been in more than the hundreds all over the world, aided in part by myself in that I bought an extra hundred from them (the publishers) and have been passing them around ever since." (I had, incidentally, hoped that I could rely on the correctness of the impressive display of effort that had gone into this edition, but when I followed up some topics of special interest, I was disappointed).

On embarrassment: The only thing I am red-faced about is my having written (& missed on proof) the word "folio" when I should have written "quarto" in reference to HAMLET 1603; nobody seems to have noticed this, however.

The sole aim of the edition was to serve La Boetie; it was directed towards montanists, whose response was unexpectedly and extraordinarily receptive, as well as towards "libertarians", whose response remains incomplete.

xxxxxxx

BOOK REVIEW

Stephen Marletta

(The Totalitarian Nightmare. By Enrico Arrigoni. Western World Press, P.O.Box 2714, Culver City, CA 90230, USA)

Fantasy and satire in a collection of stories with an underlying message that under the mass indoctrination of Marxism in a Communist Totalitarian State the individual is unimportant, that he must never feel like a single entity, but like a whole:

You have been melted in the totalitarian State crucible, disassembled, absorbed, annulled as a separate entity...You have been depersonalized..disembodied of all personal content...emptied of what was characteristically yours...of what distinguished you from other human beings...All individuality...All individual values...all that was you...the I...exists no more...has been thrown into the melting pot of the totalitarian State...which feeds itself on you." (p.94-95)

But Marxism can't synthesize all:

"And tomorrow morning how am I going to die? Single or as a whole?

"Tomorrow morning you are going to die alone, Gregory, alone! When you were born, Gregory, you were born alone and single, then we created the Communist totalitarian State and fused you into a block, but when you die you revert to the original condition of loneliness and singleness. That's one of the contradictions that even Karl Marx has not succeeded in fusing into a synthesis.

"That's too bad! Because tomorrow morning I would like to take along with me the whole block of Communist leaders, to keep me company in the grave." (p. 259)

Despite the massive scale of force and pressure there is always one (or more) who will raise his or her head:

"Believe me, Gregory, the individual, although he doesn't exist, is disruptive, obstructive, deceptive, he is elusive, transgressive, subversive; he is an anti-statist, and anti-communist, an anarchist.. Do you see, Gregory, why we are worried about the individual?" (p.261)

This book has no price. Arrigoni says that he "had only the means to have 150 copies printed, which are distributed free. Any individual or organization that considers this book worthy of wider circulation can take it from there." (Another note reads: "Additional copies \$1.00. California residents add sales tax. Bulk order or bookstore rates on request." Presumably added by the Western World Press.- Ed.)

XXXXXXX

REVIEWS

Egoist

(Anthology 74 and Anthology 75. The Ikuta Press, B-403, 2617-2, Motoyoshida-cho, Mito 310, Japan. 1,000 yen)

A variety of styles, themes and poets. Best known to readers of MINUS ONE will be our regular contributor, Wm. Flygare, some of whose rich word-mixes have previously appeared in these columns. I particularly liked his "Rock", one of his best, "Marche Esclave", "Own-ly This", and "Death in Focus". Yoko Danno maintains a consistently spare and evocative style conveying great awareness of "elemental" things. Lindley William Hubbell's pieces are uneven and sometimes little better than word-doodles, but in "Li Fei" he achieves a beautifully simple lyric. Hisao Kanseki and Horoaki Sato also contribute. M. Fei?

(What Is Man's Destiny? By Laurance Labadie. Introduction by Mark A. Sullivan. Published by him from Apt. 2E, 227 Columbus Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10023, USA. 20 cents.)

This essay was the last written for publication by the late Laurance Labadie. Vigorous and lucid to the end Labadie attacks governmentalism with his usual gusto. Unfortunately, at times he falls into an economic reductionism, particularly when he claims that the "scramble for money" is alone responsible for physical and "mental" illness - a view redolent of the most naive utopianism. Despite this flaw, Labadie is well worth reading.

(The Politics of Obedience. The Discourse of Voluntary Servitude by Etienne de la Boetie. Translated by Harry Kurz. Introduction by Murray Rothbard. Free Life Publications, 41 Union Square, New York, N.Y. 10003. \$2.95)

Since a review of the recent Ralph Myles edition of de la Boetie's essay has already appeared in a previous issue there is little to say about this edition except that it presents the "modern" translation made by Harry Kurz in 1942 and has a lengthy introduction by Murray Rothbard. Rothbard's answer to the question as to why men submit to despotism is to create a "cadre" of "libertarian" intellectuals who, in some unspecified way, will enlighten the masses and lead them to the promised land of Liberty. In the unlikely chance that this were to happen, I suspect that the product of such "libertarian Leninism" would be yet another variant of the ruler-ruled pattern - no doubt garnished with an "anarchist" ideology.

(Assorted Pickles from Sweet Gherkins. Dill Pickle Press. Edwd. R. Johnson, P.O.Box 822, Muscatine, Iowa 52761, USA. 50 cents.)

Odds and ends, bits and pieces, culled by Ed Johnson from his irregular publication, Sweet Gherkins. Many famous radicals, and some not so famous, are represented. Johnson has featured Stirner in early issues of his magazine, but omits him from this anthology. Perche?

(Tolerance, John Zube, 7 Oxley St., Berrina, N.S.W. Australia 2577.
50 cents (Aus.))

A plea for universal pluralism. Zube wants a world in which every system of human relationships can have room for experiment. He argues that only in this way can the best system or systems win. Trouble is that for his own "system" of "tolerance" to be accepted by "all", "all" will have to become tolerant in the way he defines, and the adherents of other systems are not likely to accept his definition. In fact, his opposition to mono-systems boils down to yet another mono-system in which no one is allowed to be intolerant....Friend Zube has yet to grasp that there just isn't any answer to his search for social harmony.

We already HAVE ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ tolerance & harmony, to a large extent, re religion & lifestyles, in great diversity.
BOOK REVIEW Only re political, economic & social systems is it still outlawed, Pat Parker and S.E. Parker with disastrous consequences for the great majority, conditioned so far to consider only territorial model systems of this kind.
(More In Sorrow. Arthur Moysc. Illustrated by the Author. Kropotkin's Lighthouse Publications c/o 5 Caledonian Rd., London N.1. 60p + 11p postage) PLOT.

A collection of short stories, bizarre, comic, and sad, set in the milieu of the London anarchist and "protest" movements of a few years ago. From these stories, written as autobiographies, Moysc emerges as an anarchist and poet who defies definition, yet captures your imagination. Envisably unapologetic, direct and simple, what matters to his heart, he moves towards, if not in fact, always in spirit; what arouses his indignation and fear, he attacks, often with inspired humour. Every story is the work of an acute, but not cruel, observer who for many years has witnessed the antics of the world-redeemers, the misfits, and the small-time crooks. 20.8. 97.

Jim Huggon, of Kropotkin Lighthouse Publications, is to be congratulated on rescuing these stories from the obscurity of a defunct magazine.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

NOTICE

THE STORM! is a journal exploring and advocating anarchy - life without compulsory authority. Every issue will be addressed to a certain theme. The first delineates an anarchist-individualist critique of corporate capitalist society. Future issues will explore such themes as: anarchism and the American Revolution, individualism versus sexism, and evaluation of various libertarian (or so-called) thinkers past and present. Subscriptions to The Storm! are 75 cents per issue, or three issues for 2 dollars. Those interested in contributing or subscribing should write to: Mark A. Sullivan, Apt. 2E, 227 Columbus Ave., New York, N.Y. 10023, USA.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

All great books are the philosophies of victims. There is one cure for the feeling of vengeance. It is not forgiveness, but war. The war of the iconoclast on the eternal philistine springs from "malign joy" - the hatred of those who have not suffered like us, the grim determination of the restless soul to let no species of complacency escape his venom.

Benjamin De Casseres.

"I feel bad - so I make you feel bad." J.Z.

MINUS ONE is an irregular review for anarchists, egoists and individualists. It is published and edited by S.E. Parker, 186 Gloucester Terrace, London W.2., England. Subscriptions: £1.00 (3 US dollars) for six issues.

THE MEANING OF A NAITE

Wm. Flygare

Lysander X Smith
 drafted at eighteen,
 & martyred at twenty
 in a cause
 which,
 as causes do,
 deserted him:

feels
 but cannot find
 those limbs
 with which he runs
 & hugs
 in dreams;

until
 the time
 of Lysander's liberation
 some 30 or 40 years from now,
 hands
 not his own
 shall feed & function
 what is left
 in a basket
 of Lysander
 "liberator of mankind."

xxxxxxxxx

All laws in which the community proscribes the conduct - "betters the morals" - of individuals are enacted on a theory of "world betterment", i.e., an ideal. All this stupendous and freedom-destroying web of regulation in which the individual finds himself has been woven on the loom of the Ideal. Today the practical, cold-blooded doctrine of self-regulation stands confronted by bayonets in the hands of idealists (that is, the slaves of the superstition called "socialization", the stupid cringers before an ideal of herd-life). The lure of the Socialistic state attracts more people than any other doctrine ever before put forth because it pictures an ideal condition.

Benjamin De Casseres