have spared himself all his clumsy machinations, since, starting with Machiavelli, Hobbes, Spinoza, Bodinus and others of modern times, not to mention earlier ones, might has been represented as the basis of right. Thereby the theoretical view of politics was freed from morality, and apart from the postulate of an independent treatment of politics nothing was accepted. Later, in the eighteenth century in France and in the nineteenth century in England, all right was reduced to civil law (which Saint Max does not discuss) and the latter to a quite definite power, the power of the owners of private property. Moreover, the matter was by no means left at a mere phrase.

Thus Saint Sancho draws the definition of might from right and explains it as follows:

"We are in the habit of classifying states according to the various ways in which the 'supreme power' is divided ... hence, the supreme power! Power over whom? Over the individual.... The state uses force ... the behaviour of the state is exercise of force, and it calls its force right.... The collective as a whole ... has a power which is called rightful, i.e., which is right" (pp. 259, 260).

Through “our” “habit”, our saint arrives at his longed-for power and can now “look after” a himself.

Right, the might of man—might, my right.

Intermediate equations:

To be authorised = to be empowered.

To authorise oneself = to empower oneself.

Antithesis:

To be authorised by man—to be empowered by me.

First antithesis:

Right, might of man—Might, my right

now becomes converted into:

\[
\text{Right of man} = \begin{cases} 
\text{Might of me,} \\
\text{My might,}
\end{cases}
\]

because in the thesis right and might are identical, and in the antithesis the “half-and-half mode of expression” has to be “taken back”, since right, as we have seen, has “lost all meaning”.

Note 1. Examples of bombastic and boastful paraphrases of the above antitheses and equations:

“What you have the power to be, you have the right to be.” “I derive all right and all authority from myself, I am authorised to do everything which I have the power to

---

*a* In the German original a pun on the word *pflegen*, which can mean to be in the habit, to be accustomed to and to look after, to take care of.—*Ed.*
do."—"I do not demand any right, and therefore I need recognise none. What I can obtain for myself by force, I obtain for myself, and what I cannot obtain by force, to that I have no right either, etc.—It is a matter of indifference to me whether I am authorised or not; if only I have the power, then I am already empowered as a matter of course and do not need any other power or authority" (pp. 248, 275).

Note 2. Examples of the way in which Saint Sancho expounds might as the real basis of right:

"Thus, 'the communists' say" (how on earth does "Stirner" know what the communists say, since he has never set eyes on anything concerning them except the Bluntschli report," Becker's *Volkspolitik* and a few other things?): "Equal work gives people the right to equal enjoyment... No, equal work does not give you this right, only equal enjoyment gives you the right to equal enjoyment. Enjoy, and you are entitled to enjoyment.... If you take enjoyment, then it is your right; if, on the other hand, you only yearn for it, without seizing it, it will remain as before the 'established right' of those who have the privilege of enjoyment. It is their right, just as it would become your right, by your seizing it" (p. 250).

Compare what is here put into the mouth of the communists with what was previously said about "communism". Saint Sancho again presents the proletarians here as a "closed society", which has only to take the decision of "seizing" in order the next day to put a summary end to the entire hitherto existing world order. But in reality the proletarians arrive at this unity only through a long process of development in which the appeal to their right also plays a part. Incidentally, this appeal to their right is only a means of making them take shape as "they", as a revolutionary, united mass.

As for the above proposition itself, from start to finish it is a brilliant example of tautology, as is at once clear if one omits both might and right, which can be done without any harm to the content. Secondly, Saint Sancho himself distinguishes between personal and material property," thereby making a distinction between enjoying and the power to enjoy. I may have great personal power (capacity) of enjoyment without necessarily having the corresponding material power (money, etc.). Thus my actual "enjoyment" still remains hypothetical.

"That the child of royalty sets himself above other children," continues our school-master, using examples suitable for a child's book, "is already his act, one which ensures his superiority, and that other children recognise and approve this act is their act, which makes them deserving of being subjects" (p. 250).

In this example, the social relation in which the royal child stands to other children is regarded as the power and indeed as the

---

*a* Johann Caspar Bluntschli, "Die Kommunisten in der Schweiz nach den bei Weitling vorgefundenen Papieren".—*Ed.

*b* In the original *Vermögen*, which can mean both ability, faculty, power and means, fortune, property.—*Ed.
personal power of the royal child, and as the impotence of other children. If the fact that other children allow themselves to be commanded by the royal child is regarded as the “act” of the other children, this proves at most that they are egoists. “Peculiarity is at work in the little egoists” and induces them to exploit the royal child, to extract an advantage from him.

“It is said” (i.e., Hegel said) “that punishment is the right of the criminal.” But impunity is equally his right. If he succeeds in his undertakings, he gets his right, and if he fails it equally serves him right. If someone with reckless courage puts himself in danger and is killed, we say: it serves him right, he asked for it. But if he overcomes the danger, i.e., if his power is victorious, it appears he is also right. If a child plays with a knife and cuts himself, it serves him right; if he does not cut himself, that is also all right. Therefore it serves the criminal right if he suffers the penalty he risked; why did he take the risk, knowing the possible consequences?” (p. 255).

In the concluding words of the last sentence, where the criminal is asked why he took the risk, the school-masterish nonsense of the whole passage is latent. Whether it serves a criminal right if on burgling a house he falls down and breaks his leg, or a child who cuts himself—all these important questions, with which only a man like Saint Sancho is capable of occupying himself, yield only the result that here chance is declared to be my power. Thus, in the first example it was my action that was “my power”, in the second example it was social relations independent of me, in the third it was chance. But we have already encountered these contradictory definitions in connection with peculiarity.

Between the above childish examples Sancho inserts the following amusing little intermezzo:

“For otherwise right would be a humbug. The tiger who attacks me is right and I, who kill it, am also right. I am protecting against it not my right, but myself” (p. 251).

In the first part of this passage Saint Sancho sets himself in a relation of right to the tiger, but in the second part it occurs to him that basically no relation of right is involved at all. For that reason “right” appears to “be a humbug”. The right of “Man” merges into the right of the “Tiger”.

This concludes the criticism of right. Long after having learned from hundreds of earlier writers that right originated from force, we now learn from Saint Sancho that “right” is “the power of man”. Thus he has successfully eliminated all questions about the connection between right and real people and their relations, and has established his antithesis. He restricts himself to abolishing right

---

a G.W.F. Hegel, Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts, I. Theil, 3. Abschnitt.— Ed.
in the form in which he posits it, namely, as the holy, i.e., he restricts himself to abolishing the holy and leaving right untouched.

This criticism of right is embellished with a host of episodes—all sorts of things which people are “in the habit” of discussing at Stehely’s between two and four in the afternoon.

Episode 1. “The right of man” and “established right”.

“When the revolution made ‘equality’ into a ‘right’, it [the revolution] fled into the religious sphere, into the domain of the holy, the ideal. Therefore a struggle has been waged ever since over the holy, inalienable rights of man. Quite naturally and with equal justification, the ‘established right of the existing’ is asserted against the eternal right of man; right against right, and of course each of these condemns the other as a wrong. Such has been the dispute over right since the revolution” (p. 248).

Here Saint Sancho first of all repeats that the rights of man are “the holy” and that therefore a struggle over the rights of man has been waged ever since. Thereby he only proves that the material basis of this struggle is still, for him, holy, i.e., alien.

Since the “right of man” and “established right” are both “rights”, they are “equally justified” and here in fact “justified” in the historical sense. Since both are “rights” in the legal sense, they are “equally justified” in the historical sense. In this way one can dispose of everything in the shortest space of time without knowing anything about the matter. Thus, for example, it can be said of the struggle over the Corn Laws in England: “quite naturally and with equal justification” rent, which is also profit (gain), is “asserted” against the profit (gain) [of the manufacturers], gain against gain, and “of course each of these decries the other. Such has been the struggle” over the Corn Laws in England since 1815. 93

Incidentally, Stirner might have said from the outset: existing right is the right of man, human right. In certain circles one is also “in the habit” of calling it “established right”. Where then is the difference between the “right of man” and “established right”?

We already know that alien, holy right is what is given to me by others. But since the rights of man are also called natural, innate rights, and since for Saint Sancho the name is the thing itself, it follows that they are rights which are mine by nature, i.e., by birth.

But “established rights amount to the same thing, namely to nature, which gives me a right, that is to birth and, furthermore, to inheritance”, and so on. “I am born as a man is equivalent to saying: I am born as a king’s son.”

This is on pages 249, 250, where Babeuf is reproached for not having had this dialectical talent for dissolving differences. Since “under all circumstances”, the “ego” is “also” man, as Saint Sancho later concedes, and therefore has the benefit “also” of what it has as man, just as the ego, for instance, as a Berliner has the benefit of the
Berlin Tiergarten,¹ so "also" the ego has the benefit of the right of man "under all circumstances". But since he is by no means born a "king's son" "under all circumstances", he by no means has the benefit of "established right" "under all circumstances". In the sphere of right, therefore, there is an essential difference between the "right of man" and "established right". If it had not been necessary for Saint Sancho to conceal his logic it "should have been said here": After I have, in my opinion, dissolved the concept of right, in the way in which I am generally "in the habit" of dissolving concepts, the struggle over these two special rights becomes a struggle within a concept which, in my opinion, has been dissolved by me, and "therefore" does not need to be touched upon any further by me.

For greater thoroughness Saint Sancho could have added the following new turn of expression: The right of man too is acquired, hence well acquired, and well-acquired [i.e., established] right is the human right possessed by men, the right of man.

That such concepts, if they are divorced from the empirical reality underlying them, can be turned inside-out like a glove¹ has already been thoroughly enough proved by Hegel, whose use of this method, as against the abstract ideologists, was justified. Saint Sancho, therefore, has no need to make it appear ridiculous by his own "clumsy" "machinations".

So far established right and the right of man "have amounted to the same thing", so that Saint Sancho could reduce to nothing a struggle that exists outside his mind, in history. Now our saint proves that he is as keen-witted in drawing distinctions as he is all-powerful in heaping everything together, in order to be able to bring about a new terrible struggle in the "creative nothing" of his head.

"I am also ready to admit" (magnanimous Sancho) "that everyone is born as a human being" (hence, according to the above-mentioned reproach against Babeuf, also as a "king's son"), "hence, the newly born are in this respect equal to one another ... only because as yet they reveal themselves and act as nothing but mere children of men, naked little human beings." On the other hand, adults are the "children of their own creation". They "possess more than merely innate rights, they have acquired rights".

(Does Stirner believe that the infant emerged from the mother's womb without any act of his own, an act by which he acquired the "right" to be outside the mother's womb; and does not every child from the very beginning reveal himself and act as a "unique" child?)

---

¹ A park in Berlin.— Ed.
² Cf. William Shakespeare, Twelfth Night, Act III, Scene 1.—Ed.
"What a contradiction, what a battlefield! The old battle of innate rights and established rights!" (p. 252).

What a battle of bearded men against babes!
Incidentally, Sancho speaks against the rights of man only because "in recent times" it has again become "customary" to speak against them. In fact he has "acquired" these innate rights of man. In connection with peculiarity we already met the man who is "born free"; there Sancho made peculiarity the innate right of man, because merely by being born he revealed himself as being free and acted as such. Furthermore: "Every ego is already from birth a criminal against the state", whereby a crime against the state becomes an innate right of man, and the child already commits a crime against something that does not yet exist for him, but for which he exists. Finally, "Stirner" speaks further on about "innately limited intellects", "born poets", "born musicians", etc. Since here the power (musical, poetic resp. limited ability) is innate, and right = power, one sees how "Stirner" claims for the "ego" the innate rights of man, although this time equality does not figure among these rights.

**Episode II. Privileges and equal rights.** Our Sancho first of all transforms the struggle over privilege and equal right into a struggle over the mere "concepts" privileged and equal. In this way he saves himself the trouble of having to know anything about the medieval mode of production, the political expression of which was privilege, and the modern mode of production, of which right as such, equal right, is the expression, or about the relation of these two modes of production to the legal relations which correspond to them. He can even reduce the two above-mentioned "concepts" to the still simpler expression: equal and unequal, and prove that one and the same thing (e.g., other people, a dog, etc.) may, according to circumstances, be a matter of indifference—i.e., of equanimity, equality, or it may not be a matter of indifference—i.e., it may be different, unequal, preferred, etc., etc.

"Let the brother of low degree rejoice in that he is exalted." (Saint-Jacques le bonhomme 1:9.)

**II. Law**

Here we must disclose to the reader a great secret of our saint, viz., that he begins his whole treatise about right with a general explanation of right, which "escapes" from him so long as he is

---

\[a\] See this volume, p. 311.—Ed.
\[b\] James 1:9.—Ed.
speaking about right, and which he is only able to recapture when he begins to speak about something totally different, namely—law. Then the gospel called out to our saint: judge not, that ye be not judged—and he opened his mouth and taught, saying:

“Right is the spirit of society.” (But society is the holy). “If society has a will, then this will is indeed right: society exists only thanks to right. But since it exists only thanks to the fact (not thanks to right, but only thanks to the fact) “that it exercises its domination over individuals, so right is its dominant will” (p. 244).

That is to say: “right ... is ... has ... then ... indeed ... exists only ... since ... exists only thanks to the fact ... that ... so ... dominant will”. This passage is Sancho in all his perfection.

This passage “escaped” at that time from our saint because it was not suitable for his theses, and has now been partially recaptured because it is now partially suitable again.

“States endure so long as there is a dominant will and this dominant will is regarded as equivalent to one’s own will. The will of the ruler is law” (p. 256).

The dominant will of society = right,
Dominant will = law—
Right = law.

“Sometimes”, i.e., as the trade mark of his “treatise” about law, there will still turn out to be a distinction between right and law, a distinction which—strange to say—has almost as little to do with his “treatise” about law as the definition of right which “escaped” from him has to do with the “treatise” about “right”:

“But what is right, what is considered legitimate in a society is also given a verbal expression—in law” (p. 255).

This proposition is a “clumsy” copy of Hegel:

“That which is lawful is the source of the knowledge of what is right or, properly, what is legitimate.”

What Saint Sancho calls “receiving verbal expression”, Hegel also calls: “posited”, “known”, etc., Rechtsphilosophie, par. 211 et seq.

It is very easy to understand why Saint Sancho had to exclude right as the “will” or the “dominant will” of society from his “treatise” about right. Only to the extent that right was defined as man’s power could he take it back into himself as his power. For the sake of his antithesis, therefore, he had to hold fast to the materialistic definition of “power” and let the idealistic definition of “will” “escape”. Why, when speaking of “law”, he now recaptures “will” we shall understand in connection with the antitheses about law.

\[a\] Matthew 7:1.—Ed.
In actual history, those theoreticians who regarded might as the basis of right were in direct contradiction to those who looked on will as the basis of right—a contradiction which Saint Sancho could have regarded also as that between realism (the child, the ancient, the Negro, etc.) and idealism (the youth, the modern, the Mongol, etc.). If power is taken as the basis of right, as Hobbes, etc., do, then right, law, etc., are merely the symptom, the expression of other relations upon which state power rests. The material life of individuals, which by no means depends merely on their “will”, their mode of production and form of intercourse, which mutually determine each other—this is the real basis of the state and remains so at all the stages at which division of labour and private property are still necessary, quite independently of the will of individuals. These actual relations are in no way created by the state power; on the contrary they are the power creating it. The individuals who rule in these conditions—leaving aside the fact that their power must assume the form of the state—have to give their will, which is determined by these definite conditions, a universal expression as the will of the state, as law, an expression whose content is always determined by the relations of this class, as the civil and criminal law demonstrates in the clearest possible way. Just as the weight of their bodies does not depend on their idealistic will or on their arbitrary decision, so also the fact that they enforce their own will in the form of law, and at the same time make it independent of the personal arbitrariness of each individual among them, does not depend on their idealistic will. Their personal rule must at the same time assume the form of average rule. Their personal power is based on conditions of life which as they develop are common to many individuals, and the continuance of which they, as ruling individuals, have to maintain against others and, at the same time, to maintain that they hold good for everybody. The expression of this will, which is determined by their common interests, is the law. It is precisely because individuals who are independent of one another assert themselves and their own will, and because on this basis their attitude to one another is bound to be egoistical, that self-denial is made necessary in law and right, self-denial in the exceptional case, and self-assertion of their interests in the average case (which, therefore, not they, but only the “egoist in agreement with himself” regards as self-denial). The same applies to the classes which are ruled, whose will plays just as small a part in determining the existence of law and the state. For example, so long as the productive forces are still insufficiently developed to make competition superfluous, and therefore would give rise to competition over and
over again, for so long the classes which are ruled would be wanting the impossible if they had the “will” to abolish competition and with it the state and the law. Incidentally, too, it is only in the imagination of the ideologist that this “will” arises before relations have developed far enough to make the emergence of such a will possible. After relations have developed sufficiently to produce it, the ideologist is able to imagine this will as being purely arbitrary and therefore as conceivable at all times and under all circumstances.

Like right, so crime, i.e., the struggle of the isolated individual against the predominant relations, is not the result of pure arbitrariness. On the contrary, it depends on the same conditions as that domination. The same visionaries who see in right and law the domination of some independently existing general will can see in crime the mere violation of right and law. Hence the state does not exist owing to the dominant will, but the state, which arises from the material mode of life of individuals, has also the form of a dominant will. If the latter loses its domination, it means that not only the will has changed but also the material existence and life of the individuals, and only for that reason has their will changed. It is possible for rights and laws to be “inherited”, but in that case they are no longer dominant, but nominal, of which striking examples are furnished by the history of ancient Roman law and English law. We saw earlier how a theory and history of pure thought could arise among philosophers owing to the separation of ideas from the individuals and their empirical relations which serve as the basis of these ideas. In the same way, here too one can separate right from its real basis, whereby one obtains a “dominant will” which in different eras undergoes various modifications and has its own, independent history in its creations, the laws. On this account, political and civil history becomes ideologically merged in a history of the domination of successive laws. This is the specific illusion of lawyers and politicians, which Jacques le bonhomme adopts sans façon. He succumbs to the same illusion as, for example, Frederick William IV, who also regards laws as mere caprices of the dominant will and hence always finds that they come to grief against the “awkward something” of the world. Hardly [one] of his quite harmless whims reaches a further stage of realisation than cabinet decrees. Let him issue an order for a twenty-five million loan, i.e., for one hundred

---

a Paraphrase of a passage from Goethe’s Faust, I. Teil, 2. “Studierzimmerszene”, where Mephistopheles says: “Laws and rights are inherited like an eternal malady.”—Ed.

b Paraphrase of a line from Goethe’s Faust, I. Teil, 1. “Studierzimmerszene”, where Mephistopheles says: “This something, this awkward world.”—Ed.
and tenth part of the English national debt, and he will see whose will his dominant will is. Incidentally, we shall find later on, too, that Jacques le bonhomme uses the phantoms or apparitions of his sovereign and fellow-Berliner as documents out of which to weave his own theoretical whimsies about right, law, crime, etc. This should occasion us the less surprise since even the spectre of the Vossische Zeitung repeatedly “offers” him something, e.g., the constitutional state. The most superficial examination of legislation, e.g., poor laws in all countries, shows how far the rulers got when they imagined that they could achieve something by means of their “dominant will” alone, i.e., simply by exercising their will. Incidentally, Saint Sancho has to accept the illusion of the lawyers and politicians about the dominant will in order to let his own will be splendidly displayed in the equations and antitheses with which we shall presently delight ourselves, and in order to arrive at the result that he can get out of his head any idea which he has put into it.

“My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations” (Saint-Jacques le bonhomme 1:2). a

Law = Dominant will of the state,  
= state will.

Antitheses:

State will, alien will — My will, own will.
Dominant will of the state — My own will
= My self-will.

Subjects of the state, who sustain the law of the state

Equations:

A) State will = Not-my will.
B) My will = Not-state will.
C) Will = Desire.
D) My will = Non-desire of the state,
= Will against the state,
= Ill will towards the state.
E) To desire the non-state = Self-will.
Self-will = Not to desire the state.
F) State will = Negation of my will,
= My lack of will.
G) My lack of will = Existence of state will.

a James 1:2.— Ed.
(We know already from the preceding that the existence of the state will is equal to the existence of the state, from which the following new equation results:)

\[ \begin{align*}
H) & \text{ My lack of will} = \text{ Existence of the state.} \\
I) & \text{ The negation of my lack of will} = \text{ Non-existence of the state.} \\
K) & \text{ Self-will} = \text{ Negation of the state.} \\
L) & \text{ My will} = \text{ Non-existence of the state.}
\end{align*} \]

Note 1.
According to the already quoted passage from page 256:

"States endure so long as the dominant will is regarded as equivalent to one's own will."

Note 2.
"He who in order to exist" (the conscience of the state is appealed to) "is compelled to count on the lack of will of others is a creation of those others, just as the master is a creation of the servant" (p. 257). (Equations F, G, H, I.)

Note 3.
"My own will is the corrupter of the state. Therefore, it is branded by the latter as self-will. One's own will and the state are powers that are mortal enemies, between whom eternal peace is impossible" (p. 257).—"Therefore it in fact watches everybody, it sees an egoist in everyone" (self-will), "and it fears the egoist" (p. 263). "The state ... opposes the duel ... even a scuffle is punishable" (even if the police are not called in) (p. 245).

Note 4.
"For it, for the state, it is absolutely essential that no one should have his own will; if anyone had such a will, the state would have to expel him" (imprison, banish); "if everyone had it" ("who is this person whom you call 'everyone'"?) "then they would abolish the state" (p. 257).

This can also be expressed rhetorically:

"What is the use of your laws if no one obeys them, what is the use of your orders if everybody refuses to accept any orders?" (p. 256).*

* [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] Note 5. "People try to distinguish between law and the arbitrary command, or ordinance.... However, a law relating to human action ... is a declaration of will, hence a command (ordinance)" (p. 256).... "Someone can, of course, declare what he is prepared to put up with and consequently forbid the opposite by a law, announcing that he will treat the transgressor as an enemy.... I am forced to put up with the fact that he treats me as his enemy, but I shall never permit him to treat me as if I were his creature and to make his reason or perhaps unreasonableness my guiding principle" (p. 256).—Thus Sancho raises no objections here against the law when it treats the transgressor as an enemy. His hostility towards the law is directed only against the form, not against the content. Any repressive law which threatens him with the gallows and the wheel is acceptable to him if he can consider it as a declaration of war. Saint Sancho is satisfied if one does him the honour of regarding him as an enemy, and not as a creature. In reality he is at best the enemy of "Man", but the creature of the conditions in Berlin.
Note 5.

The simple antithesis: "state will—my will" is given an apparent motivation in the following paragraph: "Even if one were to imagine a case where each individual in the nation had expressed the same will and thus a perfect collective will! "had come into existence, things would still remain the same. Would I not today and later be bound by my will of yesterday?... My creation, that is, a definite expression of will, would have become my master; but I ... the creator, would be hampered in my course and my dissolution.... Because yesterday I possessed will, I have today no will of my own; yesterday voluntary, today involuntary" (p. 258).

The old thesis, which has often been put forward both by revolutionaries and reactionaries, that in a democracy individuals only exercise their sovereignty for a moment and then at once relinquish their authority—this thesis Saint Sancho endeavours to appropriate here in a "clumsy" fashion by applying to it his phenomenological theory of creator and creation. But the theory of creator and creation deprives this thesis of all meaning. According to this theory of his, it is not that Saint Sancho has no will of his own today because he has changed his will of yesterday, i.e., has a differently defined will, so that the nonsense which yesterday he exalted into a law as the expression of his will, now weighs like a bond or fetter on his more enlightened will of today. On the contrary, according to his theory, his will of today must be the negation of his will of yesterday, because, as creator, he is in duty bound to dissolve his will of yesterday. Only as "one without will" is he creator, as one actually having will he is always the creation. (See "Phenomenology".a) In that case, however, it by no means follows that "because yesterday he possessed will", today he is "without will", but rather that he bears ill will to his will of yesterday, whether the latter has assumed the form of law or not. In both cases he can abolish it as he, in general, is accustomed to do, namely as his will. Thereby he has done full justice to egoism in agreement with itself. It is, therefore, a matter of complete indifference here whether his will of yesterday has assumed as law the form of something existing outside his head, particularly if we recall that earlier the "word which escaped from him" behaved likewise in a rebellious way towards him. In the above-mentioned thesis, moreover, Saint Sancho desires to preserve, not indeed his self-will, but his free will, freedom of will, freedom, which is a serious offence against the moral code of the egoist in agreement with himself. In committing this offence, Saint Sancho even goes so far as to proclaim that true peculiarity is the inner freedom that was so much condemned above, the freedom of bearing ill will.

---

a See this volume, pp. 257-58.—Ed.
“How is this to be changed?” cries Sancho. “Only in one way: by not recognising any duty, i.e., not binding myself and not allowing myself to be bound [...]

“However, they will bind me! No one can bind my will, and my ill will remains free!” (p. 258).

Drums and trumpets pay homage
To his youthful splendour! a

Here Saint Sancho forgets “to make the simple reflection” that his “will” is indeed “bound” inasmuch as, against his will, it is “ill will”.

The above proposition that the individual will is bound by the general will expressed through law completes, by the way, the idealistic conception of the state, according to which it is only a matter of the will, and which has led French and German writers to the most subtle philosophising.*

Incidentally, if it is merely a matter of “desiring” and not of “being able” and, at worst, merely of “ill will”, then it is incomprehensible why Saint Sancho wants to abolish altogether an object so productive of “desiring” and “ill will” as state law.

“Law in general, etc.—that is the stage we have reached today” (p. 256).

The things Jacques le bonhomme believes!

———

* [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] Whether or not tomorrow the self-will of an individual will feel oppressed by the law which yesterday he helped to make, depends on whether new circumstances have arisen and whether his interests have changed to such an extent that yesterday’s law no longer corresponds to his changed interests. If the new circumstances affect the interests of the ruling class as a whole, the class will alter the law; if they affect only a few individuals the majority will, of course, disregard their ill will.

Equipped with this freedom of the ill will, Sancho can now re-establish the restriction imposed on the will of one person by the will of the others; it is precisely this restriction which forms the basis of the above-mentioned idealist conception of the state.

“Everything would be higgledy-piggledy if everyone could do what he liked.— But who says that everyone can do everything?” (“What he likes” is here prudently omitted.)—

“Every one of you should become an omnipotent ego!” declared the egoist in agreement with himself.

“What do you exist for,” he continues, “you who need not put up with everything? Defend yourself, then no one will harm you” (p. 259). And to remove the last semblance of a difference he lets “a few million” “stand as a protection” behind the one “you”, so that the whole discussion can very well serve as a “clumsy” beginning of a political theory in the spirit of Rousseau.

———

a From Heine’s poem “Berg-Idylle”. — Ed.
The equations so far examined were purely destructive as regards state and law. The true egoist had to adopt a purely destructive attitude to both. We missed appropriation; on the other hand, we had the satisfaction of seeing Saint Sancho performing a great trick in which he shows how the state is destroyed by a mere change of will, a change which in turn depends, of course, only on the will. However, appropriation is not lacking here either, although it is quite secondary, and can produce results only later on "from time to time". The two antitheses given above:

State will, alien will—My will, own will,
Dominant will of the state—My own will
can also be summarised as follows:

Domination of alien will—Domination of one's own will.

In this new antithesis, which incidentally all the time formed the concealed basis of his destruction of the state through his self-will, Stirner appropriates the political illusion about the domination of arbitrariness, of ideological will. He could also have expressed this as follows:

Arbitrariness of law—Law of arbitrariness.

Saint Sancho, however, did not reach such simplicity of expression. In antithesis III we already have a "law within him", but he appropriates the law still more directly in the following antithesis:

Law, the state's declaration | _ | Law, declaration of my will,
of will | _ | my declaration of will.

"Someone can, of course, declare what he is prepared to put up with, and consequently forbid the opposite by a law," etc. (p. 256).

This prohibition is necessarily accompanied by threats. The last antithesis is of importance for the section on crime.

Episoeas. We are told on page 256 that there is no difference between "law" and "arbitrary command, ordinance" because both = "declaration of will", consequently "command".—On pages 254, 255, 260 and 263, while pretending to speak about "the State" Stirner substitutes the Prussian state and deals with questions that are of the greatest importance for the Vossische Zeitung, such as the constitutional state, removability of officials, bureaucratic arrogance and similar nonsense. The only important thing here is the discovery that the old French parliaments insisted on their right to register royal edicts because they wanted "to judge according to their own right". The registration of laws by the French parliaments came into being at the same time as the bourgeoisie and hence the acquisition of absolute power by the kings, for whom in face of both the feudal nobility and foreign states it became necessary to plead an alien will
on which their own will depended, and at the same time to give the bourgeois some sort of guarantee. Saint Max can learn more about this from the history of his beloved Francis I; for the rest, before speaking about the French parliaments again, he might consult the fourteen volumes of *Des États généraux et autres assemblées nationales*, Paris, 1788, concerning what the French parliaments wanted or did not want and their significance. In general it would be in place here to introduce a short episode about the *erudition* of our saint who is so desirous of conquests. Apart from theoretical works, such as the writings of Feuerbach and Bruno Bauer, as well as the Hegelian tradition, which is his main source, apart from these meagre theoretical sources, our Sancho uses and quotes the following historical sources: on the French Revolution—Rutenberg's *Politische Reden* and the Bauers' *Denkwürdigkeiten*; on communism—Proudhon, August Becker's *Völksphilosophie*, the *Einundzwanzig Bogen* and the Bluntschi report; on liberalism—the *Vossische Zeitung*, the *Sächsische Vaterlands-Blätter*, Protocols of the Baden Chamber, the *Einundzwanzig Bogen* again and Edgar Bauer's epoch-making work; in addition, here and there as historical evidence there are also quoted: the Bible, Schlosser's *18. Jahrhundert*, Louis Blanc's *Histoire de dix ans*, Hinrichs' *Politische Vorlesungen*, Bettina's *Dies Buch gehört dem König*, Hess' *Triarchie*, the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, the *Zurich Anekdota*, Moriz Carrière on Cologne Cathedral, the session of the Paris Chamber of Peers of April 25, 1844, Karl Nauwerck, *Emilia Galotti*, the Bible—in short, the entire Berlin reading-room together with its owner, Willibald Alexis Cabanis. After this sample of Sancho's profound studies, one can easily understand why it is that he finds in this world so very much that is alien, i.e., holy.

**III. Crime**

Note 1.

"If you allow yourself to be judged right by someone else, then you must equally allow yourself to be judged wrong by him. If you receive justification and reward from him, then expect also accusation and punishment from him. Right is accompanied by wrong, legality by crime. Who—are—you?—You—are—a—criminal!!" (p. 262).

---

a By Charles Joseph Mayer.—Ed.
b Edgar Bauer, *Die liberalen Bestrebungen in Deutschland.—Ed.*
c Friedrich Christoph Schlosser, *Geschichte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts und des neunzehnten bis zum Sturz des französischen Kaiserreichs.—Ed.*
d Moses Hess, *Die europäische Triarchie.—Ed.*
e The reference is to Moriz Carrière, *Der Kölner Dom als freie deutsche Kirche*; François Guizot, *Discours dans la chambre des pairs le 25 avril 1844*; Karl Nauwerck, *Ueber die Theilnahme am Stoate*; Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's drama *Emilia Galotti.—Ed.*
The code civil is accompanied by the code pénal, the code pénal by the code de commerce. Who are you? You are a commerçant!

Saint Sancho could have spared us this nerve-shattering surprise. In his case the words: “If you allow yourself to be judged right by someone else, then you must equally allow yourself to be judged wrong by him” have lost all meaning if they are intended to add a new definition; for one of his earlier equations already states: If you allow yourself to be judged right by someone else, then you allow yourself to be judged by alien right, hence your wrong.

A. Simple Canonisation of Crime and Punishment
   a) Crime

   As regards crime, we have already seen that this is the name for a universal category of the egoist in agreement with himself, the negation of the holy, sin. In the previously given antitheses and equations concerning examples of the holy (state, right, law), the negative relation of the ego to these holies, or the copula, could also be called crime, just as about Hegelian logic, which is likewise an example of the holy, Saint Sancho can also say: I am not Hegelian logic, I am a sinner against Hegelian logic. Since he was speaking of right, state, etc., he should now have continued: another example of sin or crime are what are called juridical or political crimes. Instead of this, he again informs us in detail that these crimes are

   sin against the holy,
   " " the fixed idea,
   " " the spectre,
   " " “Man”.

   “Criminals exist only against something holy” (p. 268).
   “Only owing to the holy does the criminal code exist” (p. 318).
   “Crimes arise from the fixed idea” (p. 269).
   “One sees here that it is again 'man' who also creates the concept of crime, of sin, and thereby also of right.” (Previously it was the reverse.) “A man in whom I do not recognise man is a sinner” (p. 268).

   Note 1.

   “Can I assume that someone commits a crime against me” (this is asserted in opposition to the French people in the revolution), “without also assuming that he ought to act as I consider right? And actions of this kind I call the right, the good, etc., those deviating from this—a crime. Accordingly I think that the others ought to aim with me at the same goal ... as beings who should obey some sort of 'rational' law” (Vocation! Designation! Task! The Holy!!!). “I lay down what man is and what it means
to act truly as a man, and I demand from each that this law should become for him the norm and the ideal; in the reverse case he proves himself a sinner and criminal..." (pp. [267,] 268).

At the same time, he sheds an anxious tear at the grave of those "proper people" who in the epoch of terror were slaughtered by the sovereign people in the name of the holy. Further, by means of an example, he shows how the names of real crimes can be construed from this holy-point of view.

"If, as in the revolution, this spectre, man, is understood to mean the 'good citizen', then the familiar 'political transgressions and crimes' are brought about from this concept of man." (He should have said: this concept, etc., brings up the familiar crimes) (p. 268).

A brilliant example of the extent to which credulity is Sancho's predominant quality in the section on crime is furnished by his transformation of the sansculottes of the revolution into "good citizens" of Berlin through a synonymical abuse of the word citoyen. According to Saint Max, "good citizens and loyal officials" are inseparable. Hence "Robespierre, for example, Saint-Just, and so on" would be "loyal officials", whereas Danton was responsible for a cash deficit and squandered state money. Saint Sancho has made a good start for a history of the revolution for the Prussian townsman and villager.

Note 2.

Having thus described for us political and juridical crime as an example of crime in general—namely his category of crime, sin, negation, enmity, insult, contempt for the holy, disreputable behaviour towards the holy—Saint Sancho can now confidently declare:

"In crime, the egoist has hitherto asserted himself and mocked the holy" (p. 319).

In this passage all the crimes hitherto committed are assigned to the credit of the egoist in agreement with himself, although subsequently we shall have to transfer a few of them to the debit side. Sancho imagines that hitherto crimes have been committed only in order to mock at "the holy" and to assert oneself not against things, but against the holy aspect of things. Because the theft committed by a poor devil who appropriates someone else's taler can be put in the category of a crime against the law, for that reason the poor devil committed the theft just because of a desire to break the law. In exactly the same way as in an earlier passage Jacques le bonhomme imagined that laws are issued only for the sake of the holy, and that thieves are sent to prison only for the sake of the holy.
b) Punishment

Since we are at present concerned with juridical and political crimes we discover in this connection that such crimes "in the ordinary sense" usually involve a punishment, or, as it is written, "the wages of sin is death". After what we have already learned about crime, it follows, of course, that punishment is the self-defence and resistance of the holy to those who desecrate it.

Note 1.

"Punishment has sense only when it is intended as expiation for violating something holy" (p. 316). In punishing, "we commit the folly of desiring to satisfy right, a spectre" (the holy). "The holy must" here "defend itself against man". (Saint Sancho here "commits the folly" of mistaking "Man" for the "unique ones", the "proper egos", etc.) (p. 318).

Note 2.

"Only owing to the holy does the criminal code exist and it disintegrates of itself when punishment is abandoned" (p. 318).

What Saint Sancho really wants to say is: Punishment falls into decay of itself if the criminal code is abandoned, i.e., punishment only exists owing to the criminal code. "But is not" a criminal code that only exists owing to punishment "all nonsense, and is not" punishment that exists only owing to the criminal code "also nonsense"? (Sancho contra Hess, Wigand, b p. 186.) Sancho here mistakes the criminal code for a textbook of theological morality.

Note 3.

As an example of how crime arises from the fixed idea, there is the following:

"The sanctity of marriage is a fixed idea. From this sanctity it follows that infidelity is a crime, and therefore a certain law on marriage" (to the great annoyance of the "German Chambers" and of the "Emperor of all Russians", not to speak of the "Emperor of Japan" and the "Emperor of China", and particularly the "Sultan") "imposes a shorter or longer term of punishment for that" (p. 269).

Frederick William IV, who thinks he is able to promulgate laws in accordance with the holy, and therefore is always at loggerheads with the whole world, can comfort himself with the thought that in our Sancho he has found at least one man imbued with faith in the state. Let Saint Sancho just compare the Prussian marriage law, which exists only in the head of its author, with the provisions of the Code civil, which are operative in practice, and he will be able to discover the difference between holy and worldly marriage laws. In the Prussian phantasmagoria, for reasons of state, the sanctity of marriage is supposed to be enforced both upon husband and wife; in

---

a Romans 6:23.—Ed.
b Max Stirner, "Recensenten Stirners".—Ed.
French practice, where the wife is regarded as the private property of her husband, only the wife can be punished for adultery, and then only on the demand of the husband, who exercises his property right.

B. Appropriation of Crime and Punishment Through Antithesis

Crime in the sense of man \[\text{Violation of man's law (of the state's declaration of will, of state power), p. 259 et seq.}\]

Crime in my sense \[\text{Violation of my law (of my declaration of will, of my power), p. 256 and passim.}\]

These two equations are counterposed as antitheses and derive simply from the opposition of "man" and the "ego". They merely sum up what has been said already.

The holy punishes the "ego" — "I punish the 'ego'".

\[
\text{Crime} = \text{hostility to Man's law (the Holy)} \quad \text{Hostility} = \text{crime against my law.}
\]

\[
\text{The criminal} = \text{the enemy or opponent of the holy (the Holy as a moral person).}
\]

\[
\text{Punishment} = \text{self-defence of the holy against the "ego".}
\]

\[
\text{Punishment} = \text{satisfaction (vengeance) of man in relation to the "ego".}
\]

In the last antithesis, satisfaction can also be called self-satisfaction, since it is the satisfaction of me, in opposition to the satisfaction of man.

If in the above antithetical equations only the first member is taken into account, then one obtains the following series of simple antitheses where the thesis always contains the holy, universal, alien name, while the anti-thesis always contains the worldly, personal, appropriated name.

\[
\text{Crime} \quad \text{Hostility.}
\]

\[
\text{Criminal} \quad \text{Enemy or opponent.}
\]

\[
\text{Punishment} \quad \text{My defence.}
\]

\[
\text{Punishment} \quad \{\text{Satisfaction, vengeance, self-satisfaction.}\}
\]

In an instant we shall say a few words about these equations and antitheses which are so simple that even a "born simpleton" (p. 434)
can master this "unique" method of thought in five minutes. But first a few more quotations in addition to those given earlier.

Note 1.
"In relation to me you can never be a criminal but only an opponent" (p. 268).— and "enemy" in the same sense on p. 256.— Crime as the hostility of man is illustrated on page 268 by the example of the "enemies of the Fatherland."— "Punishment ought" (a moral postulate) "to be replaced by satisfaction, which again cannot aim at satisfying right or justice, but at giving us satisfaction" (p. 318).

Note 2.
While Saint Sancho attacks the halo (the windmill) of existing power, he does not even understand this power, let alone come to grips with it; he only advances the moral demand that the relation of the ego to it should be formally changed. (See "Logic"?)

"I am forced to put up with the fact" (bombastic assurance) "that he" (viz., my enemy, who has a few million people behind him) "treats me as his enemy; but I shall never permit him to treat me as his creature or to make his reason or unreasonableness my guiding principle" (p. 256, where he allows the aforesaid Sancho a very restricted freedom, namely the choice between allowing himself to be treated as his creature or of suffering the 3,300 lashes imposed by Merlin on his posterior. This freedom is allowed him by any criminal code which, it is true, does not first ask the aforesaid Sancho in what form it should declare its hostility to him).— "But even if you impress your opponent as a force" (being for him an "impressive force") "you do not on that account become a sanctified authority; unless he is a wretch. He is not obliged to respect you and pay regard to you even if he has to be on his guard against you and your power" (p. 258).

Here Saint Sancho himself appears as a "wretch" when with the greatest seriousness he haggles about the difference between "to impress" and "to be respected", "to be on one's guard" and to "have regard for"—a difference of a sixteenth part at most. When Saint Sancho is "on his guard" against someone, "he gives himself over to reflection, and he has an object which he has in view, which he respects and which inspires him with reverence and fear" (p. 115).

In the above equations, punishment, vengeance, satisfaction, etc., are depicted as coming only from me; inasmuch as Saint Sancho is the object of satisfaction, the antitheses can be turned round: then self-satisfaction is transformed into another-getting-satisfaction-with-regard-to-me or the prejudicing-of-my-satisfaction.

Note 3.
The very same ideologists who could imagine that right, law, state, etc., arose from a general concept, in the final analysis perhaps the

---

a This volume, p. 286.—Ed.
b In the original a pun on the word Schächer which Stirner uses in the passage quoted—Schächer means "wretch" or "robber", while schachern means "to barter" "to haggle".—Ed.
concept of man, and that they were put into effect for the sake of this concept—these same ideologists can, of course, also imagine that crimes are committed purely because of a wanton attitude towards some concept, that crimes, in general, are nothing but making mockery of concepts and are only punished in order to do justice to the insulted concepts. Concerning this we have already said what was necessary in connection with right, and still earlier in connection with hierarchy, to which we refer the reader.

In the above-mentioned antitheses, the canonised definitions—crime, punishment, etc.—are confronted with the name of another definition, which Saint Sancho in his favourite fashion extracts from these first definitions and appropriates for himself. This new definition, which, as we have said, appears here as a mere name, being worldly is supposed to contain the direct individual relation and express the factual relations. (See "Logic"). The history of right shows that in the earliest, most primitive epochs these individual, factual relations in their crudest form directly constituted right. With the development of civil society, hence with the development of private interests into class interests, the relations of right underwent changes and acquired a civilised form. They were no longer regarded as individual, but as universal relations. At the same time, division of labour placed the protection of the conflicting interests of separate individuals into the hands of a few persons, whereby the barbaric enforcement of right also disappeared. Saint Sancho's entire criticism of right in the above-mentioned antitheses is limited to declaring the civilised form of legal relations and the civilised division of labour to be the fruit of the "fixed idea", of the holy, and, on the other hand, to claiming for himself the barbaric expression of relations of right and the barbaric method of settling conflicts. For him it is all only a matter of names; he does not touch on the content itself, since he does not know the real relations on which these different forms of right are based, and in the juridical expression of class relations perceives only the idealised names of those barbaric relations. Thus, in Stirner's declaration of will, we rediscover the feud; in hostility, self-defence, etc.—a copy of club-law and practice of the old feudal mode of life; in satisfaction, vengeance, etc.—the jus talionis, the old German Gewere, compensatio, satisfactio—in short, the chief elements of the leges barbarorum and consuetudines feudorum, which Sancho has appropriated for himself and taken to his heart not from libraries, but from the tales of his former master about Amadis of Gaul. In the final analysis, therefore, Saint Sancho again arrives merely at an impotent moral injunction that everybody should himself obtain satisfaction and carry out
punishment. He believes Don Quixote’s assurance that by a mere moral injunction he can without more ado convert the material forces arising from the division of labour into personal forces. How closely juridical relations are linked with the development of these material forces due to the division of labour is already clear from the historical development of the power of the law courts and the complaints of the feudal lords about the legal development. (See, e.g., Monteil, loc. cit., "XIVe, XVe siècle.) It was just in the epoch between the rule of the aristocracy and the rule of the bourgeoisie, when the interests of two classes came into conflict, when trade between the European nations began to be important, and hence international relations themselves assumed a bourgeois character, it was just at that time that the power of the courts of law began to be important, and under the rule of the bourgeoisie, when this broadly developed division of labour becomes absolutely essential, the power of these courts reaches its highest point. What the servants of the division of labour, the judges and still more the professores juris, imagine in this connection is a matter of the greatest indifference.

C. Crime in the Ordinary and Extraordinary Sense

We saw above that crime in the ordinary sense, by being falsified, was put to the credit of the egoist in the extraordinary sense. Now this falsification becomes obvious. The extraordinary egoist now finds that he commits only extraordinary crimes, which have to be set against the ordinary crimes. Therefore we debit the aforesaid egoist with the ordinary crimes, which have been previously entered into the credit column.

The struggle of the ordinary criminals against other people’s property can also be expressed as follows (although this holds good of any competitor):

that they—“seek other people’s goods” (p. 265),

seek holy goods,

seek the holy, and in this way the ordinary criminal is transformed into a “believer” (p. 265).

But this reproach which the egoist in the extraordinary sense levels against the criminal in the ordinary sense is only an apparent one—for it is indeed he himself who strives for the halo of the whole world. The real reproach that he levels against the criminal is not that he seeks “the holy”, but that he seeks “goods”.

After Saint Sancho has built himself a “world of his own, a heaven”, namely this time an imaginary world of feuds and

---

a This volume, p. 220.—Ed.
knights-errant, transferred to the modern world, after he has at the same time given documentary evidence of his difference, as a knightly criminal, from ordinary criminals, after this he once more undertakes a crusade against "dragons and ostriches, hobgoblins", "ghosts, apparitions and fixed ideas". His faithful servant, Szeliga, gallops reverently after him. As they wend their way, however, there occurs the astounding adventure of the unfortunate ones who were being dragged off to some place they had no wish to go to, as described in Chapter XXII of Cervantes. For while our knight-errant and his servant Don Quixote were jogging along their path, Sancho raised his eyes and saw coming towards him some dozen men on foot manacled and bound together by a long chain, accompanied by a commissar and four gendarmes, belonging to the holy Hermandad, to the Hermandad which is holy, to the holy. When they came close, Saint Sancho very politely asked the guards to be so kind as to tell him why these people were being led in chains.—They are convicts of His Majesty sent to work at Spandau, you do not have to know any more.—How, cried Saint Sancho, men being forced? Is it possible that the king can use force against someone's "proper ego"? In that case I take upon myself the voca­tion of putting a stop to this force. "The behaviour of the state is violent action, and it calls this justice. Violent action of an individual, however, it calls crime." Thereupon Saint Sancho first of all began to admonish the prisoners, saying that they ought not to grieve, that although they were "not free", they were still their "own", and that although maybe their "bones" might "crack" under the lash of the whip and that perhaps they might even have a "leg torn off", yet, he said, you will triumph over all that, for "no one can bind your will"! "And I know for certain that there is no witchcraft in the world that could direct and compel the will, as some simpletons imagine; for the will is our free arbitrary power and there is no magic herb or spell that can subdue it." Yes, "your will no one can bind and your ill will remains free!"

But since this sermon did not pacify the convicts, who began one after the other to relate how they had been unjustly condemned, Sancho said: "Dear brethren, from what you have related it has become clear to me that, although you have been punished for your crimes, yet the punishment which you are suffering gives you little pleasure and that hence you are reluctant to receive it and do not look forward to it. And it is highly possible that the cause of your ruin is pusillanimity on the rack in one case, poverty in another, lack

---

[a] Cf. Isaiah 34:13-14.—Ed.
of favour in a third and, finally, the judge's unfair judgment, and that you have not been given the justice that was your due, 'your right'. All this compels me to show you why heaven sent me into the world. But since the wisdom of the egoist in agreement with himself prescribes not doing by force what can be done by agreement, I hereby request the commissar and gendarmes to release you and let you go your ways. Moreover, my dear gendarmes, these unfortunates have done you no harm. It does not behave egoists in agreement with themselves to become the executioners of other unique ones who have done them no harm. Evidently, with you 'the category of the one who has been robbed stands in the forefront'. Why do you show such 'zeal' in your actions 'against crime'? 'Verily, verily I say unto you, you are enthusiastic for morality, you are filled with the idea of morality', 'You persecute all those who are hostile to it'—'Owing to your oath as officials', you are bringing these poor convicts 'to prison', you are the holy! Therefore release these people voluntarily. If you do not, you will have to reckon with me, who 'overthrows nations with one puff of the living ego', who 'commits the most unmeasured desecration' and 'is not afraid even of the Moon'."

"This is a fine piece of impudence indeed!" cried the commissar. "You'd do better to put that basin straight on your head and be on your way!"

Saint Sancho, however, infuriated by this Prussian rudeness, couched his lance and rushed at the commissar with as much speed as the "apposition" is capable of, so that he immediately threw him to the ground. There ensued a general mêlée, during which the convicts freed themselves from their chains, a gendarme threw Szeliga-Don Quixote into the Landwehrgraben or sheep's ditch [Schafgraben], and Saint Sancho performed the most heroic feats in his struggle against the holy. A few minutes later, the gendarmes were scattered, Szeliga crept out of the ditch and the holy was abolished for the time being.

Then Saint Sancho gathered round him the liberated convicts and addressed them as follows (pp. 265, 266 of "the book"):

"What is the ordinary criminal" (the criminal in the ordinary sense) "but a man who has committed the fatal mistake" (a fatal story-teller for the citizen and the countryman!) "of striving after what belongs to the people instead of seeking what is his own? He has desired the contemptible" (a general muttering among the convicts at this moral judgment) "goods of another, he has done what believers do who aspire to what belongs to God" (the criminal as a noble soul). "What does the priest do who admonishes the criminal? He tells him of the great violation of right he has committed by his action in desecrating what the state has sanctified, the property of the state, which also includes the life of the state's subjects. Instead of this the priest might have done better to reproach the criminal with having besmirched himself" (titters among
the convicts at this egoistical appropriation of banal clerical phraseology) "by not despising the alien but regarding it as worthy of being robbed" (murmuring among the convicts). "He could have done so, were he not a priest" (one of the convicts: "In the ordinary sense!"). I, however, "speak with the criminal as with an egoist, and he will be ashamed" (shameless, loud cheers from the criminals, who do not wish to be called upon to feel shame), "not because he has committed a crime against your laws and your goods, but because he considered it worth while to circumvent your laws" (this refers only to "circumvention in the ordinary sense"); elsewhere, however, "I go round a rock so long as I am unable to blow it up" and I "circumvent", for example, even the "censorship"), "and to desire your goods" (renewed cheers); "he will be ashamed...."

Gines de Passamonte, the arch-thief, who in general was not very patient, shouted: "Are we then to do nothing but feel ashamed, be submissive, when a priest in the extraordinary sense 'admonishes' us?"

"He will be ashamed," continues Sancho, "that he did not despise you, together with what is yours, that he was too little of an egoist." (Sancho here applies an alien measure to the egoism of the criminal. In consequence, a general bellowing breaks out among the convicts; in some confusion, Sancho gives way, turning with a rhetorical gesture to the absent "good burghers"). "But you cannot speak to him egoistically, for you have not the stature of a criminal, you ... perpetrate nothing."

Gines again interrupts: "What credulity, my good man! Our prison warders perpetrate all kinds of crimes, they embezzle, they defraud, they commit rape [...a]

[B. My Intercourse]
[I. Society]99

[...] again he reveals only his credulity. The reactionaries knew already that by the constitution the bourgeoisie abolishes the naturally arisen state and establishes and makes its own state, that "le pouvoir constituant, qui était dans le temps" naturally "passa dans la volonté humaine", b that "this fabricated state was like a fabricated, painted tree", c etc. See Fiévé's Correspondance politique et administrative, Paris, 1815, Appel à la France contre la division des opinions, Le drapeau blanc by Sarran ainé, d the Gazette de France of the Restoration period, and the earlier works of Bonald, de Maistre, etc. The liberal bourgeois, in turn, reproach the old republicans—about

---

a Twelve pages of the manuscript are missing here.—Ed.
b "The constitutional power which had been shaped in the course of time had permeated the human will." Lourdoueix, "Appel à la France contre la division des opinions" (quoted from Karl Wilhelm Lancizolle's book Ueber Ursachen, Character und Folgen der Julitage).—Ed.
c Karl Wilhelm Lancizolle, op. cit.—Ed.
d Sarran the elder.—Ed.
whom they obviously know as little as Saint Max knows about the bourgeois state—on the grounds that their patriotism is nothing but "une passion factice envers un être abstrait, une idée générale" (Benj. Constant, *De l'esprit de conquête*, Paris, 1814, p. 48), whereas the reactionaries accused the bourgeois on the grounds that their political ideology is nothing but "une mystification que la classe aisée fait subir à celles qui ne le sont pas" (Gazette de France, 1831, Février).

On page 295, Saint Sancho declares that the state is "an institution for making the nation Christian", and all he can say about the basis of the state is that it "is held together" with the "cement" of "respect for the law", or that the holy "is held together" by respect (the holy as link) for the holy (p. 314).

Note 4.

"If the state is holy, there must be censorship" (p. 316). "The French Government does not contest freedom of the press as a right of man, but it demands a guarantee from the individual that he is really a human being." (Quel bonhomme! Jacques le bonhomme is "called upon" to study the September Laws) (p. 380).

Note 5, in which we find the most profound explanations about the various forms of the state, which Jacques le bonhomme makes independent and in which he sees only different attempts to realise the true state.

"The republic is nothing but absolute monarchy, for it makes no difference whether the monarch is called prince or people, since both are majesties" (the holy).... "Constitutionalism is a step further than the republic, for it is the state in the process of dissolution."

This dissolution is explained as follows:

"In the constitutional state... the government wants to be absolute, and the people wants to be absolute. These two absolutes" (i.e., holies) "will destroy one another" (p. 302). "I am not the state, I am the creative negation of the state"; "thereby all questions" (about the constitution, etc.) "sink into their true nothing" (p. 310).

He should have added that these propositions about forms of the state are merely a paraphrase of this "nothing", whose sole creation is the proposition given above: I am not the state. Saint Sancho, just like a German school-master, speaks here of "the republic," which is, of course, far older than constitutional monarchy, e.g., the Greek republics.

That in a democratic, representative state like North America class conflicts have already reached a form which the constitutional monarchies are only just being forced to approach—about this, of

---

a "An artificial passion directed towards something abstract, a general idea."—*Ed.*

b "A deception with which the wealthy class deludes those that are not wealthy." Quoted from Karl Wilhelm Lancizolle, op. cit.—*Ed.*

c What a simpleton.—*Ed.*
course, he knows nothing. His phrases about constitutional monar­chy prove that since 1842 by the Berlin calendar\textsuperscript{10} he has learned nothing and forgotten nothing.\textsuperscript{a}

Note 6.

"The state owes its existence only to the contempt which I have for myself", and "with the disappearance of this disdain it will fade away entirely" (it seems that it depends solely on Sancho how soon all the states on earth will "fade away". Repetition of Note 3 in the reversed equation, see "Logic")\textsuperscript{b}: "It exists only when it is \textit{superior to me}, only as \textit{Macht} and the \textit{Mächtiger}. Or" (a remarkable \textit{or} which proves just the opposite of what it is intended to prove) "can you imagine a state the inhabitants of which \textit{in all their entirety} (a jump from "I" to "we") "\textit{attach no importance} to it [sich allesamt nichts aus ihm machen]?" (p. 377).

There is no need to dwell on the synonymy of the words "\textit{Macht}", "\textit{Mächtig}" and "\textit{machen}".

From the fact that in any state there are people who attach importance to it, i.e., who, in the state and thanks to the state, \textit{themselves} acquire importance, Sancho concludes that the state is a power standing above these people. Here again it is only a matter of getting the fixed idea about the state out of one's mind. Jacques le bonhomme continues to imagine that the state is a mere idea and he believes in the independent power of this idea of the state. He is the true "politician who believes in the state, is possessed by the state" (p. 309). Hegel idealises the conception of the state held by the political ideologists who still took separate individuals as their point of departure, even if it was merely the \textit{will} of these individuals; Hegel transforms the common will of these individuals into the absolute will, and Jacques le bonhomme \textit{bona fide} accepts this idealisation of ideology as the correct view of the state and, in this belief, criticises it by declaring the Absolute to be the Absolute.

5. Society as Bourgeois Society

We shall spend somewhat more time on this chapter because, not unintentionally, it is the most confused of all the confused chapters in "the book", and because at the same time it proves most strikingly how little our saint succeeds in getting to know things in their mundane shape. Instead of making them worldly, he makes them holy by "giving" the reader the "benefit" only of his own holy conception. Before coming to bourgeois society proper, we shall hear some new explanations about property in general and in its relation

\textsuperscript{a} Paraphrase of the French saying: "\textit{Ils n'ont rien appris ni rien oublié}" ("They have learned nothing and forgotten nothing"); when it was first coined, shortly after the French Revolution, it was used in relation to the royalists.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} This volume, pp. 280-81.—\textit{Ed.}
to the state. These explanations appear the newer because they give Saint Sancho the opportunity to put forward again his most favourite equations about right and the state and thus to give his "treatise" "more manifold transformations" and "refractions". We need, of course, only quote the last members of these equations since the reader will still have in mind their context from the chapter "My Power".

Private property or bourgeois property = Not my property
= Holy property
= Property of others
= Respected property or respect for the property of others
= Property of man (pp. 327, 369).

From these equations one obtains at once the following antitheses:

Property in the bourgeois sense

"Property of man" = "My property."
("Human belongings" = My belongings.) P. 324.
Equations: Man = Right
= State power.

Private property or bourgeois property

Rightful property (p. 324),
= mine by virtue of right (p. 332),
= guaranteed property,
= property of others,
= property belonging to another,
= property belonging to right,
= property by right (pp. 367, 332),
= a concept of right,
= something spiritual,
= universal,
= fiction,
= pure thought,
= fixed idea,
= spectre,
= property of the spectre (pp. 368, 324, 332, 367, 369).

Private property = Property of right.
Right = Power of the state.
Private property = Property in the power of the state
State property = My non-property.

We now come to the antitheses:

Private property — Egoistical property.

Authorised by right (by the state, by Man) — Empowered by me to have property (p. 339).

Mine by virtue of right — Mine by virtue of my power or force (p. 332).

Property given by another — Property taken by me (p. 339).

Rightful property — Rightful property of another is what I consider right (p. 339), which can be repeated in a hundred other formulas if, for example, one puts plenary powers instead of power, or uses formulas already given.

Private property = My property = property alien relation to the property of all others.

Or also:

Property comprising a few objects — Property comprising everything (p. 343).

Alienation [Entfremdung], as the relation or link in the above equations, can be expressed also in the following antitheses:

Private property — Egoistical property.

“To behave towards property as towards something holy, a spectre”, “to respect it”, “to have respect for property” (p. 324).

“To renounce the holy relation towards property”, no longer to regard it as alien, no longer to fear the spectre, to have no respect for property, to have the property of lack of respect (pp. 368, 340, 343).

The modes of appropriation contained in the above equations and antitheses will be dealt with when we come to the “union”, but as for the time being we are still in the “holy society”, we are here only concerned with canonisation.
Note. In the section “Hierarchy” we already dealt with the question why the ideologists can regard the property relation as a relation of “Man”, the different forms of which in different epochs are determined by the individuals’ conception of “Man”. It suffices here to refer the reader to that analysis.

_Treatise 1._ On the parcellation of landed property, the redemption of feudal obligations and the swallowing-up of small landed property by large landed property.

All these things are deduced from holy property and the equation: bourgeois property = respect for the holy.

1) “Property in the bourgeois sense means holy property, in such a way that I must respect your property. ‘Respect for property!’ _Hence_ the politicians would like everyone to possess his little piece of property and by their endeavour have partly brought about an incredible parcellation” (pp. 327, 328).—2) “The political liberals see to it that as far as possible all feudal obligations are redeemed and that everyone is a free master on his land, even though this land has only such a quantity of ground” (the land has a quantity of ground?) “that it can be adequately fertilised by the manure from one person.... No matter how small it is, so long as it is one’s own, i.e., a respected property! The more such owners there are, the more free people and good patriots has the state” (p. 328).—3) “Political liberalism, like everything religious, counts on respect, humanity, the virtues of love. Therefore it experiences constant vexation. For in practice people respect nothing, and every day small properties are being bought up by large landowners, and the ‘free people’ are turned into day-labourers. If, on the other hand, the ‘small owners’ had borne in mind that large property also belongs to them, they would not have respectfully excluded themselves from it and would not have become excluded” (p. 328).

1) Here, therefore, first of all the whole development of parcellation, about which Saint Sancho knows only that it is the holy, is explained from a mere idea which “the politicians” “have got into their heads”. _Because_ “the politicians” demand “respect for property”, _hence_ they “would like” parcellation, which moreover was carried out everywhere by not respecting other people’s property! “The politicians” actually have “partly brought about an incredible parcellation”. It was therefore through the action of the “politicians” that in France even before the revolution, just as today in Ireland and partly in Wales, parcellation had long existed in agriculture, and that capital and all other conditions were lacking for large-scale cultivation. Incidentally, how much “politicians” nowadays “would like” to carry out parcellation, Saint Sancho could see from the fact that all the French bourgeois are dissatisfied with parcellation, both because it weakens competition among the workers and also for political reasons; further, from the fact that all reactionaries (as Sancho could see if only from the _Erinnerungen_ of the old Arndt)

---

^a See this volume, pp. 183-84.—Ed.
regarded parcellation simply as the conversion of landed property into modern, industrial, marketable, desanctified property. We shall not here set forth for our saint the economic reasons why the bourgeoisie, as soon as it has attained power, must carry out this conversion, which can come about both by the abolition of land rents that exceed profit and by parcellation. Nor shall we explain to him that the form in which this conversion takes place depends on the level of development of industry, trade, shipping, etc., in the country concerned. The propositions cited above about parcellation are nothing more than a bombastic circumlocution of the simple fact that in various places “here and there” considerable parcellation exists—expressed in our Sancho’s canonising manner of speech, which suits everything and nothing. For the rest, Sancho’s propositions given above contain merely the fantasies of the German petty bourgeois about parcellation which, of course, is for him the alien, “the holy”. Cf. “Political Liberalism”.

2) The redemption of feudal obligations, a misery which occurs only in Germany, where the governments were only compelled to carry it through by the more advanced conditions in neighbouring countries and by financial difficulties—this redemption is held by our saint to be something that “the political liberals” desire in order to produce “free people and good burghers”. Sancho’s horizon again does not go beyond the Pomeranian Landtag and the Saxon Chamber of Deputies. This German redemption of feudal obligations never led to any political or economic results and, being a half-measure, remained without any effect at all. Sancho knows nothing, of course, about the historically important redemption of feudal obligations in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which was due to the commencing development of trade and industry and the landowners’ need for money.

The very same people who, like Stein and Vincke, wanted the redemption of feudal obligations in Germany in order, as Sancho believes, to make good burghers and free people, found later on that in order to produce “good burghers and free people” feudal obligations ought to be restored, as is just now being attempted in Westphalia. From which it follows that “respect”, like the fear of God, is useful for all purposes.

3) The “buying-up” of small landed property by the “large landowners” takes place, according to Sancho, because in practice “respect for property” does not occur. Two of the most common consequences of competition—concentration and buying-up—and competition as a whole, which does not exist without concentration, seem here to our Sancho to be violations of bourgeois property, which
moves within the sphere of competition. Bourgeois property is already violated by the very fact of its existence. In Sancho's opinion, it is not possible to buy anything without attacking property.* How deeply Saint Sancho has penetrated into the concentration of landed property can already be deduced from the fact that he sees in it only the most obvious act of concentration, the mere "buying-up". Incidentally, from what Sancho says it is not possible to perceive to what extent small landowners cease to be owners by becoming day-labourers. Indeed, on the following page (p. 329) Sancho himself with great solemnity advances as an argument against Proudhon that they continue to be "owners of the share remaining to them in the utilisation of the land", namely owners of wages. "It can sometimes be observed in history" that large landed property swallows up small landed property, and then in turn the small swallows up the large, two phenomena which, in Saint Sancho's opinion, become peacefully resolved into the adequate reason that "in practice people respect nothing". The same thing holds good for the other manifold forms of landed property. And then the wise "if the small owners had", etc.! In the Old Testament we saw how Saint Sancho, in accordance with the speculative method, made earlier generations reflect on the experiences of later ones; now we see how, in accordance with his ranting method, he complains that the earlier generations have failed to bear in mind not only the thoughts of later generations about them, but also his own nonsense. What school-masterly "wisdom" a! If the terrorists had considered that they would bring Napoleon to the throne, if the English barons at the time of Runnymede and Magna Charta had considered that in 1849 the Corn Laws b would be repealed, if Croesus had considered that Rothschild would surpass him in riches, if Alexander the Great had considered that Rotteck b would judge him and that his Empire would fall into the hands of the Turks, if Themistocles had considered that he would defeat the Persians in the interests of Otto the Child, c if Hegel had considered that he would be exploited in such a "vulgar" way by Saint Sancho, if, if, if! About what kind of "small owners" does Saint Sancho fancy that he is talking? About the propertyless peasants who only became "small owners" as a result of the parcelling

* [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] Saint Sancho arrives at this nonsense because he mistakes the juridical, ideological expression of bourgeois property for actual bourgeois property, and he cannot understand why the reality will not correspond to this illusion of his.

a In the manuscript the Berlin dialect form Jescheitheit is used.—Ed.

b Karl Rotteck, Allgemeine Weltgeschichte für alle Stände.—Ed.
out of large landed property, or about those who are being ruined nowadays as a result of concentration? For Saint Sancho these two cases are as like as two drops of water. In the first case, the small owners did not by any means exclude themselves from "large property", but each took possession of it insofar as he was not excluded by others and had the power to do so. This power, however, was not Stirner's vaunted power, but was determined by quite empirical relations, e.g., their development and the whole preceding development of bourgeois society, the locality and its greater or lesser degree of connection with the neighbourhood, the size of the piece of land taken into possession, and the number of those who appropriated it, the relations of industry, of intercourse, means of communication, instruments of production, etc., etc. That they had no intention of excluding themselves from large landed property is evident even from the fact that many of them became large landed proprietors themselves. Sancho makes himself ridiculous even in Germany by his unreasonable demand that these peasants should have jumped the stage of parcellation, which did not yet exist and was at that time the only revolutionary form for them, and that they should have thrown themselves at a bound into his egoism in agreement with itself. Disregarding this nonsense of his, it was not possible for these peasants to organise themselves communistically, since they lacked all the means necessary for bringing about the first condition of communist association, namely collective husbandry, and since, on the contrary, parcellation was only one of the conditions which subsequently evoked the need for such an association. In general, a communist movement can never originate from the countryside, but only from the towns.

In the second case, when Saint Sancho talks of the ruined small owners, these still have a common interest with the big landowners as against the wholly propertyless class and the industrial bourgeoisie. If this common interest is absent, they lack the power to appropriate large landed property, since they live scattered and their whole activity and way of life make association, the first condition for such appropriation, impossible for them, and such a movement, in its turn, presupposes a much more general movement which by no means depends on them.

Finally, Sancho's whole tirade amounts to this: that they ought merely to get rid of their respect for the property of others. We shall hear a little more about this later on.

In conclusion, let us take one more proposition ad acta. "The point is that in practice people respect nothing," so, after all, it appears that it is not "just" a matter of "respect".
Treatise No. 2. Private property, state and right.

"If, if, if!"

"If" Saint Sancho had for one moment set aside the current ideas of lawyers and politicians about private property, and also the polemic against it, if he had once looked at this private property in its empirical existence, in its connection with the productive forces of individuals, then all his Solomon’s wisdom, with which he will now entertain us, would have been reduced to nothing. Then it would hardly have escaped him (although like Habakkuk he is capable de tout104) that private property is a form of intercourse necessary for certain stages of development of the productive forces; a form of intercourse that cannot be abolished, and cannot be dispensed with in the production of actual material life, until productive forces have been created for which private property becomes a restricting fetter. In that case it could not have escaped the reader also that Sancho ought to have occupied himself with material relations, instead of dissolving the whole world in a system of theological morality in order to set against it a new system of would-be egoistical morality. It could not have escaped him that it was a question of things altogether different from “respect” or disrespect. “If, if, if!”

Incidentally, this “if” is only an echo of Sancho’s proposition given above; for “if” Sancho had done all that, he obviously could not have written his book.

Since Saint Sancho accepts in good faith the illusion of politicians, lawyers and other ideologists which puts all empirical relations upside-down, and, in addition, in the German manner adds something of his own, private property for him becomes transformed into state property, or property by right, on which he can now make an experiment to justify his equations given above. Let us first of all look at the transformation of private property into state property.

"The question of property is decided only by force" (on the contrary, the question of force has so far been decided by property), “and since the state alone is the mighty one—irrespective of whether it is a state of burghers, a state of ragamuffins” (Stirner’s “union”) “or simply a state of human beings—it alone is the owner” (p. 333).

Side by side with the fact of the German “state of burghers” here again fantasies invented by Sancho and Bauer appear on an equal footing, whereas no mention is made anywhere of the historically important state formations. First of all he transforms the state into a person, into “the Mighty one”. The fact that the ruling class establishes its joint domination as public power, as the state, Sancho interprets and distorts in the German petty-bourgeois manner as meaning that the “state” is established as a third force against this
ruling class and absorbs all power in the face of it. He proceeds now to confirm this belief of his by means of a series of examples.

Because property under the rule of the bourgeoisie, as in all epochs, is bound up with definite conditions, first of all economic, which depend on the degree of development of the productive forces and intercourse—conditions which inevitably acquire a legal and political expression—Saint Sancho in his simplicity believes that

"the state links possession of property" (car tel est son bon plaisir) "just as it links everything else, e.g., marriage, with certain conditions" (p. 335).

Because the bourgeois do not allow the state to interfere in their private interests and give it only as much power as is necessary for their own safety and the maintenance of competition and because the bourgeois in general act as citizens only to the extent that their private interests demand it, Jacques le bonhomme believes that they are "nothing" in face of the state.

"The state is only interested in being wealthy itself; whether Michael is rich and Peter poor is a matter of indifference to it ... in face of it both of them are nothing" (p. 334).

On page 345 he derives the same wisdom from the fact that competition is tolerated in the state.

Because the board of a railway is concerned about its shareholders only insofar as they make their payments and receive their dividends, the Berlin school-master in his innocence concludes that the shareholders are "nothing in face of the board just as we are all sinners in the face of God". On the basis of the impotence of the state in face of the activities of private property-owners Sancho proves the impotence of private property-owners in face of the state and his own impotence in face of both.

Further, since the bourgeois have organised the defence of their own property in the state, and the "ego" cannot, therefore, take away his factory "from such and such a manufacturer", except under the conditions of the bourgeoisie, i.e., under the conditions of competition, Jacques le bonhomme believes that

"the state has the factory as property, the manufacturer holds it only in fee, as possession" (p. 347).

In exactly the same way when a dog guards my house it "has" the house "as property", and I hold it only "in fee, as possession" from the dog.

Since the concealed material conditions of private property are often bound to come into contradiction with the juridical illusion

a Because it chooses to do so—a paraphrase of the concluding words of French royal edicts.—Ed.
about private property—as seen, for example, in expropriations—Jacques le bonhomme, concludes that

“here the otherwise concealed principle that only the state is the property-owner whereas the individual is a feudal tenant, strikes the eye” (p. 335).

All that “strikes the eye here” is the fact that worldly property relations are hidden from the eyes of our worthy burgher behind the mantle of “the holy”, and that he has still to borrow a “heavenly ladder” from China in order to “climb” to the “rung of civilisation” attained even by school-masters in civilised countries. In the same way as Sancho here transforms the contradictions belonging to the existence of private property into the negation of private property, he dealt, as we saw above, with the contradictions within the bourgeois family.\(^a\)

Since the bourgeois, and in general all the members of civil society, are forced to constitute themselves as “we”, as a juridical person, as the state, in order to safeguard their common interests and—if only because of the division of labour—to delegate the collective power thus created to a few persons, Jacques le bonhomme imagines that

“each has the use of property only so long as he bears within himself the ego of the state or is a loyal member of society.... He who is a state-ego, i.e., a good burgher or subject, he, as such an ego, not as his own, holds the fee undisturbed” (pp. 334, 335).

From this point of view, a person possesses a railway share only so long as he “bears within himself” the “ego” of the board; consequently it is only as a saint that one can possess a railway share.

Having in this way convinced himself of the identity of private and state property, Saint Sancho can continue:

“That the state does not arbitrarily take away from the individual that which he has from the state, only means that the state does not rob itself” (pp. 334, 335).

That Saint Sancho does not arbitrarily rob others of their property only means that Saint Sancho does not rob himself, for indeed he “regards” all property as his own.

One cannot demand of us that we should deal further with the rest of Saint Sancho’s fantasies about the state and property, e.g., that the state “tames” and “rewards” individuals by means of property, that out of special malice it has invented high stamp duties in order to ruin the citizens if they are not loyal, etc., etc. and in general with the petty-bourgeois German idea of the omnipotence of the state, an idea which was already current among the old German lawyers and is here presented in the form of grandiloquent assertions.

Finally Saint Sancho also tries to confirm his adequately proved

\(^a\) See this volume, pp. 180-81.—Ed.
identity of state and private property by means of etymological synonymy; in doing which, however, he belabours his erudition en ambas posaderas.

“My private property is only that which the state allows me out of its property, by depriving [privieren] other state members of it: it is state property” (p. 339).

By chance this is just the reverse of what happened. Private property in Rome, to which alone this etymological witticism can relate, was in the most direct contradiction to state property. True, the state gave the plebeians private property; in doing so it did not, however, deprive “others” of their private property but deprived these plebeians themselves of their state property (ager publicus) and their political rights, and it was precisely on that account that they themselves were called privati, robbed ones, and not the fantastical “other state members” of whom Saint Sancho dreams. Jacques le bonhomme covers himself with shame in all countries, all languages and all epochs as soon as he begins to talk about positive facts concerning which “the holy” cannot have any knowledge a priori.

Desperation because the state swallows up all property drives Sancho back to his innermost “indignant” self-consciousness, where he is surprised to discover that he is a man of letters. He expresses his astonishment in the following remarkable words:

“In opposition to the state I feel ever more clearly that I still retain one great power, power over myself.”

Further on this is developed thus:

“My thoughts constitute real property for me with which I can carry on trade” (p. 339).

Thus, Stirner the “ragamuffin”, the “man of only ideal wealth”, arrives at the desperate decision to carry on trade with the curdled, sour milk of his thoughts. But what cunning does he use if the state declares his thoughts to be contraband? Just listen to this:

“I renounce them” (which is undoubtedly very wise) “and exchange them for others” (that is, if anyone should be such a bad businessman as to accept his exchange of thoughts), “which then become my new, purchased property” (p. 339).

Our honourable burgher will not rest until he has it in black and white that he has bought his property honestly. Here one sees the consolation of the Berlin burgher in the face of all his political calamities and police tribulations: “Thoughts are free of customs duty!”

\[a\] Common land.— Ed.

\[b\] In the original a pun, for the German word Wechsel, used here, can mean either “change”, “alteration”, “exchange” or “bill of exchange”.— Ed.

\[c\] Martin Luther, Von weltlicher Obrigkeit.— Ed.
The transformation of private property into state property reduces itself, in the final analysis, to the idea that the bourgeois has possessions only as a member of the bourgeois species, a species which as a whole is called the state and which invests individuals with the fief of property. Here again the matter is put upside-down. In the bourgeois class, as in every other, it is only personal conditions that are developed into common and universal conditions under which the separate members of the class possess and live. Although previously philosophical illusions of this kind could be current in Germany, they have now become completely ludicrous, since world trade has adequately proved that bourgeois gain is quite independent of politics, but that politics, on the other hand, is entirely dependent on bourgeois gain. Already in the eighteenth century, politics was so dependent on trade that when, for example, the French Government wanted to raise a loan, the Dutch demanded that a private individual should stand security for the state.

That "my worthlessness" or "pauperism" is the "realisation of the value" or the "existence" of the "state" (p. 336) is one of the thousand and one Stirnerian equations which we mention here only because in this connection we shall hear something new about pauperism.

"Pauperism is my worthlessness, the phenomenon that I cannot realise my value. Hence state and pauperism are one and the same.... The state is always trying to derive benefit from me, i.e., to exploit me, make use of me, utilise me, even though this utilisation consists merely in my providing proles (proletariat). It wants me to be its creature" (p. 336).

Apart from the fact that one sees here how little it depends on him to realise his value, although everywhere and at all times he can assert his peculiarity, and that here once again, in contradiction to former statements, essence and appearance are totally divorced from each other, we have again the above-mentioned petty-bourgeois view of our bonhomme that the "state" wants to exploit him. The only further point of interest to us is the ancient Roman etymological derivation of the word "proletariat", which is here naively smuggled into the modern state. Does Saint Sancho really not know that wherever the modern state has developed, "providing proles" is for the state, i.e., the official bourgeois, precisely the most unpleasant activity of the proletariat? Perhaps he ought to translate Malthus and Minister Duchâtel into German, for his own benefit? Just now, Saint

---

\(^{a}\) Offspring.—Ed.

\(^{b}\) Thomas Robert Malthus, _An Essay on the Principle of Population_; Charles Marie Duchâtel, _De la Charité_.—Ed.
Sancho, as a German petty bourgeois, "felt" "ever more clearly" that "in opposition to the state he still retained one great power", namely—the power to think in defiance of the state. If he were an English proletarian he would have felt that he "retained the power" to produce children in defiance of the state.

Another jeremiad against the state! Another theory of pauperism! To start with he, as "ego", "creates" "flour, linen or iron and coal", thereby from the outset abolishing division of labour. Then he begins "to complain" "at length" that his work is not paid for at its value, and in the first instance he comes into conflict with those who pay for it. Then the state comes between them in the role of "conciliator".

"If I am not satisfied with the price it" (i.e., the state) "pays for my commodity and labour, if instead I myself endeavour to fix the price of my commodity, i.e., try to see that it is lucrative for me, I come into conflict in the first instance" (a great "in the first instance"!—not with the state, but) "with the buyers of the commodity" (p. 337).

If then he wants to enter into "direct relation" with these buyers, i.e., "seize them by the throat", the state "intervenes", "tears man from man" (although it was not a matter of "man in general" but of worker and employer or, what he lumps together in confusion, of the seller and buyer of commodities); moreover, the state does this with the malicious intention "to put itself in the middle as spirit" (obviously the holy spirit).

"Workers who demand higher wages are treated as criminals as soon as they try to achieve this by force" (p. 337).

Once more we are presented with a bouquet of nonsense. Mr. Senior need never have written his letters on wages if he had first entered into "direct relation" with Stirner, especially as in that case the state would hardly have "torn man from man". Sancho here gives the state a triple function. It first acts as a "conciliator", then as price fixer, and finally as "spirit", as the holy. The fact that, after having gloriously identified private and state property, Saint Sancho also makes the state fix the level of wages, is testimony equally to his great consistency and his ignorance of the affairs of this world. The fact that in England, America and Belgium "workers who try to gain higher wages by force" are by no means immediately treated as "criminals", but on the contrary quite often actually succeed in obtaining higher wages, is also something of which our saint is ignorant, and which disposes of his whole legend about wages. The fact that, even if the state did not "put itself in the middle", the workers would gain nothing by "seizing" their employers "by the

---

Nassau William Senior, *Three Lectures on the Rate of Wages.* — Ed.
throat" or at any rate much less than through association and strikes, that is, so long as they remain workers and their opponents capitalists—this is also something that could be comprehended even in Berlin. There is likewise no need to demonstrate that bourgeois society, which is based on competition, and its bourgeois state, owing to their whole material basis, cannot permit any struggle among the citizens except the struggle of competition, and are bound to intervene not as "spirit", but with bayonets if people "seize each other by the throat".

Incidentally, Stirner's idea that only the state becomes richer when individuals become richer on the basis of bourgeois property, or that up to now all private property has been state property, is an idea that again puts historical relations upside-down. With the development and accumulation of bourgeois property, i.e., with the development of commerce and industry, individuals grew richer and richer while the state fell ever more deeply into debt. This phenomenon was evident already in the first Italian commercial republics; later, since the last century, it showed itself to a marked degree in Holland, where the stock exchange speculator Pinto drew attention to it as early as 1750,\(^a\) and now it is again occurring in England. It is therefore obvious that as soon as the bourgeoisie has accumulated money, the state has to beg from the bourgeoisie and in the end it is actually bought up by the latter. This takes place in a period in which the bourgeoisie is still confronted by another class, and consequently the state can retain some appearance of independence in relation to both of them. Even after the state has been bought up, it still needs money and, therefore, continues to be dependent on the bourgeoisie; nevertheless, when the interests of the bourgeoisie demand it, the state can have at its disposal more funds than states which are less developed and, therefore, less burdened with debts. However, even the least developed states of Europe, those of the Holy Alliance, are inexorably approaching this fate, for they will be bought up by the bourgeoisie; then Stirner will be able to console them with the identity of private and state property, especially his own sovereign, who is trying in vain to postpone the hour when political power will be sold to the "burghers" who have become "angry".

We come now to the relation between private property and right, where we have to listen to the same stuff in another form. The identity of state and private property is apparently given a new turn. Political recognition of private property in law is declared to be the basis of private property.

\(^a\) Isaac Pinto, Lettre sur la Jalousie du Commerce in Traité de la Circulation et du Crédit.—Ed.
“Private property lives by grace of right. It is guaranteed only in right—for possession is not yet property—it becomes mine only with the consent of right; it is not a fact, but a fiction, a thought. That is property by right, rightful property, guaranteed property; it is mine not thanks to me, but thanks to right” (p. 332).

In this passage the previous nonsense about state property merely reaches still more comical heights. We shall, therefore, pass on at once to Sancho’s exploitation of the fictitious *jus utendi et abutendi.*

On page 332 we learn, besides the beautiful passage above, that property
“is unlimited power over something which I can dispose of as I please”. But “power” is “not something existing of itself, but exists only in the powerful ego, in me, the possessor of power” (p. 366). Hence property is not a “thing”, “what is mine is not this tree, but my power over it, my ability to dispose of it” (p. 366). He only knows “things” or “egos”. “The power” which is “separated from the ego”, given independent existence, transformed into a “spectre”, is “right”. “This perpetuated power” (treatise on right of inheritance) “is not extinguished even when I die, but is passed on or inherited. Things now really belong not to me, but to right. On the other hand, this is nothing but a delusion, for the power of the individual becomes permanent, and becomes a right, only because other individuals combine their power with his. The delusion consists in their belief that they cannot take back their power” (pp. 366, 367).

“A dog who sees a bone in the power of another dog stands aside only if it feels it is too weak. Man, however, respects the right of the other man to his bone.... And as here, so in general, it is called ‘human’ when something spiritual, in this case right, is seen in everything, i.e., when everything is made into a spectre and treated as a spectre.... It is human to regard the individual phenomenon not as an individual, but as a universal phenomenon” (pp. 368, 369).

Thus once again the whole mischief arises from the faith of individuals in the conception of right, which they *ought* to get out of their heads. Saint Sancho only knows “things” and “egos”, and as regards anything that does not come under these headings, as regards all relations, he knows only the abstract concepts of them, which for him, therefore, also become “spectres”. “On the other hand”, it does dawn on him at times that all this is “nothing but a delusion” and that the “power of the individual” very much depends on whether others combine their power with his. But in the final analysis everything is nevertheless reduced to the “illusion” that individuals “believe” that they cannot take back their power”. Once again the railways do not “actually” belong to the shareholders, but to the statutes. Sancho immediately puts forward the right of inheritance as a striking example. He explains it not from the necessity for accumulation and from the family which existed before right, but from the juridical fiction of the prolongation of power beyond

---

a The right of using and consuming (also: abusing), i.e., of disposing of a thing at will.— *Ed.*
death.* However, the more feudal society passes into bourgeois society, the more is this juridical fiction itself abandoned by the legislation of all countries. (Cf., for example, the Code Napoléon.) There is no need to show here that absolute paternal power and primogeniture—both natural feudal primogeniture and the later form—were based on very definite material relations. The same thing is to be found among ancient peoples in the epoch of the disintegration of the community in consequence of the development of private life (the best proof of this is the history of the Roman right of inheritance). In general, Sancho could not have chosen a more unfortunate example than the right of inheritance, which in the clearest possible way shows the dependence of right on the relations of production. Compare, for example, Roman and German right of inheritance. Certainly, no dog has ever made phosphorus, bone-meal or lime out of a bone, any more than it has ever "got into its head" anything about its "right" to a bone; equally, it has never "entered the head" of Saint Sancho to reflect whether the right to a bone which people, but not dogs, claim for themselves, is not connected with the way in which people, but not dogs, utilise this bone in production. In general, in this one example we have before us Sancho's whole method of criticism and his unshakable faith in current illusions. The hitherto existing production relations of individuals are bound also to be expressed as political and legal relations. (See above.) Within the division of labour these relations are bound to acquire an independent existence over against the individuals. All relations can be expressed in language only in the form of concepts. That these general ideas and concepts are looked upon as mysterious forces is the necessary result of the fact that the real relations, of which they are the expression, have acquired independent existence. Besides this meaning in everyday consciousness, these general ideas are further elaborated and given a special significance by politicians and lawyers, who, as a result of the division of labour, are dependent on the cult of these concepts, and who see in them, and not in the relations of production, the true basis of all real property relations. Saint Sancho, who takes over this illusion

* [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] He could have learned from more advanced legal systems which adequately express modern property relations, e.g., from the Code civil, that... "The perpetuated power" which "is not extinguished even when I die" is, in the Code civil, reduced to a minimum, and the legal portion of children is a recognition of the material basis of the law and particularly of the law under bourgeois rule.
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a This volume, p. 36.— Ed.
without examination, is thus enabled to declare that property by right is the basis of private property, and that the concept of right is the basis of property by right, after which he can restrict his whole criticism to declaring that the concept of right is a concept, a spectre. That is the end of the matter for Saint Sancho. To set his mind at rest, we can add that in all the early law books the behaviour of two dogs who have found a bone is regarded as right: vim vi repellere licere, say the Pandects; idque jus natura comparatur, by which is meant jus quod natura omnia animalia (people and dogs) docuit; but that later it is “just” the organised repulsion of force by force that becomes right.

Saint Sancho, who is now well under way, proves his erudition in the field of the history of right by disputing a “bone” with Proudhon.

Proudhon, he says, “tries to humbug us into believing that society is the original possessor and sole owner of imprescriptible right; that the so-called owner has committed theft with regard to society; that if society takes from any present-day owner his property, it does not steal anything from him, for it is only asserting its imprescriptible right. That is where one can get with the spectre of society as a juridical person” (pp. 330, 331).

In contrast to this Stirner “tries to humbug us into believing” (pp. 340, 367, 420 and elsewhere) that we, viz., the propertyless, presented the owners with their property, out of ignorance, cowardice or good nature, etc., and he calls on us to take back our gift. The difference between these two “attempts at humbugging” is that Proudhon bases himself on a historical fact, while Saint Sancho has only “got something into his head” in order to give the matter a “new turn”. For recent investigations into the history of right have established that both in Rome and among the German, Celtic and Slav peoples the development of property had as its starting-point communal or tribal property and that private property strictly speaking arose everywhere by usurpation; Saint Sancho could of course not extract this from the profound idea that the concept of right is a concept. In relation to the legal dogmatists, Proudhon was perfectly right when he stressed this fact and in general combated them by means of their own premises. “That is where one can get with the spectre” of the concept of right as a concept. Proudhon could only have been attacked on account of his proposition quoted above if he had defended the earlier and cruder form of property against the private property that had developed out of this primitive
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a It is permissible to repel force by force.—Ed.
b And this right is fixed by nature.—Ed.
c A right which nature has taught all living beings.—Ed.
communal system. Sancho sums up his criticism of Proudhon in the arrogant question:

"Why such a sentimental appeal for sympathy as if he were a poor victim of robbery?" (p. 420).

Sentimentality, of which, incidentally, not a trace is to be found in Proudhon, is only permitted towards Maritornes. Sancho really imagines that he is a "whole fellow" compared with such a believer in apparitions as Proudhon. He considers his inflated bureaucratic style, of which even Frederick William IV would be ashamed, to be revolutionary. "Blessed are those that believe." a

On page 340 we learn:

"All the attempts to enact rational laws about property proceeded from the bay of love into a barren ocean of definitions."

A fitting companion to this is the equally bizarre statement:

"Intercourse hitherto has been based on love, on considerate behaviour, on care for one another" (p. 385).

Saint Sancho here surprises himself with a striking paradox about right and intercourse. If, however, we recall that by "love" he understands love of "Man", love of something existing in and for itself, of the universal, that by love he understands the relation to an individual or thing regarded as essence, the holy, then this appearance of brilliance is dissipated. The oracular utterances quoted above are then reduced to the old trivialities which have bored us throughout the "book", i.e., that two things, about which Sancho knows nothing, viz., in this case hitherto existing right and hitherto existing intercourse, are "the holy", and that in general only "concepts have ruled the world" up to now. The relation to the holy, as a rule called "respect", can on occasion also be entitled "love". (See "Logic".)

Just one example of how Saint Sancho transforms legislation into a love relation, and trade into a love-affair:

"In a Registration Bill for Ireland, the government put forward the proposal to give the suffrage to those who pay a tax of £5 for the poor. Consequently one who gives alms acquires political rights or, elsewhere, becomes a Knight of the Swan" (p. 344).

It is to be noted here first of all that this "Registration Bill" granting "political rights" was a municipal or corporation Bill or, in more comprehensible language to Sancho, an "urban regulation", which was not designed to grant "political rights" but only urban rights, the right to elect local officials. Secondly, Sancho, who translates McCulloch, surely ought to know quite well the meaning
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a Luke 1:45 (paraphrased).—Ed.
of "to be assessed to the poor-rates at five pounds". This does not mean "to pay a tax of £5 for the poor", but means to be entered on the list of those who pay this tax as the tenants of a house the annual rent of which amounts to £5. Our Berlin bonhomme does not know that the poor-rate in England and Ireland is a local tax which varies in amount in different towns and different years, so that it would be a sheer impossibility to connect any sort of right with the payment of a particular amount of tax. Finally, Sancho believes that the English and Irish poor-rate is an "alms"; whereas it only provides funds for a direct and open offensive war of the ruling bourgeoisie against the proletariat. It pays the cost of work-houses which, as is well known, are a Malthusian deterrent against pauperism. We see how Sancho "proceeds from the bay of love into a barren ocean of definitions".

It may be remarked in passing that German philosophy, because it took consciousness alone as its point of departure, was bound to end in moral philosophy, where the various heroes squabble about true morals. Feuerbach loves man for the sake of man, Saint Bruno loves him because he "deserves" it (Wigand, p. 137\textsuperscript{b}), while Saint Sancho loves "everyone", because he likes to do so, with the consciousness of egoism ("the book", p. 387).

We have already seen above—in the first treatise—how the small landed proprietors respectfully excluded themselves from large landed property. This self-exclusion from other people's property, out of respect, is depicted in general as the characteristic of bourgeois property. From this characteristic Stirner is able to explain to himself why it is that "within the bourgeois system, in spite of its implication that everyone should be an owner, the majority have practically nothing" (p. 348). This "occurs because the majority are pleased if they are owners at all, even if they are merely owners of a few rags" (p. 349).

That the "majority" possess only "a few rags", Szeliga regards as a perfectly natural consequence of their love of rags.

Page 343: "Am I thus nothing but an owner? No, hitherto a person was merely an owner, secure in possession of a plot of land by allowing others also to possess their plot; now, however, everything belongs to me. I am the owner of everything that I need and can take possession of."

Just as Sancho previously made small landed proprietors respectfully exclude themselves from large landed property, and now makes the small landed proprietors exclude one another, so he could

---

\textsuperscript{a} McCulloch, \textit{Statistical Account of the British Empire}. The quotation is in English in the manuscript.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} Bruno Bauer, "Charakteristic Ludwig Feuerbachs".—\textit{Ed.}
go into more detail and make respect responsible for the exclusion of commercial property from landed property, of industrial property from commercial property proper, etc., and thus arrive at a totally new political economy on the basis of the holy. He has only then to get respect out of his head in order to abolish at one stroke division of labour and the form of property that arises from it. Sancho gives an example of this new political economy on page 128 of “the book”, where he buys a needle not from a shopkeeper, but from respect, and not with money paid to the shopkeeper, but with respect paid to the needle. Incidentally, the dogmatic self-exclusion of each individual from other people’s property which Sancho attacks is a purely juridical illusion. Under the modern mode of production and intercourse each person delivers a blow at this illusion and directs his efforts precisely to excluding all others from the property that at present belongs to them. How the matter stands with regard to Sancho’s “property in everything” is clear enough from the supplementary clause: “that I need and can take possession of”. He explains this in more detail on page 353:

“If I say: the world belongs to me, then, properly speaking, this too is empty talk, which has meaning only insofar as I do not respect any property of others”; that is insofar as non-respect of the property of others constitutes his property.

What irks Sancho about the private property that is so dear to him is precisely its exclusiveness, without which it would be nonsense—the fact that besides him there are also other private owners. For the private property of others is something holy. We shall see how in his “union” he gets over this inconvenience. We shall find that his egoistical property, property in the extraordinary sense, is nothing but ordinary or bourgeois property transfigured by his sanctifying fantasy.

Let us conclude with the following wisdom of Solomon:

“If people reach a stage where they lose respect for property, then each will possess property ... then [in this matter, too, unions will augment the means of the individual and safeguard his contested property” (p. 342)].

[Treatise No. 3. On competition in the ordinary and extraordinary sense.]

One morning the writer of these lines, in suitable attire, went to see Herr Minister Eichhorn:

“Since things have come to nothing with the factory-owner” (for the Finance Minister had given him neither a site nor funds to build a factory of his own, and the

---

a Here and below the word is in English in the original.—Ed.
b Four pages of the manuscript are missing here.—Ed.
Minister of Justice had not given him permission to take the factory away from the factory-owner—see above on bourgeois property⁵)—"I will compete with this professor of law; the man is a blockhead, and I, who know a hundred times more than he does, will take his audience away from him."—"But, my friend, did you study at a university and get a degree?"—"No, but what of that? I fully understand all that is necessary for teaching."—"I'm sorry, but in this matter there is no free competition. I have nothing against you personally, but the essential thing is lacking—a doctor's diploma—and I, the state, demand it."—"So that is the freedom of competition," sighed the author. "Only the state, my master, gives me the possibility of competing." Whereupon he returned home downcast (p. 347).

In a more advanced country it would not have occurred to him to ask the state for permission to compete with a professor of law. But once he turns to the state as an employer and asks for remuneration, i.e., wages, thus entering the sphere of competition, then of course after his previous treatises about private property and privati, communal property, the proletariat, lettres patentes, the state and status, etc., one cannot suppose that his "solicitation will be successful". Judging by his past feats, the state can at best appoint him as custodian (custos) of "the holy" on some domanial estate in the backwoods of Pomerania.

By way of amusement we can "insert" here "episodically" Sancho's great discovery that there is no "other difference" between the "poor" and the "rich" "than that between the resourceful and the resourceless" (p. 354).

Let us plunge once more into the "barren ocean" of Stirner's "definitions" of competition:

"Competition is connected less" (Oh, "less"!) "with the intention of doing a thing as well as possible, than with the intention of making it as profitable, lucrative, as possible. For that reason people study for the sake of a post (bread-and-butter study), cultivate obsequiousness and flattery, routine and knowledge of business; they work for appearance. Hence while apparently it is a matter of a good performance, in reality people aim only at a good stroke of business and monetary gain. Of course, no one wants to be a censor, but people want to get advancement... people are afraid of being transferred or even more of being dismissed" (pp. 354, 355).

Let our bonhomme discover a textbook on political economy where even theoreticians assert that in competition it is a matter of a "good performance" or "of doing a thing as well as possible" and not of making "it as profitable as possible". Incidentally, in any such book he will find it stated that under the system of private property

---

⁵ See this volume, p. 356.—Ed.

⁶ In the original der Vermögende, a capable, resourceful, powerful or wealthy person.—Ed.

⁷ In the original der Unvermögende, an incapable, resourceless, powerless or destitute person.—Ed.
highly developed competition, for example in England, certainly causes a “thing” to be “done as well as possible”. Small-scale commercial and industrial swindling flourishes only in conditions of restricted competition, among the Chinese, Germans and Jews, and in general among hawkers and small shopkeepers. But even hawking is not mentioned by our saint; he only knows the competition of super-numerary officials and school-masters on probation, he reveals himself here as a downright royal-Prussian junior official. He might just as well have given as an example of competition the endeavour of courtiers in every age to win the favour of their sovereign, but that lay much too far beyond his petty-bourgeois field of vision.

After these tremendous adventures with super-numerary officials, salaried accountants and registrars, Saint Sancho experiences his great adventure with the famous horse Clavileño, of which the prophet Cervantes has already spoken in the New Testament, Chapter 41. For Sancho mounts the high horse of political economy and determines the minimum wage by means of “the holy”. True, here once again he reveals his innate timidity and at first refuses to mount the flying steed that carries him far above the clouds into the region “where hail and snow, thunder, lightning and thunderbolts are engendered”. But the “Duke”, i.e., the “state”, encourages him and as soon as the bolder and more experienced Szeliga-Don Quixote has swung himself into the saddle, our worthy Sancho climbs behind him on to the horse’s crupper. And when Szeliga’s hand had turned the peg on the horse’s head, the horse soared high into the air and all the ladies—especially Maritornes—cried after them: “May egoism in agreement with itself guide you, valiant knight, and you, still more valiant armour-bearer, and may you succeed in liberating us from the spectre of Malambruno, of ‘the holy’. Only keep your balance, valiant Sancho, so that you do not fall and suffer the same fate as Phaeton, when he wanted to drive the chariot of the sun.”

“If we assume” (he is already wavering hypothetically) “that just as order belongs to the essence of the state, subordination too is based on its nature” (a pleasant modulation between “essence” and “nature”—the “goats” which Sancho observed during his flight), “then we observe that the underprivileged are excessively overcharged and defrauded by the inferior” (it should probably read superior) “or privileged” (p. 357).

“If we assume ... then we observe.” It should read: then we assume. If we assume that “superior” and “inferior” exist in the state, then “we assume” likewise that the former are “privileged” compared with the latter. We can, however, ascribe the stylistic
beauty of this sentence, as also the sudden recognition of the “essence” and “nature” of a thing, to the timidty and confusion of our Sancho while anxiously trying to retain his balance during his aerial flight, and to the rockets set alight under his nose. We are not even surprised that Saint Sancho derives the consequences of competition not from competition but from bureaucracy, and once again makes the state determine wages.*

He does not take into consideration that the continual fluctuations in wages explode the whole of his beautiful theory; a closer examination of industrial conditions would certainly have provided him with examples of a factory-owner being “overcharged” and “defrauded” by his workers according to the universal laws of competition, if these juridical and moral expressions had not lost all meaning within the framework of competition.

The dwarfish form to which competition has shrunk for Sancho once again demonstrates the naive and petty-bourgeois manner in which world-embracing relations are reflected inside his unique skull, and the extent to which he as a school-master is bound to extract moral applications from all these relations and to refute them with moral postulates. We must give this precious passage in extenso “so that nothing should be lost”.

“As regards competition again, it exists precisely because not all persons attend to their business and come to an understanding with one another about it. Thus, for example, bread is needed by all the inhabitants of a town; hence they could easily come to an agreement to establish a public bakery. Instead, they leave the supply of bread to competing bakers. Similarly, they leave the supply of meat to the butchers, of wine to the wine merchants, etc.... If I do not concern myself with my business, then I have to be content with what it suits others to offer me. To have bread is my business, my wish and desire, and yet people leave it to the bakers, and hope at most, thanks to their contention, rivalry and their attempts to outstrip one another, in a word, thanks to their competition, to get an advantage which people could not count on under the guild-system, when the right to bake bread belonged wholly and solely to the guilds-men” (p. 365).

It is characteristic of our petty bourgeois that he here recommends to his fellow-philistines, in place of competition, an institution like public bakeries, which existed in many places under the guild-system and which were put an end to by the cheaper competitive mode of production. That is to say, he recommends an
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* [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] Here again he does not take into consideration that the “overcharging” and “defrauding” of the workers in the modern world is due to their lack of property and that the lack of property directly contradicts the assertions which Sancho attributes to the liberal bourgeoisie [...] the liberal bourgeoisie who claim to give property to everyone by parcelling out landed property.
institution of a local nature, which could only persist under narrowly restricted conditions and was inevitably bound to perish with the rise of competition, which abolished local narrowness. He has not even learned from competition that the "need" of bread, for example, differs from day to day, that it does not at all depend on him whether tomorrow bread will still be "his business" or whether others will still regard his need as their business, and that within the framework of competition the price of bread is determined by the costs of production and not by the whim of the bakers. He ignores all those relations which were brought about by competition: the abolition of local narrowness, the establishment of means of communication, highly developed division of labour, world intercourse, the proletariat, machinery, etc., and regretfully looks back to medieval philistinism. All he knows about competition is that it is "contention, rivalry and attempts to outstrip one another"; he is not concerned about its connection with division of labour, the relation between supply and demand, etc.* That the bourgeois, whenever their interests demanded it (and they are better judges of this than Saint Sancho), always "came to an understanding" insofar as this was possible in the framework of competition and private property, is proved by the joint-stock companies, which came into being with the rise of sea-borne trade and manufacture and took possession of all the branches of industry and commerce accessible to them. Such "agreements", which led among other things to the conquest of an empire in the East Indies, are of course a small matter compared with the well-meaning fantasy about public bakeries, which is worthy of being discussed in the Vossische Zeitung.

As for the proletarians, they—at any rate in the modern form—first arose out of competition; they have already repeatedly set up collective enterprises which, however, always perished because they were unable to compete with the "contending" private bakers, butchers, etc., and because for proletarians—owing to the frequent opposition of interests among them arising out of the division of labour—no other "agreement" is possible than a political one.

* [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] At the outset they could have "come to an understanding". That an "understanding" (to use this word with its moral connotations) is only made possible by competition and that because of the antagonistic class interests there can be no question of all people "coming to an understanding", as Sancho suggests, hardly troubles our sage. These German philosophers generally believe that their own petty parochial misery is of world-historical importance, while as regards the most far-reaching historical relations they imagine it was only for want of their wisdom that matters were not settled by "agreement" and everything cleared up. Sancho's example shows how far one can get with such fantasies.
directed against the whole present system. Where the development of competition enables the proletarians to “come to an understanding”, they reach an understanding not about public bakeries but about quite different matters.* The lack of “agreement” between competing individuals that Sancho notes here entirely corresponds to and contradicts his further exposition of competition, which we can enjoy in the “Commentary” (Wigand, p. 173).

“Competition was introduced because it was looked upon as a blessing for all. People came to an agreement about it, attempts were made to approach it jointly ... people agreed about it in much the same way as on a hunting expedition all the hunters taking part ... may find it expedient for their purpose to scatter in the forest and to hunt ‘singly’.... True, it now turns out ... that in the case of competition not everyone gets ... his advantage.”

“It turns out” that Sancho knows as much about hunting as he knows about competition. He is not speaking about a battue nor about hunting with hounds, but about hunting in the extraordinary sense. It only remains for him to write a new history of industry and commerce according to the above principles, and to set up a “union” for this kind of extraordinary hunting.

In the same calm, comfortable style appropriate to a parish magazine he speaks of the relation of competition to morality.

“Those corporeal goods which man as such” (!) “cannot maintain, we have the right to take away from him: this is the meaning of competition, of freedom of industry. Any of the spiritual goods that he cannot maintain devolve likewise upon us. But sanctified goods are inviolable. Sanctified and guaranteed—by whom?... By man or the concept, the concept of the matter under consideration.” As such sanctified goods he cites “life”, “freedom of the person”, “religion”, “honour”, “sense of decency”, “sense of shame”, etc. ([Stirner, Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum,] p. 325).

In the advanced countries, Stirner “has the right” to take all these “sanctified goods”, although not from “man as such”, but from actual men, of course, by means of and under the conditions of competition. The great revolution of society brought about by competition, which resolved the relations of the bourgeois to one another and to the proletarians into purely monetary relations, and converted all the above-named “sanctified goods” into articles of trade, and which destroyed for the proletarians all naturally derived and traditional relations, e.g., family and political relations, together

* [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] “They” should “come to an understanding” about a public bakery. It does not, of course, concern our Sancho that in each epoch those whom he calls “they” and “all” are themselves diverse individuals with diverse interests, living under diverse conditions. During the whole course of history until now individuals have always made the mistake that, from the very outset, they did not adopt the overwise “cleverness” with which, after the events, our German philosophers are expatiating about them.
with their entire ideological superstructure—this mighty revolution
did not, of course, originate in Germany. Germany played only a
passive role in it; she allowed her sanctified goods to be taken from
her without even getting the current price for them. Hence our
German petty bourgeois knows only the hypocritical assertions of the
bourgeoisie about the moral limits of competition observed by the
bourgeoisie, which every day tramples underfoot the "sanctified
goods" of the proletarians, their "honour", "sense of shame" and
"freedom of the person", and which even deprives them of religious
instruction. These would-be "moral limits" are regarded by Sancho
as the true "meaning" of competition, and its reality is excluded
from its meaning.

Sancho sums up the results of his investigation of competition as
follows:

"Is the competition free which the state, this ruler, according to bourgeois
principles, cramps by a thousand barriers?" (p. 347).

Sancho's "bourgeois principles" of everywhere making the "state"
the "ruler" and regarding the barriers of competition that arise from
the mode of production and intercourse as barriers by which the
"state" "cramps" competition, are here once more proclaimed with
suitable "indignation".

"Recently" Saint Sancho has vaguely heard miscellaneous news
"from France" (cf. Wigand, p. 190), inter alia, about the objectifica-
tion of persons in competition and the difference between competi-
tion and emulation. But the "poor Berliner" has, "out of stupidity,
spoilt these fine things" (Wigand, ibid., where it is his guilty
conscience that speaks). "Thus, for example, he says" on page 346 of
"the book":

"Is free competition actually free? Indeed, is it real competition, i.e., competition
of persons, as it gives itself out to be, because it bases its right on this title?"

Madame Competition gives herself out to be something, because
she (i.e., some lawyers, politicians and petty-bourgeois dreamers,
trailing in the tail of her suite) bases her right on this title. With this
allegory Sancho begins to adapt the "fine things" "from France" to
suit the Berlin meridian. We shall skip the absurd assertion already
dealt with above that "the state has no objection to make against me
personally" and thus allows me to compete, but does not give me the
"thing" (p. 347), and we shall pass straight on to his proof that
competition is not at all a competition of persons.

"But is it persons who actually compete? No, it is again only things! In the first
place—money, etc. There is always one who lags behind the other in the contest. But it
makes a difference whether the means that are lacking can be gained through personal
power or can only be obtained by grace, as a gift, and moreover by the poorer, for instance, being forced to leave, i.e., to present, his wealth to the richer" (p. 348).

As for the gift theory, we shall "spare him" (Wigand, p. 190). Let him look up the chapter on "contract" in any textbook of law and find out whether a "gift" he is "forced to present" is still a gift. In this way, Stirner "presents" us with our criticism of his book, for he "is forced to leave, i.e., to present", it to us.

The fact that of two competitors whose "things" are equal one ruins the other, does not exist for Sancho. That workers compete among themselves, although they possess no "things" (in Stirner's sense) is also a fact that does not exist for him. By doing away with the competition of workers among themselves, he is fulfilling one of the most pious wishes of our "true socialists", whose deepest thanks he is sure to receive. So it is "only things" and not "persons" that compete. Only weapons fight, not the people who use them, and who have learned to wield them. The people are only there to be shot dead. This is how the competitive struggle is reflected in the minds of petty-bourgeois school-masters who, faced with modern stock exchange barons and cotton-lords, console themselves with the thought that they only lack the "things" in order to bring their "personal power" to bear against them. This narrow-minded idea appears still more comic if one looks a little more closely at the "things", instead of restricting oneself to the commonest and most popular, e.g., "money" (which, however, is not so popular as it seems). These "things" include, among others: that the competitor lives in a country and town, where he enjoys the same advantages as the competitors whom he encounters; that relations between town and countryside have reached an advanced stage of development; that he is competing under favourable geographical, geological and hydrographical conditions; that as a silk manufacturer he carries on his business in Lyons, as a cotton manufacturer in Manchester, or, in an earlier period, as a shipper in Holland; that division of labour in his branch of industry—as in other branches totally independent of him—has become highly developed; that the means of communication ensure him the same cheap transport as his competitors; and that he finds in existence skilful workers and experienced overseers. All these "things", which are essential for competition, and in general the ability to compete on the world market (which he does not know and cannot know because of his theory of the state and public

---

a In German, a pun on the word schenken, which means to give, to present, to make a gift of, but which in a certain context can also mean to spare, to let off.—Ed.

b This word is in English in the manuscript.—Ed.
bakeries, but which, unfortunately, determines competition and the ability to compete), are "things" that he can neither gain by "personal power" nor "get presented" to him by "grace" of the "state" (cf. p. 348). The Prussian state, which attempted to "present" all this to the Seehandlung, could give him the best instruction on that subject. Sancho appears here as the royal Prussian philosopher of the Seehandlung, by giving a detailed commentary on the illusion of the Prussian state about its omnipotence and the illusion of the Seehandlung about its competitive capacity. Incidentally, competition certainly began as a "competition of persons" possessing "personal means". The liberation of the feudal serfs, the first condition of competition, and the first accumulation of "things" were purely "personal" acts. If, therefore, Sancho wishes to put the competition of persons in the place of competition of things, it means that he wishes to return to the beginning of competition, imagining in doing so that by his good will and his extraordinary egoistical consciousness he can give a different direction to the development of competition.

This great man, for whom nothing is holy and who is not interested in the "nature of things" and the "concept of the relation", has nevertheless in the end to declare the "nature" of the difference between personal and material to be holy, as also the "concept of the relation" between these two qualities, and so renounce the role of "creator" in respect of them. The difference—regarded by him as holy—which he notes in the passage quoted, can nevertheless be abolished without thereby committing "the most unmitigated profanation". Firstly he abolishes it himself by causing material means to be acquired through personal power and thus converts personal power into material power. He can then calmly address others with the moral postulate that they should adopt a personal attitude to him. In just the same way the Mexicans could have demanded that the Spaniards should not shoot them with rifles but attack them with their fists or, according to Saint Sancho's proposal, "seize them by the throat" in order to adopt a "personal" attitude to them.

If one person, thanks to good food, careful education and physical exercise, has acquired well-developed bodily powers and skill, while another, owing to inadequate and unhealthy food and consequent poor digestion, and as the result of neglect in childhood and over-exertion, has never been able to acquire the "things" necessary for developing his muscles—not to mention acquiring mastery over them—then the "personal power" of the first in relation to the second is a purely material one. It was not "through personal power" that he gained the "means that were lacking"; on the contrary, he
owes his "personal power" to the material means already existing. Incidentally, the transformation of personal means into material means and vice versa is only an aspect of competition and quite inseparable from it. The demand that competition should be conducted not with material means but with personal means amounts to the moral postulate that competition and the relations on which it depends should have consequences other than those inevitably arising from them.

Here is yet another, and this time the final summing-up of the philosophy of competition:

"Competition suffers from the drawback that not everyone has the means for competition, because these means are taken not from personality, but from chance. The majority are without means and therefore" (Oh, Therefore!) "impecunious" (p. 349).

It has already been pointed out to him that in competition personality itself is a matter of chance, while chance is personality. The "means" for competition which are independent of personality are the conditions of production and intercourse of the persons themselves, which within the framework of competition appear as an independent force in relation to these persons, as means which are accidental for them. The liberation of people from these forces comes about, according to Sancho, by people getting out of their heads the ideas about these forces, or rather the philosophical and religious distortions of these ideas—whether by etymological synonymy ("Vermögen" and "vermögen"), moral postulates (e.g., let each one be an all-powerful ego), or by making monkey faces and by sentimentally comic bragging against "the holy".

We have heard the complaint made before that in present-day bourgeois society the "ego", especially because of the state, cannot realise its value, i.e., cannot bring its "abilities" [Vermögen] into play. Now we learn in addition that "peculiarity" does not give the "ego" the means for competition, that "its might" is no might at all and that it remains "impecunious", although every object, "being its object, is also its property".* It is a complete denial of egoism in agreement with itself. But all these "drawbacks" of competition will disappear, once "the book" has become part of the general consciousness of people. Until then Sancho persists in his trade in thoughts, without however achieving a "good performance" or "doing things as well as possible".

* [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] The difference between essence and appearance asserts itself here in spite of Sancho.

---

3 See this volume, pp. 78-79.—Ed.
II. Rebellion

The criticism of society brings to an end the criticism of the old, holy world. By means of rebellion we make a leap into the new, egoistical world.

We have already seen in "Logic" what rebellion is in general; it is refusal to respect the holy. Here, however, rebellion acquires in addition a distinct practical character.


Etc., etc. Page 422 et seq. The method hitherto used by people to overthrow the world in which they found themselves had, of course, also to be declared holy, and a "peculiar" method of smashing the existing world had to be asserted against it.

Revolution "consists in a transformation of the existing conditions [Zustand] or status, of the state or society; hence it is a political or social act". "Although the inevitable consequence" of rebellion "is a transformation of existing conditions, it is not this transformation that is its starting-point, but people's dissatisfaction with themselves". "It is an uprising of individuals, a rising without regard for the arrangements that develop out of it. Revolution aimed at new arrangements; rebellion leads to a position where we no longer allow others to arrange things for us, but arrange things for ourselves. It is not a struggle against what exists, for if it prospers what exists will collapse of itself; it is only the setting free of me from what exists. If I abandon what exists, then it is dead and putrefies. But since my aim is not to overthrow something that exists, but for me to rise above it, my aim and action are not political or social, but egoistical for they are directed solely towards me and my peculiarity" (pp. 421, 422).

Les beaux esprits se rencontrent." That which was proclaimed by the voice crying in the wilderness is now come about. The impious John the Baptist "Stirner" has found his holy Messiah in the shape of "Dr. Kuhlmann from Holstein". Listen:

"You should not tear down or destroy what stands in your way, but avoid it and abandon it. And when you have avoided and abandoned it, it will disappear of itself, for it will no longer find sustenance" (Das Reich des Geistes, etc., Genf, 1845, p. 116).

---

\(^a\) See this volume, p. 300.—Ed.
\(^b\) Zustand—state of affairs, conditions.—Ed.
\(^c\) Noble minds think alike.—Ed.
\(^d\) Mark 1:3.—Ed.
\(^e\) Georg Kuhlmann. Die Neue Welt oder das Reich des Geistes auf Erden.—Ed.
The difference between revolution and Stirner's rebellion is not, as Stirner thinks, that the one is a political and social act whereas the other is an egoistical act, but that the former is an act whereas the latter is no act at all. The whole senselessness of the antithesis that Stirner puts forward is evident at once from the fact that he speaks of "the Revolution" as a juridical person, which has to fight against "what exists", another juridical person. If Saint Sancho had studied the various actual revolutions and revolutionary attempts perhaps he might even have found in them the forms of which he had a vague inkling when he created his ideological "rebellion"; he might have found them, for example, among the Corsicans, Irish, Russian serfs, and in general among uncivilised peoples. If, moreover, he had concerned himself with the actual individuals "existing" in every revolution, and with their relations, instead of being satisfied with the pure ego and "what exists", i.e., substance (a phrase the overthrow of which requires no revolution, but merely a knight-errant like Saint Bruno), then perhaps he would have come to understand that every revolution, and its results, was determined by these relations, by needs, and that the "political or social act" was in no way in contradiction to the "egoistical act".

The depth of Saint Sancho's insight into "revolution" is shown in his statement:

"Although the consequence of rebellion is a transformation of existing conditions, [...] this transformation is not its starting-point."

This implies, by way of antithesis, that the starting-point of the revolution is "a transformation of existing conditions", i.e., that revolution originates in revolution. "The starting-point" of rebellion, on the other hand, is "people's dissatisfaction with themselves". This "dissatisfaction with oneself" fits admirably with the earlier phrases about peculiarity and the "egoist in agreement with himself", who is always able to go "his own way", who is always delighted with himself and who at every instant is what he can be. Dissatisfaction with oneself is either dissatisfaction with oneself within the framework of a definite condition which determines the whole personality, e.g., dissatisfaction with oneself as a worker, or it is moral dissatisfaction. In the first case, therefore, it is simultaneously and mainly dissatisfaction with the existing relations; in the second case—an ideological expression of these relations themselves, which does not at all go beyond them, but belongs wholly to them. The first case, as Sancho believes, leads to revolution; for rebellion there remains, therefore, only the second case—moral dissatisfaction with oneself. "What exists" is, as we know, "the holy";
hence, "dissatisfaction with oneself" reduces itself to moral dissatisfaction with oneself as a holy one, i.e., one who believes in the holy, in what exists. It could only occur to a discontented school-master to base his arguments about revolution and rebellion on satisfaction and dissatisfaction, moods that belong wholly to the petty-bourgeois circle from which, as we continually find, Saint Sancho derives his inspiration.

We already know what meaning "going beyond the framework of what exists" has. It is the old fancy that the state collapses of itself as soon as all its members leave it and that money loses its validity if all the workers refuse to accept it. Even in a hypothetical form, this proposition reveals all the fantasy and impotence of pious desire. It is the old illusion that changing existing relations depends only on the good will of people, and that existing relations are ideas. The alteration of consciousness divorced from actual relations—a pursuit followed by philosophers as a profession, i.e., as a business—is itself a product of existing relations and inseparable from them. This imaginary rising above the world is the ideological expression of the impotence of philosophers in face of the world. Practical life every day gives the lie to their ideological bragging.

In any event, Sancho did not "rebel" against his own state of confusion when he wrote those lines. For him there is the "transformation of existing conditions" on one side, and "people" on the other side, and the two sides are entirely separate from each other. Sancho does not give the slightest thought to the fact that the "conditions" have always been the conditions of these people and it would never have been possible to transform them unless the people transformed themselves and, if it has to be expressed in this way, unless they became "dissatisfied with themselves" in the old conditions. He thinks he is dealing a mortal blow at revolution when he asserts that it aims at new arrangements, whereas rebellion leads to a position where we no longer allow others to arrange things for us, but arrange things for ourselves. But the very fact that "we" arrange things for "ourselves", that it is "we" who rebel, denotes that the individual, despite all Sancho's "repugnance", has to "allow" that "we" "arrange things" for him, and that therefore the only difference between revolution and rebellion is that in the former this is known, whereas in the latter people harbour illusions about it. Next Sancho leaves it open whether the rebellion "prospers" or not. One cannot understand why it should not "prosper", and even less why it should prosper, since each rebel goes his own way. Worldly conditions would have to intervene to show the rebels the necessity of a joint act, one which
would be "political or social", irrespective of whether it arises from egoistical motives or not. A further "trashy distinction", based again on confusion, is that drawn by Sancho between the "overthrow" of what exists and "rising" above it, as though in overthrowing what exists he does not rise above it, and in rising above it, he does not overthrow it, if only insofar as it exists in him himself. Incidentally, neither "overthrow" by itself nor "rising" by itself tells us anything; that "rising" also takes place in revolution Sancho could have seen from the fact that "Levons-nous!" was a well-known slogan in the French Revolution.

"Revolution bids" (!) "us to create institutions, rebellion urges us to rise or rise up." Revolutionary minds were occupied with the choice of a constitution, and the entire political period teems with constitutional struggles and constitutional questions, just as socially-gifted persons revealed extraordinary inventiveness as regards social institutions (phalansteries and such-like). To be without a constitution is the endeavour of the rebel" (p. 422).

That the French Revolution brought institutions in its train is a fact; that Empörung is derived from the word empor is also a fact; that during the revolution and after it people fought for constitutions is another fact, and equally so that various social systems were outlined; and it is no less a fact that Proudhon spoke about anarchy. From these five facts Sancho has concocted the above-quoted passage.

From the fact that the French Revolution led to "institutions", Sancho concludes that this is a "bidding" of revolution in general. From the fact that the political revolution was a political one in which the social transformation had also an official expression in the form of constitutional struggles, Sancho—faithfully following his history-broker—deduces that in it people fought over the best constitution. To this discovery he links, by means of the words "just as", a mention of social systems. In the epoch of the bourgeoisie, people occupied themselves with constitutional questions, "just as" in recent times various social systems have been devised. This is the train of thought in the above-quoted passage.

It follows from what was said above against Feuerbach that previous revolutions within the framework of division of labour were bound to lead to new political institutions; it likewise follows that the communist revolution, which removes the division of labour, ultimately abolishes political institutions; and, finally, it follows also

---

\[\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\] Stirner uses three words which have a common root: Einrichtung—arrangement, institution—and the synonyms sich aufrichten and emporrichten—to stand up, to raise oneself, to rise.—\textit{Ed.}

\[\text{\textsuperscript{b}}\] Empörung—rising, rebellion; empor—up, upwards.—\textit{Ed.}

\[\text{\textsuperscript{c}}\] An allusion to Bruno Bauer.—\textit{Ed.}

\[\text{\textsuperscript{d}}\] See this volume, p. 53.—\textit{Ed.}
that the communist revolution will be guided not by the "social institutions of inventive socially-gifted persons", but by the productive forces.

But "to be without a constitution is the endeavour of the rebel"! He who is "born free", who is from the outset rid of everything, endeavours at the end of time to get rid of the constitution.

It should be mentioned also that all sorts of earlier illusions of our bonhomme contributed to Sancho's concept of "rebellion". They include, among others, his belief that the individuals who make a revolution are linked by some ideal bond and that their "raising the standard of revolt" is limited to inscribing on it a new concept, fixed idea, spectre, or apparition—the holy. Sancho makes them get this ideal bond out of their heads, whereby in his imagination they become a disorderly mob which can now only "rebel". In addition, he has heard that competition is a war of all against all, and this proposition, mixed with his desanctified revolution, constitutes the main factor of his "rebellion".

"When, for the sake of clarity, I try to think of a comparison, there comes to my mind, against my expectation, the foundation of Christianity" (p. 423). "Christ", we learn here, "was not a revolutionary but a rebel who rose. Therefore, he was concerned about one thing alone: 'be ye wise as serpents'" (ibid.).

In order to suit the "expectation" and the "alone" of Sancho the second half of the biblical text quoted (Matthew 10:16) "and harmless as doves" ought not to exist. Christ has to figure here for the second time as a historical person in order to play the same role as the Mongols and Negroes played above. Whether Christ is meant to clarify the rebellion or the rebellion to clarify Christ is not known. The Christian-German gullibility of our saint is concentrated in the statement that Christ "drained the sources of life of the entire heathen world, and without them" (this ought to read: without him) "the existing state was anyway bound to wither" (p. 424). A withered flower of pulpit eloquence! See above on the "ancients". For the rest, credo ut intelligam, or, in order to find a "comparison for the sake of clarity".

Countless examples have already shown us that everywhere nothing but sacred history comes into our saint's mind and, indeed, in precisely those passages where the reader "has not expected" it. "Against expectation" it occurs to him again even in the "Commentary", where Sancho on page 154 makes the "Judaic reviewers" in

---

a Thomas Hobbes, Elementa philosophica. De cive [Præfatio ad lectores].—Ed.

b I believe in order to understand. The expression belongs to the medieval scholastic Anselm of Canterbury.—Ed.
ancient Jerusalem exclaim in opposition to the Christian definition "God is love": “Thus you see that it is heathen God that is proclaimed by the Christians; for if God is love, then he is the God Amor, the God of love!”—“Against expectation”. however, the New Testament was written in Greek, and the “Christian definition” reads: \(\text{ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἡστιν} \) (1 John 4:16), whereas “the God Amor, the God of love” is called "\(\text{Ἐρως}\). Sancho has, therefore, still to explain how it is that the “Judaic reviewers” were able to achieve the transformation of \(\text{ἀγάπη} \) into \(\text{ἔρως}\). In this passage of the “Commentary”, Christ—again “for the sake of clarity”—is compared with Sancho, and at any rate it must be admitted that they have a striking resemblance to each other, both are “corpulent beings” and the joyful heir at least believes in the existence, or the uniqueness, of both of them. Sancho is the modern Christ, at this “fixed idea” of his the whole historical construction is “aimed”.

The philosophy of rebellion, which has just been presented to us in the form of bad antitheses and withered flowers of eloquence, is in the final analysis only a boastful apology for the parvenu system (parvenu, 
\text{Emporkömmling, Emporgekommener, Empörer}^b). Every rebel in his “egoistical act” is faced by a particular existing reality, over which he endeavours to rise, without regard to the general conditions. He strives to get rid of the existing world only insofar as it is a fetter, for the rest, he endeavours, on the contrary, to appropriate it. The weaver who “rises” to become a factory-owner thereby gets rid of his loom and abandons it; for the rest, the world goes on as before and our “prosperous” rebel offers to others only the hypocritical moral demand that they should become parvenus like himself.* Thus, all Stirner’s belligerent rodomontades end in moral deductions from Gellert’s fables and speculative interpretations of middle-class wretchedness.

So far we have seen that rebellion is anything you like, except action. On page 342 we learn that “the procedure of seizure is not contemptible, but expresses the \text{pure action of the egoist in agreement with himself}”:

This should surely read: of egoists in agreement \textit{with one another}, since otherwise seizure amounts to the uncivilised “procedure” of

* [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] These are the traditional moral principles of the petty bourgeois, who believes that the world will be set to rights, if everyone by himself tries to get as far as possible and for the rest does not trouble his head about the course of the world.

---

\(^a\) God is love.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^b\) A pun on Stirner’s synonymy: \textit{Emporkömmling} (upstart), \textit{Emporgekommener} (one who has raised himself up), and \textit{Empörer} (rebel).—\textit{Ed.}
thieves or to the civilised “procedure” of the bourgeois, and in the first case does not prosper, while in the second case it is not “rebellion”. It is to be noted that corresponding to the egoist in agreement with himself, who does nothing, we have here the “pure” act, certainly the only act which could be expected from such an inactive individual.

We learn by the way what created the plebs, and we can be sure in advance that it was created by a “dogma”, and faith in that dogma, in the holy, a faith which here for a change appears as consciousness of sin:

“Seizure is a sin, a crime—this is the dogma that alone creates a plebs ... the old consciousness of sin alone is to blame” (p. 342).

The belief that consciousness is to blame for everything is his dogma, which makes him a rebel and the plebs a sinner.

In contrast to this consciousness of sin, the egoist incites himself, respectively the plebs, to seizure as follows:

“I tell myself: where my power extends, that is my property, and I claim as my property everything that I feel strong enough to reach,” etc. (p. 340).

Thus, Saint Sancho tells himself that he wants to tell himself something, calls on himself to have what he has, and formulates his real relation as a relation of power—a paraphrase which in general is the secret of all his rodomontades. (See “Logic”.) Then he—who at each instant is what he can be, and therefore has what he can have—distinguishes his realised, actual property, which he has in his capital account, from his possible property, his unrealised “feeling of strength”, which he enters in his profit and loss account. This is a contribution to the science of book-keeping of property in the extraordinary sense.

The meaning of his solemn “telling” was revealed by Sancho in a passage already quoted:

“I tell myself ... then that is, properly speaking, empty talk.”

Sancho continues:

“Egoism” says “to the propertyless plebs” in order to “exterminate” it: “Seize and take what you need!” (p. 341).

How “empty” this “talk” is can be seen at once from the following example:

“I as little regard the wealth of the banker as something alien, as Napoleon did the lands of the kings. We” (“I” is suddenly transformed into “we”) “are not at all afraid to conquer this wealth, and we also seek the means to do so. Thus, we divest it of its alien character which we were afraid of” (p. 369).
How little Sancho has “divested” the wealth of the banker of its “alien character” he proves at once by his well-meaning advice to the plebs to “conquer” it by seizure. “Let him seize and see what is left in his hands!” Not the wealth of the banker but useless paper, the “corpse” of that wealth which is no more wealth than “a dead dog is a dog”. The wealth of the banker is wealth only in the framework of the existing relations of production and intercourse and can be “conquered” only in the conditions of these relations and with the means which are valid for them. And if Sancho were to turn to some other wealth, he would find that the prospect was no better. Thus, the “pure act of the egoist in agreement with himself” amounts in the final analysis to an extremely impure misunderstanding. “That is where one can get with the spectre” of the holy.

Having told himself what he wanted to tell himself, Sancho makes the rebellious plebs say what he has prompted it to say. The fact is that in case of a rebellion he has drawn up a proclamation together with instructions as to its use, which should be posted up in all village ale-houses and distributed throughout the countryside. The proclamation claims a place in Der hinkende Botte and in the Duchy of Nassau’s country almanac. For the time being Sancho’s tendances incendiaires are limited to the countryside, to propaganda among agricultural labourers and dairy maids, not touching the towns, which is a further proof of the extent to which he has “divested” large-scale industry of its “alien character”. Nevertheless we should like here to give as detailed an account as possible of this valuable document, which ought not to be lost, in order “to contribute to the spread of a well-deserved fame insofar as it lies in our power” (Wigand, p. 191).

The proclamation is printed on page 358 et seq. [of “the book”] and begins as follows:

“But what is it due to that your property is safe, you privileged ones?... It is due to the fact that we refrain from attacking, consequently, it is due to our protection.... It is due to the fact that you use force against us.”

First it is due to the fact that we refrain from attacking, i.e., to the fact that we use force against ourselves, and then to the fact that you use force against us. Cela va à merveille! Let us continue.

“If you desire our respect, then buy it at a price acceptable to us.... We only want good value.”

First the “rebels” want to sell their respect at an “acceptable price” and then they make “good value” the criterion of the price. First an arbitrary price, then a price determined independently of arbitrariness by commercial laws, by the costs of production and the relation between supply and demand.
"We agree to leave you your property provided you properly compensate this leaving.... You will shout about force if we help ourselves.... without force we shall not get them" (i.e., the oysters that the privileged enjoy).... "We intend taking nothing from you, nothing at all."

First we "leave" it to you, then we take it away from you and have to use "force", and finally we prefer taking nothing from you after all. We leave it to you in the event of your giving it up yourself; in a moment of enlightenment, the only one we have, we see that this "leaving" amounts to "helping oneself" and use of "force", but in the end we cannot be reproached with "taking" anything from you. And there the matter must rest.

"We toil for twelve hours in the sweat of our brows and you offer us a few pence for it. In that case you should take an equal amount for your work too.... No equality at all!"

The "rebellious" agricultural labourers reveal themselves as true Stirnerian "creations".

"You do not like that? You imagine that our work is more than adequately paid with those wages, but that yours, on the other hand, deserves a wage of several thousand. But if you did not put such a high value on your work and allowed us to realise a better value for ours, we would, if need be, achieve something more important than you do for many thousand taler, and if you received only such wages as ours, you would soon become more diligent in order to earn more. If you were to do something that appears to us to be ten and a hundred times more valuable than our own work, ah" (ah, you good and faithful servant?) "then you should get a hundred times more for it; we, for our part, are also thinking of making you things for which you will pay us more than the usual daily wage."

First the rebels complain that they are paid too little for their work. At the end, however, they promise that only if they receive a higher daily wage, they will perform work for which it will be worth paying "more than the usual daily wage". Further, they believe they would achieve extraordinary things if only they were to receive better wages, although at the same time they expect extraordinary achievements from the capitalist only if his "wage" is reduced to the level of theirs. Finally, after having performed the economic feat of transforming profit—this necessary form of capital, without which they would perish together with the capitalist—into wages, they perform the miracle of paying "a hundred times more" than they receive for "their own work", i.e., a hundred times more than they earn. "This is the meaning" of the above phrase, if Stirner "means what he says". But if this is only a stylistic error on his part, if the rebels intend jointly to offer the capitalist a hundred times more

---

a Matthew 25:21.— Ed.
than each of them earns, then Stirner is only making them offer the capitalist what each capitalist already has nowadays. For it is clear that the work of the capitalist, in combination with his capital, is worth ten or a hundred times more than that of a single person who is merely a worker. Hence in this case, as always, Sancho leaves everything as it was before.

"We shall get on with one another if only we agree that no one any longer needs to present anything to someone else. Then we shall presumably go as far as to pay a decent price even to cripples, the sick and the aged, to prevent them from dying of hunger and want, for if we wish them to live it is fitting that we should pay for the fulfilment of our desire. I say pay for, hence I do not mean any miserable alms."

This sentimental episode about cripples, etc., is intended to prove that Sancho's rebellious agricultural labourers have already "risen" to those heights of middle-class consciousness where they do not wish to present anything or be presented with anything, and where they consider that the dignity and interests of the two parties in a relation are assured as soon as this relation is turned into a purchase.

This thunderous proclamation of the people who, in Sancho's imagination, are in rebellion, is followed by directions for its use in the form of a dialogue between a landowner and his labourers, the master this time behaving like Szeliga and the labourers like Stirner. In these directions the English strikes and the French workers' coalitions are interpreted a priori in the Berlin manner.

Spokesman of the labourers: "What have you got?"
Landowner: "I have an estate of 1,000 morgen."a
Spokesman: "And I am your labourer, and henceforth I will only cultivate your land for a wage of a taler a day."
Landowner: "In that case I shall hire someone else."
Spokesman: "You won't find anyone, for we labourers will not work in future on any other conditions, and if you find anyone who agrees to take less, let him beware of us. Even a servant-girl now demands as much, and you will no longer find anyone for a lower wage."
Landowner: "Oh! Then I shall be ruined!"
Labourers (in chorus): "Don't be in such a hurry! You are sure to get as much as we get. And if not, we'll deduct sufficient for you to live like us.—We are not talking of equality!"
Landowner: "But I am accustomed to better living!"
Labourers: "We have nothing against that, but that's not our concern; if you can save more, all right. Do we have to hire ourselves out at a reduced price so that you can live well?"
Landowner: "But you uneducated people do not need so much!"
Labourers: "Well, we shall take a little more so as to be able to get the education that we may, perhaps, need."
Landowner: "But if you ruin the rich, who will support the arts and sciences?"

---

a An old Germanic land measure of varying size in different parts of the country. The Prussian morgen for example was 0.63 acre.—Ed.
Labourers: “Well, our numbers must see to that. We'll all contribute, it will make a good round sum. Anyway, you wealthy people now buy only the trashiest books and pictures of tearful madonnas or a pair of nimble dancer's legs.”
Landowner: “Oh, miserable equality!”
Labourers: “No, dear worthy master, we are not talking of equality! We only want to be appraised according to our worth, and if you are worth more, then after all you will also be appraised more highly. We only want good value and intend to show ourselves worth the price you will pay.”

At the end of this dramatic masterpiece Sancho admits that, of course, “unanimity of the labourers” will be “required”. How this will come about we are not told. What we do learn is that the agricultural labourers have no intention of changing in any way the existing relations of production and intercourse, but merely want to force the landowner to yield them the amount by which his expenditure exceeds theirs. It is a matter of indifference to our well-meaning bonhomme that this excess of expenditure, if distributed over the mass of the proletarians, would give each of them a mere trifle and not improve his position in the slightest. The stage of development of agriculture to which these heroic labourers belong becomes evident immediately after the conclusion of the drama, when they are transformed into “domestic servants”. They are living, therefore, under patriarchal conditions in which division of labour is still very little developed, and in which, incidentally, the whole conspiracy “will reach its final goal” by the landowner taking the spokesman into a barn and giving him a thrashing, whereas in more civilised countries the capitalist ends the matter by closing his enterprise for a time and letting his workers go and “play”. Sancho's highly practical way of constructing his work of art, his strict adherence to the limits of probability, is evident not only from his peculiar idea of arranging a turn-out of agricultural labourers, but especially from his coalition of “servant-girls”. And how complacent to imagine that the price of corn on the world market will depend on the wage demands of these agricultural labourers from Further Pomerania and not on the relation between supply and demand! A real sensation is caused by the surprising discourse of the labourers about literature, the latest art exhibition and the fashionable dancer of the day, surprising even after the unexpected question of the landowner about art and science. They become quite friendly as soon as they touch on this literary subject and for a moment the harassed landowner even forgets his threatened ruin in order to demonstrate his dévouement to art and science. Finally the rebels give him an assurance of their upright character and make the reassuring

---

a Here and below the word is in English in the manuscript.— Ed.
statement that they are guided neither by vexatious interests nor subversive tendencies, but by the highest moral motives. All they ask is price according to worth and they promise on their honour and conscience to be worthy of the higher price. All this has the sole aim of ensuring for each his own, his honest and fair earnings, “honestly earned pleasure”. That this price depends on the state of the labour-market, and not on the moral rebellion of a few literary-minded agricultural labourers, is, of course, a fact which our worthy folk could not be expected to know.

These rebels from Further Pomerania are so modest that despite their “unanimity”, which gives them the power to do something very different, they prefer to remain servants with the “wage of a taler a day” as their highest desire. It is quite consistent, therefore, that they do not cross-examine the landowner, who is in their power, but he cross-examines them.

The “firm spirit” and “strong self-consciousness of the domestic servant” find expression also in the “firm”, “strong” language in which he and his comrades speak. “Perhaps—well—our numbers must see to that—a good round sum—dear worthy master—after all.” Previously we read in the proclamation: “If need be—ah—we are thinking of making—perhaps, maybe, etc.” One would think that the agricultural labourers had also mounted the wonderful steed Clavileño.*

Our Sancho’s whole noisy “rebellion”, therefore, reduces itself in the final analysis to a turn-out, but a turn-out in the extraordinary sense, viz., a turn-out on Berlin lines. Whereas in civilised countries the real turn-out plays a smaller and smaller role in the labour movement, because the more widespread association of workers leads to other forms of action, Sancho tries to depict the petty-bourgeois caricature of a turn-out as the ultimate and highest form of the world-historic struggle.

The waves of rebellion now cast us on the shore of the promised land, flowing with milk and honey, where every true Israelite sits beneath his fig-tree and where the millennium of “agreement” has dawned.

* [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] France produces relatively more than Further Pomerania. According to Michel Chevalier [Cours d’Economie politique fait au Collège de France], the entire annual product of France uniformly distributed among its population amounts to 97 francs a head, this means per family....

---

\(^a\) Exodus 3:8.— Ed.
In the section on rebellion we first of all collected examples of Sancho’s bragging, and then traced the practical course of the “pure act of the egoist in agreement with himself”. With regard to “union”, we shall do the opposite: we shall first of all examine the actual institutions and then compare them with the illusions of our saint about them.

1. Landed Property

“If we no longer wish to leave the land to the landed proprietors, but want to appropriate it for ourselves, then we unite to this end and form a union, société” (society), “which makes itself the owner; if we are successful, the landed proprietors cease to be such.” The “land” will then be the “property of the conquerors.... And the attitude to the land of these individuals collectively will be no less arbitrary than that of an isolated individual or so-called propriétaire. Hence, in this case too, property continues to exist, and indeed even as ‘exclusive’ property, since mankind, that great society, excludes the individual from its property, leasing to him, perhaps, only a part of it, as a reward.... So it remains and so it will come to be. That in which all want to have a share will be taken away from the individual who wants to have it for himself alone and turned into common property. Since it is common property each has his share in it and this share is his property. Thus in our old conditions, a house belonging to five heirs is likewise their common property; one-fifth part of the income, however, is the property of each of them” (pp. 329, 330).

After our brave rebels have formed a union, a society, and in this form have won a portion of land for themselves, this “société”, this juridical person, “makes itself” the “proprietor”. To avoid any misunderstanding, he adds at once that “this society excludes the individual from the property, leasing to him, perhaps, only a part of it, as a reward”. In this way Saint Sancho appropriates for himself and his “union” his notion of communism. The reader will recall that Sancho in his ignorance reproached the communists for wanting to make society the supreme owner that gives each individual his “property” in feudal tenure.

Further, Sancho offers his recruits the prospect of a “share in the common property”. On a later occasion, this same Sancho says, again against the communists:

“Whether wealth belongs to the whole community, which allows me a portion of it, or to separate owners, for me the compulsion is the same, since in both cases I am powerless to decide about it”

(for this reason, too, his “collective” “takes away” from him what it does not want him to have in his exclusive possession, and so makes him feel the power of the collective will).

Thirdly, we here again encounter the “exclusiveness” with which he has often reproached bourgeois property, so that “even the miserable spot on which he stands does not belong to him”. On the
contrary, he has only the right and power to squat on it as a miserable and oppressed corvée peasant.

Fourthly, Sancho here appropriates the feudal system which, to his great annoyance, he has discovered in all hitherto existing or proposed forms of society. The “society” of conquerors behaves much as did the “unions” of semi-barbarian Germans who conquered the Roman provinces and introduced there a crude feudal system which was still strongly alloyed with the old tribal mode of life. It gives every individual a piece of land “as a reward”. At the stage where Sancho and the sixth-century Germans are, the feudal system still coincides in many respects with the system of “reward”.

It goes without saying, incidentally, that the tribal property which Sancho here restores afresh to honour would be bound before long to be dissolved again in the conditions now existing. Sancho feels this himself, for he exclaims: “So it remains and” (a beautiful “and”!) “so it will come to be”, and finally, he proves—by his great example of the house belonging to five heirs—that he has not the slightest intention of going outside the framework of our old relations. His whole plan for the organisation of landed property has only the aim of leading us by a historical detour back to petty-bourgeois hereditary tenure and the family property of German imperial towns.

Of our old relations, i.e., those now existing, Sancho has appropriated only the legal nonsense that individuals, or propriétaires, behave “arbitrarily” in relation to landed property. In the “union”, this imagined “arbitrariness” is to be continued by “society”. To the “union” it is so much a matter of indifference what happens to the land that “perhaps” “society” leases plots of land to individuals, or perhaps not. All that is quite immaterial.

Sancho, of course, cannot know that a definite structure of agriculture is linked to a definite form of activity and determined by a definite stage of the division of labour. But anyone else can see how little the small corvée peasants, as proposed here by Sancho, are in a position where “each of them can become an omnipotent ego”, and how little their ownership of a miserable plot of land resembles the greatly praised “ownership of everything”. In the real world, the intercourse of individuals depends on their mode of production, and therefore Sancho’s “perhaps” completely overthrows—perhaps—his whole union. But “perhaps”, or rather undoubtedly, there emerges here Sancho’s real view concerning intercourse in the union, namely, the view that the basis of egoistical intercourse is the holy.

Sancho brings to light here the first “institution” of his future union. The rebels who strove to be “without a constitution”, “arrange things for themselves”, by “choosing” for themselves a
"constitution" of landed property. We see that Sancho was right in not placing any brilliant hopes in new "institutions". At the same time, however, we see that he ranks highly among the "socially-gifted persons" and is "extraordinarily inventive in regard to social institutions".

2. Organisation of Labour

"The organisation of labour concerns only such work as can be done for us by others, such as cattle-slaughtering, ploughing, etc.; other work remains egoistical because, for example, no one can compose your music for you, complete the sketches for your paintings, etc. No one can do Raphael's works for him. These are works of a unique individual which only this unique person is capable of producing, whereas the former work deserves to be called human" (on page 356 this is made identical with "generally useful"), "since peculiarity is of little consequence here and almost every person can be trained to do it" (p. 355).

"It is always expedient for us to come to an agreement about human labour, in order that it should not claim all our time and effort, as is the case under competition.... For whom, however, should time be gained? For what purpose does a human being need more time than is required to restore his exhausted labour-power? To this communism gives no reply. For what purpose? In order to enjoy himself as the unique, having done his share as a human being" (pp. 356, 357).

"Through work I can fulfil the official duties of a president, minister, etc.; these posts require only a general education, namely, the education that is generally accessible.... Although, however, anyone could occupy these posts, it is only the unique power of the individual, peculiar to him alone, that gives them, as it were, life and significance. For performing his duties not as an ordinary man would do, but by exerting the power of his uniqueness, he does not get paid, if he is paid only as an official or minister. If he has acted to your satisfaction and you wish for your benefit to retain this power of the unique person, which is worthy of gratitude, then you ought to pay him not simply as a man who performs a merely human task, but as one who accomplishes something unique" (pp. 362, 363).

"If you are in a position to afford joy to thousands of people, then thousands will remunerate you for it; for it is in your power not to do it and therefore they have to pay you for the fact that you do it" (p. 351).

"One cannot establish any general rate of payment for my uniqueness, as can be done for work I perform as a man. Only for the latter can a tariff be fixed. Therefore you may fix a general tariff for human work, but do not deprive your uniqueness of what is due to it" (p. 363).

As an example of the organisation of labour in the union, the public bakeries already mentioned are cited on page 365. Under the conditions of vandal parcellation presupposed above, these public institutions must be a real miracle.

First of all human labour must be organised and thereby shortened so that Brother Straubinger,111 having finished his work early, can "enjoy himself as the unique" (p. 357), but on page 363 the "enjoyment" of the unique one is reduced to his extra earnings. On page 363 it is stated that the vital activity of the unique person
does not have to take place subsequently to human labour; the latter can be performed as unique labour, and in that case it requires an additional wage. Otherwise the unique one, who is interested not in his uniqueness but in a higher wage, could shelve his uniqueness and to spite society be satisfied with acting as an ordinary person, at the same time playing a trick on himself.

According to page 356, human labour coincides with generally useful labour, but according to pages 351 and 363 unique labour shows its worth by being paid for additionally as generally useful or, at least, useful to many people.

Thus, the organisation of labour in the union consists in the separation of human labour from unique labour, in the establishment of a tariff for the former and in haggling for an additional wage for the latter. This addition is again twofold, one part being for the unique performance of human labour and the other for the unique performance of unique labour. The resulting book-keeping is the more complicated because what was unique labour yesterday (e.g., spinning cotton thread No. 200) becomes human labour today, and because the unique performance of human labour requires a continual *moucharderie* upon oneself in one's own interest and universal *moucharderie* in the public interest. Hence this whole great organisational plan amounts to a wholly petty-bourgeois appropriation of the law of supply and demand, which exists at present and has been expounded by all economists. The law which determines the price of those types of labour that Sancho declares unique (e.g., that of a dancer, a prominent physician or lawyer), he could have found already explained by Adam Smith, and a tariff fixed for it by the American Cooper. Modern economists explain on the basis of this law the high payment for what they call *travail improductif* and the low wages of the agricultural day-labourer, and in general all inequalities in wages. Thus, with God's help, we have again arrived at competition, but a competition which has so much come down in the world that Sancho can propose a fixed rate, the establishment of wages by law, as was the case of old in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

It deserves mention also that the idea which Sancho puts forward here is also to be found as something completely new in the Herr Messiah—Dr. Georg Kuhlmann of Holstein.

---

*a* Spying.—Ed.


*c* Thomas Cooper, *Lectures on the Elements of Political Economy.*—Ed.

*d* Georg Kuhlmann, *Die Neue Welt oder das Reich des Geistes auf Erden.*—Ed.
What Sancho here calls human labour is, apart from his bureaucratic fantasies, the same thing as is usually meant by machine labour, labour which, as industry develops, devolves more and more on machines. True, because of the above-described organisation of landownership, machines are an impossibility in the "union" and therefore the corvée peasants in agreement with themselves prefer to reach an agreement with one another about this work. As regards "presidents" and "ministers", Sancho—this poor localised being, as Owen puts it—forms his opinion only by his immediate environment.

Here, as always, Sancho is again unlucky with his practical examples. He thinks that "no one can compose your music for you, complete the sketches for your paintings. No one can do Raphael's works for him". Sancho could surely have known, however, that it was not Mozart himself, but someone else who composed the greater part of Mozart's *Requiem* and finished it, and that Raphael himself "completed" only an insignificant part of his own frescoes.

He imagines that the so-called organisers of labour wanted to organise the entire activity of each individual, and yet it is precisely they who distinguish between directly productive labour, which has to be organised, and labour which is not directly productive. In regard to the latter, however, it was not their view, as Sancho imagines, that each should do the work of Raphael, but that anyone in whom there is a potential Raphael should be able to develop without hindrance. Sancho imagines that Raphael produced his pictures independently of the division of labour that existed in Rome at the time. If he were to compare Raphael with Leonardo da Vinci and Titian, he would see how greatly Raphael's works of art depended on the flourishing of Rome at that time, which occurred under Florentine influence, while the works of Leonardo depended on the state of things in Florence, and the works of Titian, at a later period, depended on the totally different development of Venice. Raphael as much as any other artist was determined by the technical advances in art made before him, by the organisation of society and the division of labour in his locality, and, finally, by the division of labour in all the countries with which his locality had intercourse. Whether an individual like Raphael succeeds in developing his talent depends wholly on demand, which in turn depends on the division of labour and the conditions of human culture resulting from it.

---

*This phrase is in English in the manuscript.—Ed.*
In proclaiming the uniqueness of work in science and art, Stirner adopts a position far inferior to that of the bourgeoisie. At the present time it has already been found necessary to organise this "unique" activity. Horace Vernet would not have had time to paint even a tenth of his pictures if he regarded them as works which "only this unique person is capable of producing". In Paris, the great demand for vaudevilles and novels brought about the organisation of work for their production; this organisation at any rate yields something better than its "unique" competitors in Germany. In astronomy, people like Arago, Herschel, Encke and Bessel considered it necessary to organise joint observations and only after that obtained some moderately good results. In historical science, it is absolutely impossible for the "unique" to achieve anything at all, and in this field, too, the French long ago surpassed all other nations thanks to organisation of labour. Incidentally, it is self-evident that all these organisations based on modern division of labour still lead to extremely limited results, and they represent a step forward only compared with the previous narrow isolation.

Moreover, it must be specially emphasised that Sancho confuses the organisation of labour with communism and is even surprised that "communism" gives him no reply to his doubts about this organisation. Just like a Gascon village lad is surprised that Arago cannot tell him on which star God Almighty has built his throne.

The exclusive concentration of artistic talent in particular individuals, and its suppression in the broad mass which is bound up with this, is a consequence of division of labour. Even if in certain social conditions, everyone were an excellent painter, that would by no means exclude the possibility of each of them being also an original painter, so that here too the difference between "human" and "unique" labour amounts to sheer nonsense. In any case, with a communist organisation of society, there disappears the subordination of the artist to local and national narrowness, which arises entirely from division of labour, and also the subordination of the individual to some definite art, making him exclusively a painter, sculptor, etc.; the very name amply expresses the narrowness of his professional development and his dependence on division of labour. In a communist society there are no painters but only people who engage in painting among other activities.

Sancho's organisation of labour shows clearly how much all these philosophical knights of "substance" content themselves with mere phrases. The subordination of "substance" to the "subject" about which they all talk so grandiloquently, the reduction of "substance"
which governs the "subject" to a mere "accident" of this subject, is revealed to be mere "empty talk".* Hence they wisely refrain from examining division of labour, material production and material intercourse, which in fact make individuals subordinate to definite relations and modes of activity. For them it is in general only a matter of finding new phrases for interpreting the existing world—phrases which are the more certain to consist only of comical boasting, the more these people imagine they have risen above the world and the more they put themselves in opposition to it. Sancho is a lamentable example of this.

3. Money

"Money is a commodity and indeed an essential means or faculty, for it protects wealth against ossification, keeps it fluid and effects its circulation. If you know of a better means of exchange, all right; but it too will be a variety of money" (p. 364).

On page 353 money is defined as "marketable property or property in circulation".

Thus the "union" retains money, this purely social property which has been stripped of all individuality. The extent to which Sancho is in the grip of the bourgeois outlook is shown by his question about a better means of exchange. Consequently, he first of all assumes that a means of exchange is necessary, and moreover he knows of no other means of exchange except money. The fact that ships and railways, which serve to transport commodities, are also means of exchange does not concern him. Hence in order to speak not merely of means of exchange, but particularly of money, he has to include the other attributes of money; that it is a means of exchange that is universally marketable and in circulation, that it keeps all property fluid, etc. These bring in also economic aspects which Sancho does not know but which actually constitute money; and with them the whole present situation, class economy, domination of the bourgeoisie, etc.

First of all, however, we learn something about the—extremely odd—course of monetary crises in the union.

* [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] If Sancho had taken his phrases seriously he would have had to analyse the division of labour. But he wisely refrained from doing this and unhesitatingly accepted the existing division of labour in order to exploit it for his "union". A closer examination of the subject would, of course, have shown him that the division of labour is not abolished by "getting it out of one's head". The fight of the philosophers against "substance" and their utter disregard of the division of labour, the material basis which has given rise to the phantom of substance, merely prove that for these heroes it is a matter only of abolishing phrases and by no means of changing the conditions from which these phrases were bound to arise.
The question arises:

"Where is money to be obtained?... People pay not with money, of which there may be a shortage, but with their ability [Vermögen], thanks to which alone we are wealthy [vermögend].... It is not money that harms you, but your inability [Unvermögen] to obtain it."

Now comes the moral exhortation:

"Let your ability [Vermögen] have its effect, brace yourself, and you will not lack money [Geld], your money, money of your coining.... Know then that you have as much money as you have power; for the extent to which you can assert yourself [Dir Geltung verschaffst] determines how much you are worth [giltst]" (pp. 353, 364).

The power of money, the fact that the universal means of exchange becomes independent in relation both to society and to individuals, reveals most clearly that the relations of production and intercourse as a whole assume an independent existence. Consequently, Sancho as usual knows nothing about the connection of money relations with production in general and intercourse. As a good citizen, he unhesitatingly keeps money in force; indeed it could not be otherwise with his view of division of labour and the organisation of landed ownership. The material power of money, which is strikingly revealed in monetary crises and which, in the form of a permanent scarcity of money, oppresses the petty bourgeois who is "inclined to make purchases", is likewise a highly unpleasant fact for the egoist in agreement with himself. He gets rid of the difficulty by reversing the ordinary idea of the petty bourgeois, thus making it appear that the attitude of individuals to the power of money is something that depends solely on their personal willing or running. This fortunate turn of thought then gives him the chance of reading a moral lecture, buttressed by synonymy, etymology and vowel mutation, to the astounded petty bourgeois already disheartened by lack of money, thus debarring in advance all inconvenient questions about the causes of the pecuniary embarrassment.

The monetary crisis consists primarily in the fact that all "wealth" [Vermögen] suddenly becomes depreciated in relation to the means of exchange and loses its "power" [Vermögen] over money. A crisis is in existence precisely when one can no longer pay with one's "wealth" [Vermögen], but must pay with money. And this again does not happen because of a shortage of money, as is imagined by the petty bourgeois who judges the crisis by his personal difficulties, but

---

a A play on the word Vermögen—ability, faculty, power, wealth, means, property—and its derivatives.—Ed.

b A play on the words Geld—money; sich Geltung verschaffen—to assert oneself; and gelten—to be worth.—Ed.
because the specific difference becomes fixed between money as the universal commodity, the "marketable property and property in circulation", and all the other, particular commodities, which suddenly cease to be marketable property. It cannot be expected that, to please Sancho, we shall analyse here the causes of this phenomenon. Sancho first of all consoles the moneyless and hopeless small shopkeepers by saying that it is not money that causes the scarcity of money and the whole crisis, but their inability to obtain it. It is not arsenic that is to blame for someone dying who takes it, it is the inability of his organism to digest it.

After first defining money as an essential and indeed specific form of wealth [Vermögen], as the universal means of exchange, money in the ordinary sense, Sancho suddenly turns the thing round when he sees the difficulties this would lead to and declares all ability [Vermögen] to be money, in order to create the appearance of personal power. The difficulty during a crisis is precisely that "all wealth" [Vermögen] has ceased to be "money". Incidentally, this amounts to the practice of the bourgeois who accepts "all wealth" as means of payment so long as it is money, and who only begins to raise difficulties when it becomes difficult to turn this "wealth" into money, in which case he also ceases to regard it as "wealth". Further, the difficulty in time of crisis is precisely that you, petty bourgeois, whom Sancho addresses here, can no longer put into circulation the money of your coining, your bills of exchange; but you are expected to pay with money not coined by you and which shows no evidence that it has passed through your hands.

Finally, Stirner distorts the bourgeois motto "You are worth as much as the money you possess" into "You have as much money as you are worth", which alters nothing, but only introduces an appearance of personal power and thus expresses the trivial bourgeois illusion that everyone is himself to blame if he has no money. Thus Sancho disposes of the classic bourgeois saying: L'argent n'a pas de maître,* and can now mount the pulpit and exclaim: "Let your ability have its effect, brace yourself, and you will not lack money." Je ne connais pas de lieu à la bourse où se fasse le transfert des bonnes intentions." He had but to add: Obtain credit; knowledge is power; it is harder to earn the first taler than the last million; be moderate and save your money and, most important of all, do not multiply overmuch, etc.—to reveal not one ass's ear, but both at once.

---

*a Money has no master.—Ed.

*b I do not know a place at the stock exchange where people trade in good intentions.—Ed.

*c This phrase is in English in the manuscript.—Ed.
In general, the man for whom everyone is what he can be and does what he can do, ends all chapters with moral exhortations.

The monetary system in Stirner’s union is, therefore, the existing monetary system expressed in the euphemistic and gushingly-sentimental manner of the German petty bourgeois.

After Sancho has paraded in this way with the ears of his ass, Don Quixote-Szeliga draws himself up to his full height and delivers a solemn speech about the modern knight-errant, in the course of which money is transformed into Dulcinea del Toboso and the manufacturers and commerçants en masse into knights, namely, into chevaliers d’industrie. The speech has also the subsidiary aim of proving that because money is an “essential means”, it is also “essentially a daughter”.* And he stretched out his right hand and said:

“On money depends fortune and misfortune. In the bourgeois period it is a force because like a maiden” (a dairymaid; per appositionem Dulcinea) “it is only wooed but is not indissolubly joined in marriage to anyone. All the romance and chivalry of wooing a dear object is revived in competition. Money, an object of ardent desire, is abducted by the bold chevaliers d’industrie” (p. 364).

Sancho has now arrived at a profound explanation why money in the bourgeois epoch is a power, namely, because in the first place fortune and misfortune depends on it and, secondly, because it is a maiden. He has further learned why he can lose his money, namely, because a maiden is not indissolubly joined in marriage to anyone. Now the poor wretch knows where he stands.

Szeliga, who has thus made the burgher into a knight, now in the following way makes the communist into a burgher and indeed into a burgher husband.

“He on whom fortune smiles leads the bride home. The ragamuffin is fortunate, he takes her into his household, society, and destroys the maiden. In his home she is no longer a bride, but a wife, and her maiden name disappears with her maidenhood. As a housewife, the money-maiden is called labour, for labour is the name of the husband. She is the property of the husband.

“To complete the picture, the child of labour and money is again a girl” (“essentially a daughter”), “an unmarried girl” (has Szeliga ever known of a girl coming “married” out of the maternal womb?) “and therefore money” (according to the above proof that all money is an “unmarried girl”, it is self-evident that “all unmarried girls” are “money”)—“therefore money, but having its definite descent from labour, its father” (toute recherche de la paternité est interdite). “The shape of the face, the image, bears a different stamp” (pp. 364, 365).

* Cf. Die heilige Familie, p. 266.a

---

a See present edition, Vol. 4, p. 167.—Ed.
b Any investigation regarding paternity is forbidden—the formula used in article 340 of the Code Napoléon (the French civil code).—Ed.
This story of marriage, burial and baptism is surely of itself sufficient proof that it is "essentially a daughter" of Szeliga, and indeed a daughter of "definite descent". Its ultimate basis, however, lies in the ignorance of his former stableman, Sancho. This is clearly seen at the end, when the orator is again anxiously concerned about the "coining" of money, thereby betraying that he still considers that coins are the most important medium of circulation. If he had taken the trouble to examine a little more closely the economic relations of money, instead of weaving a beautiful, leafy bridal wreath for it, he would have known that—without mentioning state securities, shares, etc.—the major part of the medium of circulation consists of bills of exchange, whereas paper money forms a comparatively small part, and coin a still smaller part. In England, for example, fifteen times as much money circulates in the form of bills of exchange and bank-notes as in the form of coin. And even as regards coin, it is determined exclusively by the costs of production, i.e., labour. Hence Stirner's elaborate process of procreation was superfluous here.

Szeliga's solemn reflections about a means of exchange based on labour but, nevertheless, different from the money of today, which he claims to have discovered among certain communists, only prove once again the simplicity with which our noble couple believe everything they read without even examining it.

When the two heroes ride homewards after this "knightly and romantic" campaign of "wooing", they are bringing back no "fortune", still less the "bride", and least of all "money", but at best one "ragamuffin" is bringing home the other.

4. State

We have seen that Sancho retains in his "union" the existing form of landownership, division of labour and money, in the way in which a petty bourgeois conceives these relations in his imagination. It is clear at a glance that with such premises Sancho cannot do without the state.

First of all his newly acquired property will have to assume the form of guaranteed, legal property. We have already heard his words:

"That in which all want to have a share will be taken away from the individual who wants to have it for himself alone" (p. 330).

---

a Carl Maria von Weber, Der Freischütz (Libretto by Friedrich Kind), Act III, Scene 4, "Wedding Song".—Ed.
Here, therefore, the will of the whole community is enforced against the will of the separate individual. Since each of the egoists in agreement with themselves may turn out to be not in agreement with the other egoists and thus become involved in this contradiction, the collective will must also find some means of expression in relation to the separate individuals—

"and this will is called the will of the state" (p. 257).

Its decisions are then legal decisions. The enforcement of this collective will in its turn requires repressive measures and public power.

"In this matter also" (in the matter of property) "the unions will multiply the means of the individual and safeguard his disputed property" (they guarantee, therefore, guaranteed property, i.e., legal property, i.e., property that Sancho possesses not "unconditionally", but "holds on feudal tenure" from the "union") (p. 342).

Obviously, the whole of civil law is re-established along with the relations of property, and Sancho himself, for example, sets forth the theory of contract fully in the spirit of the lawyers, as follows:

"It is of no importance, too, that I deprive myself of one or other freedom, for example, through any contract" (p. 409).

And in order to "safeguard" "disputed" contracts, it will also "be of no importance" if he has again to submit himself to a court and to all the actual consequences of a civil court case.

Thus, "little by little out of the twilight and the night" we come closer again to the existing relations, but only as these relations exist in the dwarfish imagination of the German petty bourgeois.

Sancho admits:

"In relation to freedom there is no essential difference between state and union. The latter cannot arise and exist without restricting freedom in various ways just as the state is incompatible with boundless freedom. Restriction of freedom is always unavoidable, for it is impossible to get rid of everything; one cannot fly like a bird just because one would like to fly, etc.... In the union there will still be a fair amount of compulsion and lack of freedom, for its aim is not freedom which, on the contrary, it sacrifices for the sake of peculiarity, but only for the sake of peculiarity" (pp. 410, 411).

Leaving aside for the time being the strange distinction between freedom and peculiarity, it should be noted that Sancho, without intending to do so, has already sacrificed his "peculiarity" in his union owing to its economic institutions. As a true "believer in the state", he sees a restriction only where political institutions begin. He lets the old society continue in existence and with it also the subordination of individuals to division of labour; in which case he
cannot escape the fate of having a special “peculiarity” prescribed for him by the division of labour and the occupation and position in life that falls to his lot as a result of it. If, for example, it fell to his lot to work as an apprentice fitter in Willenhall,\textsuperscript{115} then the “peculiarity” imposed on him would consist in a twisted hip-bone resulting in a “game leg”; if the “title spectre\textsuperscript{a} of his book”\textsuperscript{116} has to exist as a female throstle spinner, then her “peculiarity” would consist in stiff knees. Even if our Sancho continues his old vocation of a corvée peasant, already assigned to him by Cervantes, and which he now declares to be his own vocation, which he calls upon himself to fulfil, then, owing to division of labour and the separation of town and countryside, he will have the “peculiarity” of being a purely local animal cut off from all world intercourse and, consequently, from all culture.

Thus, in the union, owing to its social organisation, Sancho\textsuperscript{malgré lui} loses his peculiarity if, by way of exception, we take peculiarity in the sense of individuality. That owing to its political organisation, he then surrenders his freedom as well is quite consistent and only shows still more clearly how much he strives to retain the present state of affairs in his union.

Thus, the essential distinction between freedom and peculiarity constitutes the difference between the present state of affairs and the “union”. We have already seen how essential this distinction is. The majority of the members of the union, too, will possibly not be particularly embarrassed by this distinction and will hasten to decree their “riddance” from it, and if Sancho is not satisfied with that, they will show him on the basis of his own “book” that, firstly, there are no essences, but that essences and essential differences are “the holy”; secondly, that the union does not have to trouble about the “nature of the matter” and the “concept of the relation”; and, thirdly, that they in no way encroach on his peculiarity but only on his freedom to express it. They will perhaps prove to him, if it is his “endeavour to be without a constitution”, that they restrict only his freedom by putting him in prison, striking blows at him, or tearing off his leg, and that he remains\textit{partout et toujours} “peculiar”, so long as he is still able to show the signs of life of a polyp, an oyster or even a galvanised dead frog. They will “set a definite price” on his work, as we have already heard, and “will not allow a truly free” (!) “realisation of his property”, for thereby they restrict only his freedom, not his peculiarity. These are things for which Sancho, on page 338, reproaches the state. “What then should” our corvée

\textsuperscript{a} Marie Dähnhardt, Stirner’s wife.— \textit{Ed.}
peasant Sancho “do? He should be firm and pay no attention” to the union (ibid.). Finally, whenever he begins to grumble about the restrictions imposed on him, the majority will suggest that so long as he has the peculiarity of declaring that freedoms are peculiarities, they can take the liberty of regarding his peculiarities as freedoms.

Just as the difference mentioned above between human and unique labour was only a miserable appropriation of the law of supply and demand, so now the difference between freedom and peculiarity is a miserable appropriation of the relation between the state and civil society or, as Monsieur Guizot says, between liberté individuelle and pouvoir public. This is so much the case that in what follows he can copy Rousseau almost word for word.

“The agreement [...] according to which everyone must sacrifice a part of his freedom” occurs “not at all for the sake of something universal or even for the sake of another person”, on the contrary, “I only concluded it out of self-interest. As far as sacrificing is concerned, after all I merely sacrifice what is not in my power, i.e., I sacrifice nothing at all” (p. 418).

Our corvée peasant in agreement with himself shares this quality with all other corvée peasants and, in general, with every individual who has ever lived on the earth. Compare also Godwin, Political Justice.\textsuperscript{b}

Incidentally, Sancho appears to possess the peculiarity of imagining that according to Rousseau individuals concluded the contract for the sake of the universal, which never entered Rousseau’s head.

One consolation, however, remains for him.

“The state is holy ... the union, however, is ... not holy.” And herein lies the “great difference between the state and the union” (p. 411).

The whole difference, therefore, amounts to this, that the “union” is the actual modern state, and the “state” is Stirner’s illusion about the Prussian state, which he confuses with the state in general.

5. Rebellion

Sancho quite rightly has so little faith in his subtle distinctions between state and union, holy and not holy, human and unique, peculiarity and freedom, etc., that in the end he takes refuge in the ultima ratio of the egoist in agreement with himself—in rebellion. This time, however, he rebels not against himself, as he earlier asserted, but against the union. Just as earlier Sancho sought to achieve clarity on all points in the union, so he does here, too, as regards rebellion.

\textsuperscript{a} Du Contrat social; ou, Principes du droit politique.—Ed.

\textsuperscript{b} William Godwin, Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, and Its Influence on Morals and Happiness.—Ed.
“If the community treats me unjustly, I rebel against it and defend my property” (p. 343).
If the rebellion does not “prosper”, the union will “expel (imprison, exile, etc.) him” (pp. 256, 257).

Sancho here tries to appropriate the droits de l’homme of 1793, which included the right of insurrection—a human right that, of course, bears bitter fruits for him who tries to make use of it at his “own” discretion.

Thus Sancho’s whole union amounts to the following. Whereas in his previous criticism he regarded existing relations only from the aspect of illusion, when speaking of the union he tries to get to know the actual content of these relations and to oppose this content to the former illusions. In this attempt, our ignorant school-master was of course bound to fail ignominiously. By way of exception, he did once endeavour to appropriate the “nature of the matter” and the “concept of the relation”, but he failed to “divest” any matter or any relation of its “alien character”.

Now that we have become acquainted with the union in its real form, it only remains for us to examine Sancho’s enthusiastic ideas about it, i.e., the religion and philosophy of the union.

6. Religion and Philosophy of the Union

Here we again start from the point at which, above, we began the description of the union. Sancho employs two categories: property and wealth; the illusions about property correspond mainly to the positive data given on landed property, the illusions about wealth to the data on the organisation of labour and the monetary system in the union.

A. Property

Page 331: “The world belongs to me.”

Interpretation of his hereditary tenure of a plot of land.

Page 343: “I am the owner of everything that I need”,

a euphemistic way of saying that his needs are his possession and that what he needs as a corvée peasant is determined by his circumstances. In the same way the economists maintain that the worker is the owner of everything that he needs as a worker. See the discourse on the minimum wage in Ricardo.  

David Ricardo, On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation.—Ed.
Page 343: “Now, however, everything belongs to me.”

A musical flourish in honour of his rate of wages, his plot of land, his permanent lack of money, and his expulsion from everything that the “society” does not want him to have in exclusive possession. The same idea occurs on page 327, expressed thus:

“His” (i.e., of another person) “possessions are mine and I dispose of them as the owner to the extent of my power.”

This pompous allegro marciale passes in the following way into a gentle cadence, in which it gradually collapses on its backside—Sancho’s usual fate:

Page 331: “The world belongs to me. Do you” (communists) “say anything different with your opposite thesis: the world belongs to all? All are I, and once more I, etc.” (for example, “Robespierre, for example, Saint-Just, and so on”).

Page 415: “I am I and you are I, but ... this I, in which we are all equal, is only my thought [...] a generality” (the holy).

The practical variation on this theme occurs on page 330, where the “individuals collectively” (i.e., all) are counterposed as a regulating force to the “isolated individual” (i.e., the I as distinct from all).

These dissonances are at last resolved in the soothing final chord, to the effect that what I do not possess is at any rate the property of another “ego”. Thus, “ownership of everything” is only an interpretation of the statement that each person possesses exclusive property.

Page 336: “But property is only my property if I have unconditional possession of it. As the unconditional ego, I have property, I carry on free trade.”

We already know that only freedom, and not peculiarity, is affected if freedom of trade and unconditionality are not respected in the union. “Unconditional property” is a fitting supplement to the “secure”, guaranteed property in the union.

Page 342: “In the opinion of the communists, the community should be the owner. On the contrary, I am the owner and only come to an agreement with others about my property.”

On page 329 we saw how “the société makes itself the owner” and on page 330 how it “excludes individuals from its property”. In general, we saw that the tribal system of feudal tenure, the crudest beginnings of the system of feudal tenure, was introduced. According to page 416, the “feudal system = absence of property”; hence, according to the same page, “property is recognised in the union, and only in the union”, and moreover for a conclusive
reason: “because no one any longer holds his possession in feudal tenure from any being [Wesen]” (ibid.). That is to say, under the hitherto existing feudal system, the feudal lord was this “being”, in the union it is the société. From this one may at least conclude that Sancho possesses an “exclusive” but by no means “secure” property in the “essence” [Wesen] of past history.

In connection with page 330, according to which each individual is excluded from that which society does not consider it right for him to hold in his sole possession, and in connection with the state and legal system of the union, it is stated:

Page 369: “The rightful and legitimate property of another will only be that which you consider it right to recognise as his property. If you no longer consider it right, it loses its rightful for you and you will deride any claim to absolute right in it.”

He thus proves the astounding fact that what is right in the union does not have to be right for him—an indisputable right of man. If there exists in the union the institution of the old French parliaments, which Sancho loves so much, then he can even have his disliike recorded and deposit the document in the office of the law courts, consoling himself with the thought that “one cannot get rid of everything”.

These various statements appear to contradict themselves, one another and the actual state of things in the union. But the key to this riddle is to be found in the juridical fiction, already mentioned, that when Sancho is excluded from the property of others, he is merely coming to an agreement with these others. This fiction is expounded in more detail in the following statements:

Page 369: “This” (i.e., respect for the property of others) “comes to an end when I can leave the tree in question to another, just as I leave my stick, etc., to another, but do not from the outset regard it as something alien, i.e., holy. Rather... it remains my property, no matter for what period I cede it to another; it is mine and remains mine. I see nothing alien in the wealth belonging to the banker.”

Page 328: “I do not retreat timidly before thy and your property, but always regard it as my property, which I do not need to respect at all. Just do the same with what you call my property. With this point of view we shall most easily reach agreement with one another.”

If, according to the rules of the union, Sancho is “given a drubbing” as soon as he tries to seize another’s property, he will, of course, maintain that pilfering is a “peculiarity” of his; nevertheless, the union will decide that Sancho has merely taken a “liberty”. And if Sancho takes the “liberty” of attempting to seize another’s possessions, the union has the “peculiarity” of sentencing him to a flogging for it.

---

a A pun on the word Wesen, which can mean “being” or “essence”.—Ed.
The essence of the matter is this. Bourgeois and, particularly, petty-bourgeois and small-peasant property is, as we have seen, retained in the union. Merely the \textit{interpretation}, the "point of view", is different, for which reason Sancho always lays stress on the way of "regarding". "Agreement" is reached when this new philosophy of regarding enjoys the regard of the whole union. This philosophy consists of the following. Firstly, every relation, whether caused by economic conditions or direct compulsion, is regarded as a relation of "agreement". Secondly, it is imagined that all property belonging to others is relinquished to them by us and remains with them only until we have the power to take it from them; and if we never get the power, \textit{tant mieux}. Thirdly, Sancho and his union in theory guarantee each other absence of respect, whereas in practice the union "reaches agreement" with Sancho with the aid of a stick. Finally, this "agreement" is a mere phrase, since everyone knows that the others enter into it only with the secret reservation that they will reject it on the first convenient occasion. I see in your property something that is not yours but mine; since every ego does likewise, they see in it the \textit{universal}, by which we arrive at the modern-German philosophical interpretation of ordinary, special and exclusive private property.

The union's philosophy of property includes, \textit{inter alia}, the following fancies derived from Sancho's system:

On page 342, that property can be acquired in the union through absence of respect; on page 351, that "we are all in the midst of abundance", and I "have only to help myself to as much as I can", whereas in actual fact the whole union belongs to Pharaoh's seven lean kine; and finally that Sancho "cherishes thoughts" which are "written in his book" and which are sung on page 374 in the incomparable ode addressed to himself imitating Heine's three odes to Schlegel: "You, who cherishes such thoughts as are written in your book ... you cherish nonsense!" Such is the hymn which for the time being Sancho addresses to himself, and about which the union will later "reach agreement" with him.

Finally, it is obvious even without reaching "agreement" that property in the extraordinary sense, about which we already spoke in the "Phenomenology", is accepted in the union in lieu of payment, as "marketable" property and "property in circulation". Concerning simple facts, e.g., that I feel sympathy, that I talk to others, that my

---

\footnote{Heine's "Sonettenkranz an A. W. von Schlegel" in his \textit{Buch der Lieder}.—Ed.}

\footnote{See this volume, pp. 259-60.—Ed.}
leg is amputated (or torn off), the union will reach agreement that “the feeling experienced by sentient beings is also mine, my property” (p. 387); that other people’s ears and tongues are likewise my property, and that mechanical relations too are my property. Thus, appropriation in the union will consist chiefly in all relations being transformed into property relations by means of a facile paraphrase. This new mode of expressing “evils” that are already now rife is an “essential means or faculty” in the union and will successfully make up for the deficit in the means of existence that is inevitable in view of Sancho’s “social gifts”.

B. Wealth

Page 216: “Let each of you become an omnipotent ego!”
Page 353: “Think about increasing your wealth!”
Page 420: “Keep up the value of your gifts;
“Keep up their price,
“Do not allow yourself to be compelled to sell below the price,
“Do not allow yourself to be persuaded that your commodity is not worth the price,
“Do not make yourself ridiculous by a ridiculously low price,
“Follow the example of the courageous man”, etc.!
Page 420: “Increase the value of your property!”
“Increase your value!”

These moral sayings, which Sancho learned from an Andalusian Jewish huckster who drew up rules of life and trade for his son, and which Sancho now pulls out of his knapsack, form the main wealth of the union. The basis of all these statements is the great proposition on page 351:

“Everything that you are able to do [vermagst—inflected form of vermögen] is your wealth [Vermögen].”

This proposition is either meaningless, i. e., mere tautology, or is nonsense. It is tautology if it means: what you are able to do, you are able to do. It is nonsense if Vermögen No. 2 is meant to denote wealth “in the ordinary sense”, commercial wealth, and if the proposition is based, therefore, on the etymological similarity. The collision consists precisely in the fact that what is expected of my ability [Vermögen] is different from what it is capable of doing, e. g., it is demanded of my ability to write verses that it should make money out of these verses. My ability is expected to produce something quite different from the specific product of this special ability, viz., a product depending on extraneous conditions which are not subject to my ability. This difficulty is supposed to be resolved in the union by means of etymological synonymy. We see that our egoistical school-master hopes to occupy an important post in the
union. Incidentally, this difficulty is only an apparent one. The usual pithy moral saying of the bourgeois: “Anything is good to make money of” is here expounded at length in Sancho’s solemn manner.

C. Morality, Intercourse, Theory of Exploitation

Page 352: “You behave egoistically when you regard one another neither as owners nor as ragamuffins or workers, but as part of your wealth, as useful creatures. Then you will not give anything either to the owner, the proprietor, for his property, or to the one who works, but only to him whom you can make use of. Do we need a king? the North Americans ask themselves, and they reply: ‘He and his work are not worth a farthing to us’.”

On the other hand, on page 229, he reproaches the “bourgeois period” for the following:

“Instead of taking me as I am, attention is paid only to my property, my qualities, and a marriage alliance is concluded with me only for the sake of what I possess. The marriage is concluded, so to speak, with what I have and not with what I am.”

That is to say, attention is paid solely to what I am for others, to my usefulness, I am dealt with as a useful creature. Sancho spits into the “bourgeois period’s” soup, so that in the union he alone can devour it.

If the individuals of modern society regard one another as owners, as workers and, if Sancho wishes, as ragamuffins, this only means that they treat one another as useful creatures, a fact which can only be doubted by such a useless individual as Sancho. The capitalist, who “regards” the worker “as a worker”, shows consideration for him only because he needs workers; the worker treats the capitalist in the same way, and the Americans too, in Sancho’s opinion (we would like him to point out the source from which he took this historic fact), have no use for a king, because he is useless to them as a worker. Sancho has chosen his example with his usual clumsiness, for it is supposed to prove exactly the opposite of what it actually proves.

Page 395: “For me, you are nothing but food, just as I am eaten up and consumed by you. We stand in only one relation to one another: that of usefulness, utility, use.”

Page 416: “No one is to me a person to be held in respect, not even my fellow-man; but, like other beings (!), “he is solely an object, for which I may or may not have sympathy, an interesting or uninteresting object, a useful or useless creature.”

The relation of “usefulness”, which is supposed to be the sole relation of the individuals to one another in the union, is at once paraphrased as “eating” one another. The “perfect Christians” of

---

a The words in quotes are in English in the manuscript.—Ed.
b In the manuscript: eheilicher Bund, that is, “marriage alliance”; in Stirner’s book: ehrlicher Bund, i.e., “honest alliance”.—Ed.
the union, of course, also celebrate holy communion, only not by eating together but by eating one another.

The extent to which this theory of mutual exploitation, which Bentham expounded *ad nauseam*, could already at the beginning of the present century be regarded as a phase of the previous one is shown by Hegel in his *Phänomenologie*. See there the chapter “The Struggle of Enlightenment with Superstition”, where the theory of usefulness is depicted as the final result of enlightenment. The apparent absurdity of merging all the manifold relationships of people in the *one* relation of usefulness, this apparently metaphysical abstraction arises from the fact that in modern bourgeois society all relations are subordinated in practice to the one abstract monetary-commercial relation. This theory came to the fore with Hobbes and Locke, at the same time as the first and second English revolutions, those first battles by which the bourgeoisie won political power. It is to be found even earlier, of course, among writers on political economy, as a tacit presupposition. Political economy is the real science of this theory of utility; it acquires its true content among the Physiocrats, since they were the first to treat political economy systematically. In Helvétius and Holbach one can already find an idealisation of this doctrine, which fully corresponds to the attitude of opposition adopted by the French bourgeoisie before the revolution. Holbach depicts the entire activity of individuals in their mutual intercourse, e. g., speech, love, etc., as a relation of utility and utilisation. Hence the actual relations that are presupposed here are speech, love, definite manifestations of definite qualities of individuals. Now these relations are supposed not to have the meaning *peculiar* to them but to be the expression and manifestation of some third relation attributed to them, the relation of utility or utilisation. This *paraphrasing* ceases to be meaningless and arbitrary only when these relations have validity for the individual not on their own account, not as spontaneous activity, but rather as disguises, though by no means disguises of the category of utilisation, but of an actual third aim and relation which is called the relation of utility.

The verbal masquerade only has meaning when it is the unconscious or deliberate expression of an actual masquerade. In this case, the utility relation has a quite definite meaning, namely, that I derive benefit for myself by doing harm to someone else (*exploitation de l'homme par l'homme*); in this case moreover the use that

---

I derive from some relation is entirely extraneous to this relation, as we saw above in connection with ability [Vermögen] that from each ability a product alien to it was demanded, a relation determined by social relations—a—and this is precisely the relation of utility. All this is actually the case with the bourgeois. For him only one relation is valid on its own account—the relation of exploitation; all other relations have validity for him only insofar as he can include them under this one relation; and even where he encounters relations which cannot be directly subordinated to the relation of exploitation, he subordinates them to it at least in his imagination. The material expression of this use is money which represents the value of all things, people and social relations. Incidentally, one sees at a glance that the category of “utilisation” is first abstracted from the actual relations of intercourse which I have with other people (but by no means from reflection and mere will) and then these relations are made out to be the reality of the category that has been abstracted from them themselves, a wholly metaphysical method of procedure. In exactly the same way and with the same justification, Hegel depicts all relations as relations of the objective spirit. Hence Holbach’s theory is the historically justified philosophical illusion about the bourgeoisie just then developing in France, whose thirst for exploitation could still be regarded as a thirst for the full development of individuals in conditions of intercourse freed from the old feudal fetters. Liberation from the standpoint of the bourgeoisie, i.e., competition, was, of course, for the eighteenth century the only possible way of offering the individuals a new career for freer development. The theoretical proclamation of the consciousness corresponding to this bourgeois practice, of the consciousness of mutual exploitation as the universal mutual relation of all individuals, was also a bold and open step forward. It was a kind of enlightenment which interpreted the political, patriarchal, religious and sentimental embellishment of exploitation under feudalism in a secular way; the embellishment corresponded to the form of exploitation existing at that time and it had been systematised especially by the theoretical writers of the absolute monarchy.

Even if Sancho had done the same thing in his “book” as Helvétius and Holbach did in the last century, the anachronism would still have made it ridiculous. But we have seen that in the place of active bourgeois egoism he put a bragging egoism in agreement with itself

---

a See this volume, pp. 407-08.—Ed.
His sole service—rendered against his will and without realising it—was that he expressed the aspirations of the German petty bourgeois of today whose aim it is to become bourgeois. It was quite fitting that the petty, shy and timid behaviour of these petty bourgeois should have as its counterpart the noisy, blustering and impertinent public boasting of "the unique" among their philosophical representatives. It is quite in accordance with the situation of these petty bourgeois that they do not want to know about their theoretical loud-mouthed champion, and that he knows nothing about them; that they are at variance with one another, and he is forced to preach egoism in agreement with itself. Now, perhaps, Sancho will realise the sort of umbilical cord that connects his "union" with the Customs Union.\footnote{119}

The advances made by the theory of utility and exploitation, its various phases are closely connected with the various periods of development of the bourgeoisie. In the case of Helvétius and Holbach, the actual content of the theory never went much beyond paraphrasing the mode of expression of writers belonging to the period of the absolute monarchy. It was a different method of expression which reflected the desire to reduce all relations to the relation of exploitation and to explain the intercourse of people from their material needs and the ways of satisfying them, rather than the actual realisation of this desire. The problem was set. Hobbes and Locke had before their eyes not only the earlier development of the Dutch bourgeoisie (both of them had lived for some time in Holland) but also the first political actions by which the English bourgeoisie emerged from local and provincial limitations, as well as a comparatively highly developed stage of manufacture, overseas trade and colonisation. This particularly applies to Locke, who wrote during the first period of the English economy, at the time of the rise of joint-stock companies, the Bank of England and England's mastery of the seas. In their case, and particularly in that of Locke, the theory of exploitation was still directly connected with the economic content.

Helvétius and Holbach had before them, besides English theory and the preceding development of the Dutch and English bourgeoisie, also the French bourgeoisie which was still struggling for its free development. The commercial spirit, universal in the eighteenth century, had especially in France taken possession of all classes in the form of speculation. The financial difficulties of the government and the resulting disputes over taxation occupied the attention of all France even at that time. In addition, Paris in the eighteenth century was the only world city, the only city where there
was personal intercourse among individuals of all nations. These premises, combined with the more universal character typical of the French in general, gave the theory of Helvétius and Holbach its peculiar universal colouring, but at the same time deprived it of the positive economic content that was still to be found among the English. The theory which for the English was still simply the registration of facts becomes for the French a philosophical system. This generality devoid of positive content, such as we find it in Helvétius and Holbach, is essentially different from the substantial comprehensive view which is first found in Bentham and Mill. The former corresponds to the struggling, still undeveloped bourgeoisie, the latter to the ruling, developed bourgeoisie.

The content of the theory of exploitation that was neglected by Helvétius and Holbach was developed and systematised by the Physiocrats—who worked at the same time as Holbach—but because their basis was the undeveloped economic relations of France where feudalism, under which landownership plays the chief role, was still unshaken, they remained in thrall to the feudal outlook insofar as they declared landownership and land cultivation to be that [productive force] which determines the whole structure of society. The theory of exploitation owes its further development in England to Godwin, and especially to Bentham. As the bourgeoisie succeeded in asserting itself more and more both in England and in France, the economic content, which the French had neglected, was gradually re-introduced by Bentham. Godwin's Political Justice was written during the terror, and Bentham's chief works during and after the French Revolution and the development of large-scale industry in England. The complete union of the theory of utility with political economy is to be found, finally, in Mill.

At an earlier period political economy had been the subject of inquiry either by financiers, bankers and merchants, i.e., in general by persons directly concerned with economic relations, or by persons with an all-round education like Hobbes, Locke and Hume, for whom it was of importance as a branch of encyclopaedic knowledge. Thanks to the Physiocrats, political economy for the first time was raised to the rank of a special science and has been treated as such ever since. As a special branch of science it absorbed the other relations—political, juridical, etc.—to such an extent that it reduced them to economic relations. But it regarded this subordination of all relations to itself as only one aspect of these relations, and thereby allowed them for the rest an independent significance outside political economy. The complete subordination of all existing relations to the relation of utility, and its unconditional elevation to
the sole content of all other relations, occurs for the first time in Bentham’s works, where, after the French Revolution and the development of large-scale industry, the bourgeoisie is no longer presented as a special class, but as the class whose conditions of existence are those of the whole society.

When the sentimental and moral paraphrases, which for the French were the entire content of the utility theory, had been exhausted, all that remained for its further development was the question how individuals and relations were to be used, to be exploited. Political economy had meanwhile already provided the answer to this question; the only possible advance consisted in the inclusion of the economic content. Bentham achieved this advance. Political economy, however, had already given expression to the fact that the chief relations of exploitation are determined by production in general, independently of the will of individuals, who find them already in existence. Hence, no other field of speculative thought remained for the utility theory than the attitude of individuals to these important relations, the private exploitation of an already existing world by individuals. On this subject Bentham and his school indulged in lengthy moral reflections. The whole criticism of the existing world by the utility theory was consequently restricted within a narrow range. Remaining within the confines of bourgeois conditions, it could criticise only those relations which had been handed down from a past epoch and were an obstacle to the development of the bourgeoisie. Hence, although the utility theory does expound the connection of all existing relations with economic relations, it does so only in a restricted way.

From the outset the utility theory had the aspect of a theory of general utility, yet this aspect only became fraught with meaning when economic relations, especially division of labour and exchange, were included. With division of labour, the private activity of the individual becomes generally useful; Bentham’s general utility becomes reduced to the same general utility which is asserted in competition as a whole. By taking into account the economic relations of rent, profit and wages, the definite relations of exploitation of the various classes were introduced, since the manner of exploitation depends on the social position of the exploiter. Up to this point the theory of utility was able to base itself on definite social facts; its further account of the manner of exploitation amounts to a mere recital of catechism phrases.

The economic content gradually turned the utility theory into a mere apologia for the existing state of affairs, an attempt to prove that under existing conditions the mutual relations of people today
are the most advantageous and generally useful. It has this character among all modern economists.

But whereas the utility theory had thus at least the advantage of indicating the connection of all existing relations with the economic foundations of society, in Sancho the theory has lost all positive content; it is divorced from all actual relations and is restricted to the mere illusion cherished by the isolated bourgeois about his "cleverness", by means of which he reckons to exploit the world. Incidentally, it is only in a few passages that Sancho deals with the theory of utility even in this diluted form; almost the entire "book" is taken up, as we have seen, with egoism in agreement with itself, i.e., with an illusion about this illusion of the petty bourgeois. Even these few passages are finally reduced by Sancho to mere vapour, as we shall see.

D. Religion

"In this community" (namely with other people) "I perceive nothing at all but a multiplication of my power, and I retain it only for so long as it is my multiplied power" (p. 416).

"I no longer abase myself before any power, and recognise that all powers are only my power, which I have immediately to subdue if they threaten to become a power against me or over me; each of them is permitted to be only one of my means for achieving my purpose."

I "perceive", I "recognise", I "have to subdue", power "is permitted to be only one of my means". We have already been shown in connection with the "union" what these moral demands mean and how far they correspond to reality. This illusion about his power is closely connected with the other illusion: that in the union "substance" is abolished (see "Humane Liberalism"a), and that the relations of the union members never assume a rigid form in respect to separate individuals.

"The union, the association, this eternally fluid association of everything that exists.... Of course, society can arise also from union, but only as a fixed idea arises out of a thought.... If a union has crystallised into a society, it has ceased to be an association, for association is the unceasing process of associating with one another; it has reached the state of being associated, it has become society, the corpse of the union or association.... Neither a natural nor a spiritual bond holds the union together" (pp. 294, 408, 416).

As regards the "natural bond", it exists, despite Sancho's "ill will", in the form of corvée peasant economy and organisation of labour; etc., in the union; likewise the "spiritual bond"b in Sancho's philosophy. For the rest we need only refer to what we have already

a See this volume, p. 235.—Ed.
b Goethe, Faust, I. Teil, 2. "Studierzimmerszene".—Ed.
said several times, and repeated in connection with the union, about division of labour causing the relations to confront individuals as something existing independently of them.

"In short, society is holy, the union is your own; society uses you, you use the union", etc. [p. 418].

E. Supplement to the Union

Whereas hitherto we were shown no other possibility of reaching the "union" than through rebellion, now we learn from the "Commentary" that the "union of egoists" already exists in "hundreds of thousands" of cases as one of the aspects of existing bourgeois society and that it is accessible to us even without any rebellion and any "Stirner". Then Sancho shows us "such unions in actual life. Faust is within such unions when he exclaims: Here I am a human being" (!), "here I dare to be one," here Goethe states it even in black and white" ("but the holy person is called Humanus, see Goethe", cf. "the book").... "If Hess were to look attentively at real life, he would see hundreds of thousands of such egoistical unions—some of short duration, some enduring."

Sancho then makes some "children" meet for a game in front of Hess' window, and makes "a few friends" take Hess to a tavern and lets him associate with his "beloved".

"Of course, Hess does not notice how full of significance these trivial examples are and how infinitely different they are from the holy societies and indeed from the fraternal, human society of holy socialists" (Sancho contra Hess, Wigand, pp. 193, 194).

In just the same way, on page 305 of "the book", "association for material aims and interests" is graciously accepted as a voluntary union of egoists.

Thus the union here is reduced, on the one hand, to bourgeois associations and joint-stock companies and, on the other hand, to bourgeois clubs, picnics, etc. That the former belong wholly to the present epoch is well known, and that this equally applies to the latter is also well known. Let Sancho look at the "unions" of an earlier epoch, e.g., of feudal times, or those of other nations, e.g., of the Italians, English, etc., right down to the "unions" of children, in order to realise what the difference is. By this new interpretation of the union he confirms only his obdurate conservatism. Sancho, who incorporated the whole of bourgeois society, insofar as he liked it, into his allegedly new institution, here by way of supplement only assures us that in his union people will also enjoy themselves and indeed in quite the tradition-

---

\(\text{Goethe, Faust, I. Teil, "Osterspaziergang".—Ed.}
\)

\(\text{b From Goethe's unfinished poem "Die Geheimnisse" (Humanus—a character in this poem).—Ed.}
\)
al way. Our bonhomme, of course, does not consider the question: what relations existing independently of him enable—or do not enable—him to “accompany a few friends to a tavern”.

The idea of resolving the whole of society into voluntary groups—which is here, on the basis of hearsay accounts current in Berlin, turned into a Stirnerian idea—belongs to Fourier. But with Fourier this view presupposes a complete transformation of society and is based on a criticism of the existing “unions”, so much admired by Sancho, and of their infinite tedium. Fourier describes these present-day attempts at amusement in their connection with the existing relations of production and intercourse, and wages a polemic against them; Sancho, far from criticising them, wants on the contrary to transplant them in their entirety into his new “mutual agreement” institution for promoting happiness; he thereby only proves once again how strongly he is held in thrall to existing bourgeois society.

Finally, Sancho delivers the following oratio pro domo, i.e., in defence of the “union”.

“Is a union in which the majority allow themselves to be cheated in regard to their most natural and obvious interests, a union of egoists? Have egoists united where one is the slave or serf of another?... Societies in which the needs of some are satisfied at the expense of others, in which, for example, some can satisfy the need for rest by others having to work to the point of exhaustion... Hess... identifies... these ‘egoistical unions’ of his with Stirner’s union of egoists” ([Wigand,] pp. 192, 193).

Sancho, therefore, expresses the pious wish that in his union, based on mutual exploitation, all the members will be equally powerful, cunning, etc., etc., so that each can exploit the others to exactly the same extent as they exploit him, and so that no one will be “cheated” in regard to his “most natural and obvious interests” or be able to “satisfy his needs at the expense of others”. We note here that Sancho recognises “natural and obvious interests” and “needs” of all—consequently, equal interests and needs. Further, we recall at once page 456 of the book, according to which “overreaching” is a “moral idea inculcated by the guild spirit”, and for a man who has had a “wise education”, it remains a “fixed idea from which no freedom of thought can give protection”. Sancho “gets his thoughts from above and adheres to them” (ibid.). This equal power of all consists, according to his demand, in that everyone should become “omnipotent”, i.e., all should become impotent in relation to one another, a perfectly consistent postulate that coincides with

---

a Charles Fourier, Théorie de l’unité universelle.—Ed.
the sentimental desire of the petty bourgeois for a world of hucksters, in which everyone gets his advantage. Or, on the other hand, our saint quite suddenly presupposes a society in which each can satisfy his needs unhampered, without doing so “at the expense of others”, and in that case the theory of exploitation again becomes a meaningless paraphrase for the actual relations of individuals to one another.

After Sancho in his “union” has “devoured” and consumed the others, thereby transforming intercourse with the world into intercourse with himself, he passes from this indirect self-enjoyment to direct self-enjoyment, by consuming himself.

C. My Self-Enjoyment

The philosophy which preaches enjoyment is as old in Europe as the Cyrenaic school. Just as in antiquity it was the Greeks who were the protagonists of this philosophy, so in modern times it is the French, and indeed for the same reason, because their temperament and their society made them most capable of enjoyment. The philosophy of enjoyment was never anything but the clever language of certain social circles who had the privilege of enjoyment. Apart from the fact that the manner and content of their enjoyment was always determined by the whole structure of the rest of society and suffered from all its contradictions, this philosophy became a mere phrase as soon as it began to lay claim to a universal character and proclaimed itself the outlook on life of society as a whole. It sank then to the level of edifying moralising, to a sophistical palliation of existing society, or it was transformed into its opposite, by declaring compulsory asceticism to be enjoyment.

In modern times the philosophy of enjoyment arose with the decline of feudalism and with the transformation of the feudal landed nobility into the pleasure-loving and extravagant nobles of the court under the absolute monarchy. Among these nobles this philosophy still has largely the form of a direct, naive outlook on life which finds expression in memoirs, poems, novels, etc. It only becomes a real philosophy in the hands of a few writers of the revolutionary bourgeoisie, who, on the one hand, participated in the culture and mode of life of the court nobility and, on the other hand, shared the more general outlook of the bourgeoisie, based on the more general conditions of existence of this class. This philosophy was, therefore, accepted by both classes, although from totally different points of view. Whereas among the nobility this language was restricted exclusively to its estate and to the conditions of life of
this estate, it was given a generalised character by the bourgeoisie and addressed to every individual without distinction. The conditions of life of these individuals were thus disregarded and the theory of enjoyment thereby transformed into an insipid and hypocritical moral doctrine. When, in the course of further development, the nobility was overthrown and the bourgeoisie brought into conflict with its opposite, the proletariat, the nobility became devoutly religious, and the bourgeoisie solemnly moral and strict in its theories, or else succumbed to the above-mentioned hypocrisy, although the nobility in practice by no means renounced enjoyment, while among the bourgeoisie enjoyment even assumed an official, economic form—that of luxury.*

It was only possible to discover the connection between the kinds of enjoyment open to individuals at any particular time and the class relations in which they live, and the conditions of production and intercourse which give rise to these relations, the narrowness of the hitherto existing forms of enjoyment, which were outside the actual content of the life of people and in contradiction to it, the connection between every philosophy of enjoyment and the enjoyment actually present and the hypocrisy of such a philosophy which treated all individuals without distinction—it was, of course, only possible to discover

* [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] In the Middle Ages the pleasures were strictly classified; each estate had its own distinct forms of pleasure and its distinct manner of enjoyment. The nobility was the estate privileged to devote itself exclusively to pleasure, while the separation of work and enjoyment already existed for the bourgeoisie and pleasure was subordinated to work. The serfs, the class destined exclusively to labour, had only extremely few and restricted pleasures, which came their way mostly by chance, depended on the whim of their masters and other contingencies, and are hardly worth considering.

Under the rule of the bourgeoisie the nature of the pleasures depended on the classes of society. The pleasures of the bourgeoisie are determined by the material brought forth by this class at various stages of its development and they have acquired the tedious character which they still retain from the individuals and from the continuous subordination of pleasure to money-making. The present crude form of proletarian pleasure is due, on the one hand, to the long working hours, which led to the utmost intensification of the need for enjoyment, and, on the other hand, to the restriction—both qualitative and quantitative—of the means of pleasure accessible to the proletarian.

In general, the pleasures of all hitherto existing estates and classes had to be either childish, exhausting or crude, because they were always completely divorced from the vital activity, the real content of the life of the individuals, and more or less reduced to imparting an illusory content to a meaningless activity. The hitherto existing forms of enjoyment could, of course, only be criticised when the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat had developed to such an extent that the existing mode of production and intercourse could be criticised as well.
all this when it became possible to criticise the conditions of production and intercourse in the hitherto existing world, i.e., when the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat had given rise to communist and socialist views. That shattered the basis of all morality, whether the morality of asceticism or of enjoyment.

Our insipid, moralising Sancho believes, of course, as his whole book shows, that it is merely a matter of a different morality, of what appears to him a new outlook on life, of "getting out of one's head" a few "fixed ideas", to make everyone happy and able to enjoy life. Hence the chapter on self-enjoyment could at most reproduce under a new label the same phrases and maxims which he had already so frequently had the "self-enjoyment" of preaching to us. This chapter has only one original feature, namely that he deifies and turns into philosophical German all enjoyment, by giving it the name "self-enjoyment". While the French philosophy of enjoyment of the eighteenth century at least gave a witty description of the gay and audacious mode of life that then existed, Sancho's whole frivolity is limited to such expressions as "consuming" and "squandering", to images such as the "light" (it should read a candle) and to natural-scientific recollections which amount either to belleteuristic nonsense such as that the plant "imbibes the air of the ether" and that "song-birds swallow beetles", or else to wrong statements, for example, that a candle burns itself. On the other hand, here we again enjoy all the solemn seriousness of the statements against "the holy", which, we are told, in the guise of "vocation—designation—task" and "ideal" has hitherto spoiled people's self-enjoyment. For the rest, without dwelling on the more or less dirty forms in which the "self" in "self-enjoyment" can be more than a mere phrase, we must once more as briefly as possible outline for the reader Sancho's machinations against the holy, with the insignificant modulations occurring in this chapter.

To recapitulate briefly, "vocation, designation, task, ideal" are either

1) the idea of the revolutionary tasks laid down for an oppressed class by the material conditions; or

2) mere idealistic paraphrases, or also the apt conscious expression of the individuals' modes of activity which owing to division of labour have assumed independent existence as various professions; or

3) the conscious expression of the necessity which at every moment confronts individuals, classes and nations to assert their position through some quite definite activity; or

4) the conditions of existence of the ruling class (as determined by
the preceding development of production), ideally expressed in law, morality, etc., to which [conditions] the ideologists of that class more or less consciously give a sort of theoretical independence; they can be conceived by separate individuals of that class as vocation, etc., and are held up as a standard of life to the individuals of the oppressed class, partly as an embellishment or recognition of domination, partly as a moral means for this domination. It is to be noted here, as in general with ideologists, that they inevitably put the thing upside-down and regard their ideology both as the creative force and as the aim of all social relations, whereas it is only an expression and symptom of these relations.

As for our Sancho, we know that he has the most ineradicable faith in the illusions of these ideologists. Because people, depending on their various conditions of life, construct various notions about themselves, that is about man, Sancho imagines that the various ideas created the various conditions of life and thus the wholesale manufacturers of these ideas, i.e., the ideologists, have dominated the world. Cf. page 433.

"Thinkers rule in the world"; "thought rules the world"; "priests or schoolmasters" "stuff their heads with all sorts of trash", "they imagine a human ideal" which other people have to take as a guide (p. 442).

Sancho even knows exactly the conclusion by virtue of which people were subjected to the fancies of the school-masters and owing to their stupidity subjected themselves to these fancies:

"Because it is conceivable for me" (the school-master), "it is possible for people; because it is possible for people, it means that they ought to be such, it was their vocation; and, finally, it is only according to this vocation, only as persons having a vocation, that one must judge human beings. And the further conclusion? It is not the individual who is man, but it is a thought, an ideal, that is man—species—mankind" (p. 441).

All collisions in which, owing to their actual conditions of life, human beings become involved with themselves or with others appear to our school-master Sancho as collisions between people and their ideas about the life of "Man", ideas which they either have put themselves into their heads or have allowed school-masters to put into their heads. If they managed to get these ideas out of their heads "how happily" "these unfortunate beings could live", what "capers" they could cut, whereas now they have to "dance to the pipe of the school-masters and bear-leaders"! (p. 435). (The lowest of these "bear-leaders" is Sancho, for it is only himself whom he leads by the nose.) If, for example, people almost always and almost everywhere—in China as well as in France—did not get it into their heads that they suffer from over-
population, what an overflowing abundance of the means of existence would these “unfortunate beings” suddenly have at their disposal.

Under the pretext of writing a treatise on possibility and reality, Sancho here once more attempts to put forward his old story of the rule of the holy in the world. For him everything a school-master gets into his head about me is possible, and then Sancho can easily prove that this possibility has no reality except in his head. His solemn assertion that “behind the word possible lay concealed the most momentous misunderstanding of thousands of years” (p. 441) is sufficient proof that it is impossible for him to conceal behind words the consequences of his abundant misunderstanding of thousands of years.

This treatise on the “coincidence of possibility and reality” (p. 439), on what people have the ability to be and what they are, a treatise that harmonises so well with his earlier insistent exhortations that one should bring all one’s abilities into play, etc., leads him, however, to a few more digressions on the materialist theory of circumstances, which we shall presently deal with in more detail. But first, one more example of his ideological distortion. On page 428 he makes the question “how can one acquire life” identical with the question how is one to “create in oneself the true ego” (or “life”). According to the same page, “worrying about life” ceases with his new moral philosophy and the “squandering” of life begins. Our Solomon expresses still more “eloquently” the miraculous power of his allegedly new moral philosophy in the following saying:

“Regard yourself as more powerful than others say you are, then you will have more power; value yourself more and you will have more” (p. 483).

See above, in the section on the “union”, Sancho’s method of acquiring property.¹

Now for his theory of circumstances.

“Man has no vocation, but he has powers which manifest themselves where they exist, because their being consists solely in their manifestation, and they cannot remain inactive any more than life itself.... Everyone at each instant uses as much power as he has” (“increase your value, follow the example of the courageous man, let each of you become an omnipotent ego”, etc.—Sancho said above).... “One’s powers can indeed be intensified and multiplied, particularly by hostile resistance or friendly support; but where their application is missing one can be sure that they are absent. It is possible to strike fire from a stone, but without striking it, nothing comes out; similarly man needs an impulse. Since powers always prove to be operative of themselves, the injunction to use them would be superfluous and senseless.... Power is merely a simpler word for manifestation of power” (pp. 436, 437).

“Egoism in agreement with itself”, which just as it pleases brings

¹ See this volume, pp. 403-07.—Ed.
or does not bring its powers or abilities into play and which applies the *jus utendi et abutendi* to them, here suddenly and unexpectedly comes to grief. Once they are present, the forces here all of a sudden act autonomously, without caring about Sancho's "pleasure", they act like chemical or mechanical forces, independently of the individual who possesses them. We learn further that a force is not present if its manifestation is missing; the correction being made that power requires an *impulse* for its manifestation. We do not learn, however, how Sancho will decide whether it is the *impulse* or the *power* that is lacking when the manifestation of power is deficient. On the other hand, our unique investigator of nature teaches us that "it is possible to strike fire from a stone", and, as is always the case with Sancho, he could not have chosen a more unfortunate example. Sancho, like a simple village school-master, believes that the fire he strikes in this way comes from the stone, where it was previously latent. But any fourth-form schoolboy could tell him that in this method of obtaining fire, a method long forgotten in all civilised countries, by the friction of steel and stone, particles which become red-hot owing to this friction are separated from the steel, and not from the stone; that, consequently, the "fire", which for Sancho is not a definite relation, at a definite temperature, of certain bodies to certain other bodies, in particular oxygen, but is an independent thing, an "element", a fixed idea, "the holy"—that this fire does not come either from the stone or from the steel. Sancho might just as well have said: one can make bleached linen from chlorine, but if the "impulse", viz., the *unbleached* linen, is lacking, then "nothing comes out". We shall take this opportunity, for Sancho's "self-enjoyment", of noting an earlier fact of "unique" natural science. In the ode on crime it is stated:

"Is there not a distant peal of thunder  
And do you not see how the sky  
Filled with foreboding *is silent* and overcast?" (p. 319 of "the book").

It thunders and the sky is silent. Hence Sancho knows of some other place than the sky from which thunder comes. Further, Sancho notices the silence of the sky by means of his organ of *sight*—a feat which no one will be able to imitate. Or perhaps Sancho *hears* thunder and *sees* silence, so that the two phenomena can take place simultaneously. We saw how Sancho in dealing with "apparitions" made mountains represent the "spirit of loftiness". Here the silent sky represents for him the spirit of foreboding.

---

a The right of use and of disposal.—Ed.  
b See this volume, p. 152.—Ed.
Incidentally, it is not clear why Sancho here rails against the “injunction to use one’s powers”. This injunction, after all, could possibly be the missing “impulse”, which, it is true, fails to have effect in the case of a stone, but the efficacy of which Sancho could observe during the exercises of any battalion. That the “injunction” is an “impulse” even for his feeble powers follows also from the fact that for him it turns out to be a “stumbling block”.\(^a\)

Consciousness is also a power which, according to the doctrine which has just been enunciated, “always proves to be operative of itself”. In accordance with this, therefore, Sancho ought not to have set out to change consciousness, but at most the “impulse” which affects consciousness; consequently Sancho would have written his whole book in vain. But in this case, of course, he regards his moral preaching and “injunctions” as a sufficient “impulse”.

“What an individual can become he will become. A born poet may be prevented, owing to unfavourable \textit{circumstances}, from being abreast of the times and creating great works of art, for which much study is indispensable; but he will compose poetry whether he is an agricultural labourer or has the good fortune to live at the Weimar Court. A born musician will occupy himself with music, no matter whether on all instruments” (he found this fantasy about “all instruments” in Proudhon. See “Communism”) “or only on a shepherd’s reed” (Virgil’s \textit{Eclogues}, of course, again come into the mind of our school-master). “A born philosophical intellect can prove its worth either as a university philosopher or a village philosopher. Finally, a \textit{born dunce} always remains a blockhead. Indeed, innate limited intellects undoubtedly form the most numerous class of mankind. \textit{And why should not the same differences occur in the human species as are unmistakably seen in every species of animals?}” (p. 434).

Sancho has again chosen his example with his usual lack of skill. If all his nonsense about born poets, musicians and philosophers is accepted, then this example only proves, on the one hand, that a born poet, etc., \textit{remains} what he is from birth—namely a poet, etc.; and, on the other hand, that the born poet, etc., in so far as he \textit{becomes}, develops, may, “owing to unfavourable circumstances”, not become what he \textit{could become}. His example, therefore, on the one hand, proves nothing at all, and, on the other hand, proves the opposite of what it was intended to prove; and taking both aspects together it proves that either from birth or owing to circumstances, Sancho belongs to “\textit{the most numerous class of mankind}”. However, he shares the consolation of being a \textit{unique “blockhead”} with this class and with his own blockheadedness.

\(^a\) A pun on the word \textit{Anstoss}—impulse, shock, scandal, offence; \textit{Stein des Anstosses}—stumbling block.—\textit{Ed.}
Here Sancho experiences the adventure with the magic potion which Don Quixote brewed from rosemary, wine, olive oil and salt. As Cervantes relates in the seventeenth chapter, after Sancho had drunk this mixture he spent two hours in sweats and convulsions pouring it out from both channels of his body. The materialist potion which our valiant armour-bearer imbibed for his self-enjoyment purges him of all his egoism in the extraordinary sense. We saw above that Sancho suddenly lost all his solemnity when confronted with the “impulse”, and renounced his “ability”, like of yore the Egyptian magicians when confronted with the lice of Moses. Now we observe two new attacks of faint-heartedness, in which he also gives way “to unfavourable circumstances” and finally even admits that his original physical organisation is something that becomes crippled without co-operation from him. What is left now to our bankrupt egoist? He has no power over his original physical organisation; nor can he control the “circumstances” and the “impulse” under the influence of which this organisation develops; “what he is at every instant” is not “his own creation”, but something created by the interaction between his innate potentialities and the circumstances acting on them—all this Sancho concedes. Unfortunate “creator”! Most unfortunate “creation”!

But the greatest calamity comes at the end. Sancho, not satisfied that already long ago he received the full count of the tres mil azotes y trecientos en ambas sus valientes posaderas, finally delivers himself another and mighty blow by proclaiming himself a believer in species. And what a believer in species! Firstly, he attributes division of labour to species by making it responsible for the fact that some people are poets, others musicians, and still others school-masters. Secondly, he ascribes to species the existing physical and intellectual defects of “the most numerous class of mankind” and makes it responsible for the fact that under the rule of the bourgeoisie the majority of individuals are like himself. According to his views on innate limited intellects, one would have to explain the present spread of scrofula from the fact that “the species” finds a special satisfaction in making innate scrofulous constitutions form “the most numerous class of mankind”. Even the most ordinary materialists and medical men had got beyond such naive views long before the egoist in agreement with himself was “called” upon by “the species”, “unfavourable circumstances” and the “impulse” to make his début before the German public. Just as previously Sancho explained all

---

a Exodus 8: 16-18.—Ed.
b Three thousand and three hundred lashes upon his ample buttocks.—Ed.
crippling of individuals, and hence of their relations, by means of the fixed ideas of school-masters, without worrying about the origin of these ideas, so now he explains this crippling as merely due to the natural process of generation. He has not the slightest idea that the ability of children to develop depends on the development of their parents and that all this crippling under existing social relations has arisen historically, and in the same way can be abolished again in the course of historical development. Even naturally evolved differences within the species, such as racial differences, etc., which Sancho does not mention at all, can and must be abolished in the course of historical development. Sancho—who in this connection casts a stealthy glance at zoology and so makes the discovery that “innate limited intellects” form the most numerous class not only among sheep and oxen, but also among polyps and infusoria, which have no heads at all—has perhaps heard that it is possible to improve races of animals and by cross-breeding to create entirely new, more perfect varieties both for human enjoyment and for their own self-enjoyment. “Why should not” Sancho be able to draw a conclusion from this in relation to people as well?

We shall take this opportunity to “introduce episodically” Sancho’s “transformations” in relation to species. We shall see that his attitude to species is exactly the same as to the holy: the more he blusters against it, the more he believes in it.

No. I. We have already seen that species engenders division of labour and the crippling that takes place under existing social circumstances and indeed in such a way that the species together with its products is regarded as something immutable under all circumstances, as outside the control of people.

No. II. “Species is already realised owing to inherent constitution; on the other hand, what you make of this constitution” (according to what was said above, this ought to be: what “circumstances” make of it) “is the realisation of you. Your hand is fully realised in the sense of species, otherwise it would not be a hand but, let us say, a paw.... You make of it what and how you wish it to be and what you can make of it” (Wigand, pp. 184, 185).

Here Sancho repeats in a different form what was already said in No. I.

We have seen, therefore, from what has been said so far that species, independently of control by individuals and the stage of their historical development, brings into the world all physical and spiritual potentialities, the immediate existence of individuals and, in embryo, division of labour.

No. III. Species remains as “impulse”, which is only a general term for the “circumstances” that determine the development of
the original individual, again engendered by species. For Sancho species is here precisely the same mysterious force which other bourgeois call the nature of things and which they make responsible for all relationships that are independent of them as bourgeois, and whose interconnection, therefore, they do not understand.

No. IV. Species taken as "what is possible for man" and "required by man" forms the basis of the organisation of labour in "Stirner's union", where likewise what is possible for all and required by all is regarded as a product of species.

No. V. We have already heard about the role that agreement plays in the union.

Page 462: "If it is a matter of coming to an agreement or communicating with one another, then, of course, I can only make use of the human means that are at my disposal because I am at the same time a man" (i.e., a specimen of the species).

Here, therefore, language is regarded as a product of the species. That Sancho speaks German and not French, however, is something he in no way owes to the species, but to circumstances. Incidentally, in every modern developed language, partly as a result of the historical development of the language from pre-existing material, as in the Romance and Germanic languages, partly owing to the crossing and mixing of nations, as in the English language, and partly as a result of the concentration of the dialects within a single nation brought about by economic and political concentration, the spontaneously evolved speech has been turned into a national language. As a matter of course, the individuals at some time will take completely under their control this product of the species as well. In the union, language as such will be spoken, holy language, the language of the holy—Hebrew, and indeed the Aramaic dialect spoken by that "corporeal essence", Christ. This "occurred" to us here "against the expectation" of Sancho, and "indeed exclusively because it seems to us that it could help to clarify the remainder".

No. VI. On pages 277, 278, we learn that "the species reveals itself in nations, towns, estates, diverse corporations" and, finally, "in the family"; hence it is perfectly logical that up to now it has "made history". Thus, here all preceding history, up to the unfortunate history of the unique, becomes a product of the "species" and, indeed, for the sufficient reason that this history has sometimes been summed up under the title of the history of mankind, i.e., of the species.
No. VII. In what has been said so far Sancho has attributed to the species more than any mortal had ever done before him, and he now sums it up in the following proposition:

"Species is nothing ... species is only a conception" (spirit, spectre, etc.) (p. 239).

Ultimately, then, this "nothing" of Sancho's, which is identical with a "conception", means nothing, for Sancho himself is "the creative nothing", and the species, as we have seen, creates a great deal, and in doing so it can therefore very well be "nothing". Moreover Sancho tells us on page 456:

"Being justifies nothing at all; something imagined exists just as well as something not imagined."

Starting with page 448, Sancho spins out a yarn lasting thirty pages in order to strike "fire" out of thought and criticism of the egoist in agreement with himself. We have already experienced too many expressions of his thought and criticism to give the reader further "offence" with Sancho's beggar's broth. One spoonful of it will suffice.

"Do you believe that thoughts fly about freely for the taking, so that anyone can capture some of them and then put them forward against me as his inviolable property? Everything that flies about, all of it is—mine" (p. 457).

Here Sancho poaches snipe existing only in the mind. We have seen how many of the thoughts flying about he has captured for himself. He fancied that he could catch them as soon as he put the salt of the holy on their tails. This colossal contradiction between his actual property in regard to thoughts and his illusions on that score may serve as a classic and striking example of his entire property in the extraordinary sense. It is precisely this contrast that constitutes his self-enjoyment.

6. Solomon's Song of Songs
    or
    The Unique

Cessem do sabio Grego, e do Troiano,
As navegaçoês grandes que fizeram;
Calle-se de Alexandro, e de Trajano
A fama das victorias que tiveram,

Cesse tudo o que a Musa antigua canta,
Que outro valor mais alto se alevanta.

a A pun in the original: Anstoss geben—an expression frequently used by Stirner—can mean either "to give an impetus" or "to give offence". —Ed.
E vós, Spreïdes minhas...
Dai-me huma furia grande, e sonorosa,
E naõ de agreste avena, on frauta ruda;
Mas de tuba canora, e bellicosa
Que o peito accende, e o cõr ao gesto muda,

give me, o nymphs of the Spree, a song worthy of the heroes who fight on your banks against Substance and Man, a song that will spread over the whole world and will be sung in all lands—for it is a matter here of the man whose deeds are

Mais do que promettia a força humana,
greater than mere “human” power can perform, the man who

... edificára
Novo reino que tanto sublimára.

who has founded a new kingdom among a far-off people, viz., the “union”—it is a matter here of being a

—tenro, e novo ramo florescente
De huma arvore de Christo, mais amada,
of the tender and young blossoming shoot of a tree especially loved by Christ, a tree which is nothing less than

certissima esperança
Do augmento da pequena Christiandade;

\[\text{---}
\]

\(^{a}\) Cease man of Troy, and cease thou sage of Greece,
To boast of Navigations great ye made;
Let the high Fame of Alexander cease,
And Trajan's Banners in the East display'd:

Cease All, whose Actions ancient Bards exprest:
A brighter Valour arises in the West.
And you (my Spree\(^{b}\) Nymphs)...
Give me a mighty Fury, Nor rude Reeds
Or rustic Bag-Pipes sound, But such as War's
Lowd Instrument (the noble Trumpet) breeds,
Which fires the Breast, and stirs the blood to jars.

(This and the following quotations are from Luis de Camões, \textit{Lusiada}.—\textit{Ed.})

\(^{b}\) Marx and Engels substituted “Spree”—the river on which Berlin stands—for Tagus.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^{c}\) Beyond what strength of human nature here.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^{d}\) ... acquir'd

A modern Scepter which to Heaven aspired.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^{e}\) ... fair and tender Blossom of that Tree
Belov'd by Him, who dy'd on one for Man.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^{f}\) ... certain Hope t'extend the Pale,
One day, of narrow Christianitie.—\textit{Ed.}
the surest hope of growth for faint-hearted Christianity—in a word, it is a matter of something "unprecedented", the "unique".*

Everything that is to be found in this unprecedented song of songs about the unique was in existence earlier in the "book". We mention this chapter only for the sake of good order; so that we should be able to do it properly we have left the examination of some points until now and we shall briefly recapitulate others.

Sancho's "ego" has gone through the full gamut of soul migration. We already met it as the egoist in agreement with himself, as corvée peasant, as trader in thoughts, as unfortunate competitor, as owner, as a slave who has had one of his legs torn out, as Sancho tossed into the air by the interaction between birth and circumstances, and in a hundred other shapes. Here it bids us farewell as an "inhuman being", under the same banner as that under which it made its entry into the New Testament.

"Only the inhuman being is the real man" (p. 232).

This is one of the thousand and one equations in which Sancho expounds his legend of the holy.

The concept "man" is not the real man.

The concept "man" = Man.

Man = not the real man.

The real man = the non-man,

= the inhuman being.

"Only the inhuman being is the real man."

Sancho tries to explain to himself the harmlessness of this proposition by means of the following transformations:

"It is not so difficult to express in a few plain words what an inhuman being is; it is a man [...] who does not correspond to the concept of what is human. Logic calls this a nonsensical judgment. Would one have the right to pronounce this judgment that someone can be a man without being a man, if one did not admit the validity of the hypothesis that the concept of man can be separated from his existence, that the essence can be separated from the appearance? People say: so and so seems to be a man, but he is not a man. People have pronounced this nonsensical judgment throughout many centuries: moreover, during this long period of time there have only been inhuman beings. What individual did ever correspond to his concept?" (p. 232).

This passage is again based on our school-master's fantasy about the school-master who has created for himself an ideal of "Man" and "put it into the heads" of other people, a fantasy which forms the basic theme of "the book".

Sancho calls it a hypothesis that the concept and existence, the essence and appearance of "man" can be separated, as though the

* Cf. Camões; Lusiadas, I, 1-17.
possibility of this separation is not already expressed in the very words he uses. When he says *concept*, he is speaking of something different from *existence*; when he says *essence*, he is speaking of something different from *appearance*. It is not these *statements* that he brings into contradiction, but they themselves are the expressions of a contradiction. Hence the only question that could have been raised is whether it is permissible for him to range something under these points of view; and in order to deal with this Sancho would have had to consider the actual relations of people who have been given other names in these metaphysical relations. For the rest, Sancho's own arguments about the egoist in agreement with himself and about rebellion show how these points of view can be made to diverge, while his arguments about peculiarity, possibility and reality—in connection with "self-enjoyment"—show how they can be made simultaneously to coincide and to diverge.

The nonsensical judgment of the philosophers that the real man is not man is in the sphere of abstraction merely the most universal, all-embracing expression of the actually existing universal contradiction between the conditions and needs of people. The nonsensical form of the abstract proposition fully corresponds to the nonsensical character, carried to extreme lengths, of the relations of bourgeois society, just as Sancho's nonsensical judgment about his environment—they are egoists and at the same time they are not egoists—corresponds to the actual contradiction between the existence of the German petty bourgeois and the tasks which existing relations have imposed on them and which they themselves entertain in the form of pious wishes and desires. Incidentally, philosophers have declared people to be inhuman, not because they did not correspond to the concept of man, but because their concept of man did not correspond to the true concept of man, or because they had no true understanding of man. *Tout comme chez nous,* in "the book", where Sancho also declares that people are non-egoists for the sole reason that they have no true understanding of egoism.

In view of its extreme triviality and indisputable certainty, there should have been no need to mention the perfectly inoffensive proposition that the *idea* of man is not the *real* man, that the idea of a thing is not the thing itself—a proposition which is also applicable to a stone and to the idea of a stone, in accordance with which Sancho should have said that the real stone is non-stone. But Sancho's

---

\(^3\) A modified phrase from Nolant de Fatouville's comedy *Arlequin, empereur dans la lune*—"*tout comme ici*" (just as here) is the stock response made by the people listening to Harlequin's inventions about life on the moon.—Ed.
well-known fantasy that only because of the domination of ideas and concepts mankind has up to now been subjected to all sorts of misfortunes, makes it possible for him to link his old conclusions again with this proposition. Sancho's old opinion that one has only to get a few ideas out of one's head in order to abolish from the world the conditions which have given rise to these ideas, is reproduced here in the form that one has only to get out of one's head the idea of man in order to put an end to the actually existing conditions which are today called inhuman—whether this predicate "inhuman" expresses the opinion of the individual in contradiction with his conditions or the opinion of the normal, ruling society about the abnormal, subjected class. In just the same way, a whale taken from the ocean and put in the Kupfergraben, if it possessed consciousness, would declare this situation created by "unfavourable circumstances" to be unwhale-like, although Sancho could prove that it is whale-like, if only because it is its, the whale's, own situation—that is precisely how people argue in certain circumstances.

On page 185, Sancho raises the important question:

"But how to curb the inhuman being who dwells in each individual? How can one manage not to set free the inhuman being along with the human being? All liberalism has a mortal enemy, an invincible opponent, as God has the devil; at the side of the human being there is always the inhuman being, the egoist, the individual. State, society, mankind cannot master this devil."

"And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison,
And shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle....
And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city" (Revelation of St. John 20:7-9).

In the form in which Sancho understands it, the question again becomes sheer nonsense. He imagines that people up to now have always formed a concept of man, and then won freedom for themselves to the extent that was necessary to realise this concept; that the measure of freedom that they achieved was determined each time by their idea of the ideal of man at the time; it was thus unavoidable that in each individual there remained a residue which did not correspond to this ideal and, hence, since it was "inhuman", was either not set free or only freed malgré eux.

In reality, of course, what happened was that people won freedom for themselves each time to the extent that was dictated and permitted not by their ideal of man, but by the existing productive forces. All emancipation carried through hitherto has been based, however, on restricted productive forces. The production which these productive forces could provide was insufficient for the whole of society and made development possible only if some persons
satisfied their needs at the expense of others, and therefore some—the minority—obtained the monopoly of development, while others—the majority—owing to the constant struggle to satisfy their most essential needs, were for the time being (i.e., until the creation of new revolutionary productive forces) excluded from any development. Thus, society has hitherto always developed within the framework of a contradiction—in antiquity the contradiction between free men and slaves, in the Middle Ages that between nobility and serfs, in modern times that between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. This explains, on the one hand, the abnormal, "inhuman" way in which the oppressed class satisfies its needs, and, on the other hand, the narrow limits within which intercourse, and with it the whole ruling class, develops. Hence this restricted character of development consists not only in the exclusion of one class from development, but also in the narrow-mindedness of the excluding class, and the "inhuman" is to be found also within the ruling class. This so-called "inhuman" is just as much a product of present-day relations as the "human" is; it is their negative aspect, the rebellion—which is not based on any new revolutionary productive force—against the prevailing relations brought about by the existing productive forces, and against the way of satisfying needs that corresponds to these relations. The positive expression "human" corresponds to the definite relations predominant at a certain stage of production and to the way of satisfying needs determined by them, just as the negative expression "inhuman" corresponds to the attempt to negate these predominant relations and the way of satisfying needs prevailing under them without changing the existing mode of production, an attempt that this stage of production daily engenders afresh.

For our saint, such world-historical struggles are reduced to a mere collision between Saint Bruno and "the mass". Cf. the whole criticism of humane liberalism, especially page 192 et seq.

Thus, our simple-minded Sancho with his naive little statement about the inhuman being and with his talk of getting-man-out-of-one's-head, thanks to which the inhuman being also disappears and there is no longer any measure for individuals, finally arrives at the following result. He regards the physical, intellectual and social crippling and enslavement which as a result of the existing relations afflict an individual, as the individuality and peculiarity of that individual; like an ordinary conservative he calmly recognises these relations once he has freed his mind of all worry by getting out of his head the philosophers' idea of these relations. Just as here he declares fortuitous features imposed on the individual to be
the latter's individuality, so earlier (cf. "Logic"), in connection with the ego, he abstracted not only from any fortuituity, but also in general from any individuality.a

About the "inhuman" great result obtained by him Sancho sings in the following Kyrie eleison, b which he puts into the mouth of "the inhuman being":

"I was despicable because I sought my better self outside me;
"I was the inhuman, because I dreamed of the human;
"I was like the pious ones who hunger for their true ego and always remain poor sinners;
"I thought of myself only in comparison with someone else;
"I was not all in all, I was not—unique.
"Now, however, I cease to appear to myself as the inhuman;
"I cease to measure myself by man and to let others measure me;
"I cease to recognise anything above myself—
"I was inhuman, but I am no longer inhuman, I am the unique!" Hallelujah!

We shall not dwell further here on how "the inhuman"—which, it may be said in passing, put itself in the right frame of mind by "turning its back" on itself and the critic", Saint Bruno—how "the inhuman" here "appears", or does not "appear" to itself. We shall only point out that the "unique" (it or he) is characterised here by his getting the holy out of his head for the nine-hundredth time, whereby, as we in our turn are compelled to repeat for the nine-hundredth time, everything remains as before, not to mention the fact that it is no more than a pious wish.

We have here, for the first time, the unique person, Sancho, who with the litany mentioned above has received the accolade of knighthood, now appropriates his new, noble name. Sancho arrives at his uniqueness by getting "Man" out of his head. He thereby ceases "to think of himself only in comparison with someone else" and "to recognise something above him". He becomes incomparable. This is again the same old fantasy of Sancho's that it is not the needs of individuals, but concepts, ideas, "the holy"—here in the shape of "Man"—that are the sole tertium comparationis and the sole bond between individuals.* He gets an idea out of his head and thereby becomes unique.

To become "unique" in his sense of the word he must above all prove to us his freedom from premises.

* [The following passage is crossed out in the manuscript:] Sancho, who notices nothing but "the holy", need not bother about the fact that it is through their needs that individuals are linked together, and that the development of the productive forces up to now implies the domination of one section over the other.

---
a See this volume. pp. 278-81.—Ed.
b Lord, have mercy.—Ed.
Page 470: “Your thought has as its premise not thought, but you. But thus you nevertheless have yourself as a premise? Yes, but not to me, but to my thought. I am before my thought. It follows hence that no thought precedes my thinking, or that my thinking is without any premise. For the premise which I am for my thinking is not one created by thinking, not one that is thought, but ... is the owner of thinking, and proves only that thinking is nothing but—property.”

“We are prepared to allow” that Sancho does not think before he thinks, and that he and everyone else is in this respect a thinker without premises. Similarly we concede that he does not have any thought as the premise of his existence, i.e., that he was not created by thoughts. If for a moment Sancho abstracts from all his thoughts—which with his meagre assortment cannot be very difficult—there remains his real ego, but his real ego within the framework of the actual relations of the world that exist for it. In this way he has divested himself for a moment of all dogmatic premises, but now for the first time the real premises begin to come to light for him. And these real premises are also the premises of his dogmatic premises which, whether he likes it or not, will reappear to him together with the real ones so long as he does not obtain different real premises, and with them also different dogmatic premises, or so long as he does not recognise in a materialistic way that the real premises are the premises of his thinking, and as a result his dogmatic ones will disappear altogether. Just as his development up to now and his Berlin environment have at present led to the dogmatic premise of egoism in agreement with itself, so, despite all imaginary freedom from premises, this premise will remain with him as long as he fails to overcome its real premises.

As a true school-master, Sancho still continues to strive for the famous Hegelian “premiseless thinking”, i.e., thinking without dogmatic premises, which in Hegel too is only a pious wish. Sancho believed he could achieve this by a skilful leap and even surpass it by going in pursuit of the premiseless ego. But both the one and the other eluded his grasp.

Then Sancho tries his luck in another fashion:

Pages 214, 215: “Make full use” of the demand for freedom! “Who shall become free? You, I, we. Free from what? From everything that is not you, not I, not we. I, therefore, am the core.... What remains if I become free from everything that is not I? Only I and nothing but I.”

So that was the poodle's core!
A travelling scholar? The incident makes me laugh.³

---

³ Goethe, Faust, I. Teil, 1. “Studierzimmerszene”. —Ed.
"Everything that is not you, not I, not we" is, of course, here again a dogmatic idea, like state, nationality, division of labour, etc. Once these ideas have been subjected to criticism—and, in Sancho's opinion, this has already been done by "criticism", namely critical criticism—he again imagines that he is also free from the actual state, actual nationality and division of labour. Consequently the ego, which is here the "core", which "has become free from everything that is not I"—is still the above-mentioned premiseless ego with everything that it has not got rid of.

If, however, Sancho were once to tackle the subject of "becoming free" with the desire of freeing himself not merely from categories, but from actual fetters, then such liberation would presuppose a change common to him and to a large mass of other people, and would produce a change in the state of the world which again would be common to him and others. Although his "ego" "remains" after liberation, it is hereafter a totally changed ego sharing with others a changed state of the world which is precisely the premise, common to him and others, of his and their freedom, and it follows that the uniqueness, incomparability and independence of his "ego" again come to nothing.

Sancho tries again in a third fashion:

Page 237: "Their disgrace is not that they" (Jew and Christian) "exclude each other but that this only half occurs. If they could be perfect egoists they would totally exclude each other."

Page 273: "If one desires only to resolve the contradiction one grasps its meaning in too formal and feeble a way. The contradiction deserves rather to be sharpened."

Page 274: "Only when you recognise your contradiction fully and when everyone asserts himself from head to foot as unique will you no longer simply conceal your contradiction.... The final and most decisive contradiction—that between one unique person and another—goes basically beyond the bounds of what is called contradiction.... As a unique person you have nothing more in common with the other and, for that reason, nothing that makes you separate from him or hostile to him.... Contradiction disappears in perfect ... separateness or uniqueness."

Page 183: "I do not want to have or to be something special in relation to others; nor do I measure myself by others.... I want to be everything I can be, and to have everything I can have. What do I care whether others are or have something similar to me? They can neither be nor have something equal, the same. I do nothing detrimental to them any more than it is to the detriment of the cliff that I have the advantage of movement. If they could have it, they would have it. Doing nothing to the detriment of other people, that is the meaning of the demand to have no privileges.... One should not regard oneself as 'something special', e.g., Jew or Christian. Well, I regard myself not as something special but as unique. True, I have a resemblance to others; but this holds only for comparison or reflection; in fact, however, I am incomparable, unique. My flesh is not their flesh, my spirit is not their spirit. If you bring them under the general concept 'flesh', 'spirit', then those are your thoughts, which have nothing to do with my flesh, my spirit."
Page 234: “Human society perishes because of the egoists, for they no longer treat one another as human beings, but act egoistically as an ego against a you that is totally distinct from and hostile to me.”

Page 180: “As though one individual will not always seek out another, and as though one person does not have to adapt himself to another, when he needs him. But the difference is that in this case the individual actually unites with another individual, whereas previously he was linked to him by a bond.”

Page 178: “Only when you are unique can you in your intercourse with one another be what you actually are.”

As regards Sancho’s illusion about the intercourse of the unique ones “as what they actually are”, about “the uniting of the individual with the individual”, in short, about the “union”, that has been completely dealt with. We shall merely point out: whereas in the union each regarded and treated the other merely as his object, his property (cf. page 167 and the theory of property and exploitation), in the “Commentary” (Wigand, p. 157), on the contrary, the governor of the island of Barataria realises and recognises that the other also belongs to himself, is his own, is unique, and in that capacity also becomes Sancho’s object, although no longer Sancho’s property. In his despair, he saves himself only by the unexpected idea that “because of this” he “forgets himself in sweet self-oblivion”, a delight which he “affords himself a thousand times every hour” and which is still further sweetened by the sweet consciousness that nevertheless he has not “completely disappeared”. The result, therefore, is the old wisdom that each exists for himself and for others.

Let us now reduce Sancho’s pompous statements to their actual modest content.

The bombastic phrases about “contradiction” which has to be sharpened and taken to extremes, and about the “something special”, which Sancho does not want to have as his advantage, amount to one and the same thing. Sancho wants, or rather believes he wants, that intercourse between individuals should be purely personal, that their intercourse should not be mediated through some third thing (cf. competition). This third thing here is the “something special”, or the special, not absolute, contradiction, i.e., the position of individuals in relation to one another determined by present-day social relations. Sancho does not want, for example, two individuals to be in “contradiction” to one another as bourgeois and proletarian; he protests against the “special” which forms the “advantage” of the bourgeois over the proletarian; he would like to have them enter into a purely personal relation, to associate with one another merely as individuals. He does not take into consideration that in the framework of division of labour personal relations
necessarily and inevitably develop into class relations and become fixed as such and that, therefore, all his talk amounts simply to a pious wish, which he expects to realise by exhorting the individuals of these classes to get out of their heads the idea of their "contradiction" and their "special" "privilege". In the passages from Sancho quoted above, everything turns only on people's opinion of themselves, and his opinion of them, what they want and what he wants. "Contradiction" and the "special" are abolished by a change of "opinion" and "wanting".

Even that which constitutes the advantage of an individual as such over other individuals, is in our day at the same time a product of society and in its realisation is bound to assert itself as privilege, as we have already shown Sancho in connection with competition. Further, the individual as such, regarded by himself, is subordinated to division of labour, which makes him one-sided, cripples and determines him.

What, at best, does Sancho's sharpening of contradiction and abolition of the special amount to? To this, that the mutual relations of individuals should be their behaviour to one another, while their mutual differences should be their self-distinctions (as one empirical self distinguishes itself from another). Both of these are either, as with Sancho, an ideological paraphrase of what exists, for the relations of individuals under all circumstances can only be their mutual behaviour, while their differences can only be their self-distinctions. Or they are the pious wish that they should behave in such a way and differ from one another in such a way, that their behaviour does not acquire independent existence as a social relationship independent of them, and that their differences from one another should not assume the material character (independent of the person) which they have assumed and daily continue to assume.

Individuals have always and in all circumstances "proceeded from themselves", but since they were not unique in the sense of not needing any connections with one another, and since their needs, consequently their nature, and the method of satisfying their needs, connected them with one another (relations between the sexes, exchange, division of labour), they had to enter into relations with one another. Moreover, since they entered into intercourse with one another not as pure egos, but as individuals at a definite stage of development of their productive forces and requirements, and since this intercourse, in its turn, determined production and needs, it was, therefore, precisely the personal, individual behaviour of individuals, their behaviour to one another as individuals, that created the existing relations and daily reproduces them anew. They entered
into intercourse with one another as what they were, they proceeded “from themselves”, as they were, irrespective of their “outlook on life”. This “outlook on life”—even the warped one of the philosophers—could, of course, only be determined by their actual life. Hence it certainly follows that the development of an individual is determined by the development of all the others with whom he is directly or indirectly associated, and that the different generations of individuals entering into relation with one another are connected with one another, that the physical existence of the later generations is determined by that of their predecessors, and that these later generations inherit the productive forces and forms of intercourse accumulated by their predecessors, their own mutual relations being determined thereby. In short, it is clear that development takes place and that the history of a single individual cannot possibly be separated from the history of preceding or contemporary individuals, but is determined by this history.

The transformation of the individual relationship into its opposite, a purely material relationship, the distinction of individuality and fortuity by the individuals themselves, is a historical process, as we have already shown, and at different stages of development it assumes different, ever sharper and more universal forms. In the present epoch, the domination of material relations over individuals, and the suppression of individuality by fortuitous circumstances, has assumed its sharpest and most universal form, thereby setting existing individuals a very definite task. It has set them the task of replacing the domination of circumstances and of chance over individuals by the domination of individuals over chance and circumstances. It has not, as Sancho imagines, put forward the demand that “I should develop myself”, which up to now every individual has done without Sancho’s good advice; it has on the contrary called for liberation from a quite definite mode of development. This task, dictated by present-day relations, coincides with the task of organising society in a communist way.

We have already shown above that the abolition of a state of affairs in which relations become independent of individuals, in which individuality is subservient to chance and the personal relations of individuals are subordinated to general class relations, etc.—that the abolition of this state of affairs is determined in the final analysis by the abolition of division of labour. We have also shown that the abolition of division of labour is determined by the development of intercourse and productive forces to such a degree

\footnote{See this volume, pp. 75-81.—Ed.}
of universality that private property and division of labour become fetters on them. We have further shown that private property can be abolished only on condition of an all-round development of individuals, precisely because the existing form of intercourse and the existing productive forces are all-embracing and only individuals that are developing in an all-round fashion can appropriate them, i.e., can turn them into free manifestations of their lives. We have shown that at the present time individuals must abolish private property, because the productive forces and forms of intercourse have developed so far that, under the domination of private property, they have become destructive forces, and because the contradiction between the classes has reached its extreme limit. Finally, we have shown that the abolition of private property and of the division of labour is itself the association of individuals on the basis created by modern productive forces and world intercourse.

Within communist society, the only society in which the genuine and free development of individuals ceases to be a mere phrase, this development is determined precisely by the connection of individuals, a connection which consists partly in the economic prerequisites and partly in the necessary solidarity of the free development of all, and, finally, in the universal character of the activity of individuals on the basis of the existing productive forces. We are, therefore, here concerned with individuals at a definite historical stage of development and by no means merely with individuals chosen at random, even disregarding the indispensable communist revolution, which itself is a general condition for their free development. The individuals’ consciousness of their mutual relations will, of course, likewise be completely changed, and, therefore, will no more be the “principle of love” or dévoûment than it will be egoism.

Thus, “uniqueness”—taken in the sense of genuine development and individual behaviour, as outlined above—presupposes not only things quite different from good will and right consciousness, but even the direct opposite of Sancho’s fantasies. With him “uniqueness” is nothing more than an embellishment of existing conditions, a little drop of comforting balm for the poor, impotent soul that has become wretched through wretchedness.

As regards Sancho’s “incomparability”, the situation is the same as with his “uniqueness”. He himself will recall, if he is not completely “lost” in “sweet self-oblivion”, that the organisation of labour in

---

\[a\] See Chapter I of Volume I of *The German Ideology.*—*Ed.*
“Stirner’s union of egoists” was based not only on the comparability of needs, but also on their equality. And he assumed not only equal needs, but also equal activity, so that one individual could take the place of another in “human work”. And the extra remuneration of the “unique” person, crowning his efforts—what other basis had it than the fact that his performance was compared with that of others and in view of its superiority was better paid? And how can Sancho talk at all about incomparability when he allows money—the means of comparison that acquires independent existence in practice—to continue in being, subordinates himself to it and allows himself to be measured by this universal scale in order to be compared with others? It is quite evident that he himself gives the lie to his doctrine of incomparability. Nothing is easier than to call equality and inequality, similarity and dissimilarity, determinations of reflection. Incomparability too is a determination of reflection which has the activity of comparison as its premise. To show that comparison is not at all a purely arbitrary determination of reflection, it is enough to give just one example, money, the permanent tertium comparationis of all people and things.

Incidentally, incomparability can have different meanings. The only meaning in question here, namely “uniqueness” in the sense of originality, presupposes that the activity of the incomparable individual in a definite sphere differs from the activity of his equals. Persiani is an incomparable singer precisely because she is a singer and is compared with other singers, and indeed by people who are able to recognise her incomparability through comparison based on normal hearing and musical training. Persiani’s singing and the croaking of a frog are incomparable, although even here there could be a comparison, but it would be a comparison between a human being and a frog, and not between Persiani and a particular unique frog. Only in the first case is it possible to speak of a comparison between individuals, in the second it is a matter only of their properties as species or genus. A third type of incomparability—the incomparability of Persiani’s singing with the tail of a comet—we leave to Sancho for his “self-enjoyment”, since at any rate he finds pleasure in “nonsensical judgments”, although even this absurd comparison has a real basis in the absurdity of present-day relations. Money is the common measure for all, even the most heterogeneous things.

Incidentally, Sancho’s incomparability amounts to the same empty phrase as his uniqueness. Individuals are no longer to be measured by some tertium comparationis independent of them, but comparison should be transformed into their self-distinction, i.e., into the free
development of their individuality, which, moreover, is brought about by their getting "fixed ideas" out of their heads.

Incidentally, Sancho is acquainted only with the type of comparison made by scribblers and ranters, which leads to the magnificent conclusion that Sancho is not Bruno and Bruno is not Sancho. On the other hand, he is, of course, unacquainted with the sciences which have made considerable advances just by comparing and establishing differences in the spheres of comparison and in which comparison acquires a character of universal importance—i.e., in comparative anatomy, botany, philology, etc.

Great nations—the French, North Americans, English—are constantly comparing themselves with one another both in practice and theory, in competition and in science. Petty shopkeepers and philistines, like the Germans, who are afraid of comparison and competition, hide behind the shield of incomparability supplied them by their manufacturer of philosophical labels. Not only in their interests, but also in his own, has Sancho refused to tolerate any comparison.

On page 415 Sancho says:

"There exists no one equal to me,"

and on page 408 association with "my equals" is depicted as the dissolution of society in intercourse:

"The child prefers intercourse with his equals to society."

However, Sancho sometimes uses "equal to me" and "equal" in general in the sense of "the same", e.g., the passage on page 183 quoted above:

"They can neither be nor have something equal, the same."

Here he arrives at his final "new turn of expression", which he uses especially in the "Commentary".

The uniqueness, the originality, the "peculiar" development of individuals which, according to Sancho, does not for example occur in all "human works", although no one will deny that one stove-setter does not set a stove in the "same" way as another; the "unique" development of individuals which, in the opinion of this same Sancho, does not occur in religious, political, etc., spheres (see "Phenomenology"), although no one will deny that of all those who believe in Islam not one believes in it in the "same" way as another and to this extent each of them is "unique", just as among citizens not one has the "same" attitude to the state as another if only because it is a matter of his attitude, and not that of some-other—all
this much praised "uniqueness" which [according to Sancho] was so distinct from "sameness", identity of the person, that in all individuals who have so far existed he could hardly see anything but "specimens" of a species, is thus reduced here to the identity of a person with himself, as established by the police, to the fact that one individual is not some other individual. Thus Sancho, who was going to take the world by storm, dwindles to a clerk in a passport office.

On page 184 of the "Commentary" he relates with much unction and great self-enjoyment that he does not become replete when the Japanese Emperor eats, because his stomach and that of the Japanese Emperor are "unique", "incomparable stomachs", i.e., not the same stomachs. If Sancho believes that in this way he has abolished the social relations hitherto existing or even only the laws of nature, then his naïveté is excessively great and it springs merely from the fact that philosophers have not depicted social relations as the mutual relations of particular individuals identical with themselves, and the laws of nature as the mutual connections of these particular bodies.

The classic expression which Leibniz gave to this old proposition (to be found on the first page of any physics textbook as the theory of the impenetrability of bodies) is well known:

"Opus tamen est ... ut quaelibet monas differat ab alia quacunque, neque enim unquam dantur in natura duo entia, quorum unum exasse conveniat cum altero."a

(Principia Philosophiae seu Theses, etc.)

Sancho's uniqueness is here reduced to a quality which he shares with every louse and every grain of sand.

The greatest disclaimer with which his philosophy could end is that it regards the realisation that Sancho is not Bruno, which is obvious to every country bumpkin and police sergeant, to be one of the greatest discoveries, and that it considers the fact of this difference to be a real miracle.

Thus the "critical hurrah" of our "virtuoso of thought" has become an uncritical miserere.

After all these adventures our "unique" squire again sails into the harbour of his native serf's cottage. "The title spectre of his book"b rushes out to meet him "joyfully". Her first enquiry is: how is the ass?

---

a "However, every monad necessarily differs from every other; for in nature there are never two things that exactly coincide with each other."—Ed.
b An allusion to Stirner's wife, Marie Dähnhardt (see this volume, p. 400).—Ed.
Better than his master, replies Sancho.
Thanks be to God for so much goodness. But tell me now, my
friend, what profit have you got out of your squiredom? What new
dress have you brought me?
I have brought nothing like that, replies Sancho, but I have
brought “the creative nothing, the nothing from which I myself as
creator create everything”. This means you will yet see me in the
capacity of church father and archbishop of an island and, indeed,
one of the best it is possible to find.
God grant it, my treasure, and may it be soon, for we sorely need
it. But as regards the island you mention, I don’t know what you
mean.
Honey is not for the ass’s mouth, replies Sancho. You will see it for
yourself in due course, wife. But even now I can tell you that nothing
is more pleasant in the world than the honour of seeking adventures
as an egoist in agreement with himself and as the squire of the
rueful countenance. True, most of these adventures do not “reach
the final goal” so that “human requirement is satisfied” (tan como el
hombre querría), for ninety-nine adventures out of a hundred go
awry and follow a tangled course. I know this from experience, for in
some of them I was cheated and from others I went home soundly
pounded and thrashed. But in spite of all that, it is a fine thing, for at
any rate the “unique” requirement is always satisfied when one
wanders through the whole of history, quoting all the books in the
Berlin reading-room, getting an etymological night’s lodging in all
languages, falsifying political facts in all countries, boastfully
throwing down gages to all dragons and ostriches, elfs, field
hobgoblins and “spectres”, exchanging blows with all church
fathers and philosophers and yet, finally, paying for it only with your
own body (cf. Cervantes, I, Chapter 52).

---
a As the human being desires.—Ed.
Although formerly, when in a state of humiliation (Cervantes, Chapters 26 and 29), Sancho had all kinds of "doubts" about accepting an ecclesiastical benefice, nevertheless, after pondering over the changed circumstances and his earlier preparation as beadle to a religious brotherhood (Cervantes, Chapter 21), he finally decided to "get" this doubt "out of his head". He became archbishop of the island of Barataria and a cardinal and as such sits with solemn mien and arch-ecclesiastical dignity among the foremost of our Council. Now, after the long episode of "the book", we return to this Council.

True, we find that "brother Sancho" in his new station in life has changed considerably. He now represents the ecclesia triumphans—a in contrast to the ecclesia militans, in which he was before. Instead of the belligerent fanfares of "the book" there is a solemn seriousness; "Stirner" has taken the place of the "ego". This shows how true the French saying is: qu'il n'y a qu'un pas du sublime au ridicule. Since he became a father of the church and began to write pastoral epistles, Sancho calls himself nothing but "Stirner". He learned this "unique" way of self-enjoyment from Feuerbach, but unfortunately it befits him no better than playing the lute does his ass. When he speaks of himself in the third person, everyone sees that Sancho the "creator", after the manner of Prussian non-commissioned officers, addresses his "creation" Stirner in the third person, and should on no account be confused with Caesar. The

---

a Church triumphant.—Ed.
b Church militant.—Ed.
c There is only one step from the sublime to the ridiculous (an expression used by Napoleon on many occasions).—Ed.
d The reference is to Julius Caesar's Commentarii de bello Gallico (the author wrote in the third person about himself).—Ed.
impression is all the more comical because Sancho commits this inconsistency only in order to compete with Feuerbach. Sancho's "self-enjoyment" of his performance as a great man becomes here malgré lui an enjoyment for others.

The "special" thing that Sancho does in his "Commentary", insofar as we have not "used it up" already in the episode, consists in his regaling us with a new series of variations on the familiar themes already played with such long-winded monotony in "the book". Here Sancho's music, which like that of the Indian priests of Vishnu knows only one note, is played a few registers higher. But its narcotic effect remains, of course, the same. Thus, for example, the antithesis of "egoistical" and "holy" is again thoroughly kneaded, this time under the signboards of "interesting" and "uninteresting", and then of "interesting" and "absolutely interesting", an innovation which, incidentally, could only be of interest to lovers of unleavened bread, in common parlance matzos. One should not, of course, blame an "educated" Berlin petty bourgeois for the belletristic distortion of the interested into the interesting.

All the illusions which, according to Sancho's pet crotchet, were created by "school-masters" appear here "as difficulties—doubts", which "only spirit created" and which "the poor souls who allowed themselves to be talked into these doubts" "should ... overcome" by "light-heartedness" (the famous getting out of one's head) (p. 162). Then comes a "treatise" in which he considers whether "doubts" should be got out of one's head by "thinking" or by "thoughtlessness", and a critical-moral adagio in which he laments in minor chords:

"Thought must on no account be suppressed by rejoicing" (p. 166).

For the tranquillity of Europe, and especially of the oppressed old merry and young sorry England, as soon as Sancho has become somewhat accustomed to his episcopal chaise percée, he issues from this eminence the following gracious pastoral epistle:

"Civil society is not at all dear to Stirner, and he has no intention of extending it so that it swallows up the state and the family" (p. 189).

Let Mr. Cobden and Monsieur Dunoyer bear this in mind.

In his capacity of archbishop, Sancho immediately takes control of the spiritual police, and on page 193 he gives Hess a reprimand for confusing matters, which "are contrary to police regulations" and

---

a In the manuscript the Berlin dialect form jebildeten is used.—Ed.
b The phrase "old merry and young sorry England" is in English in the manuscript.—Ed.
c Night commode.—Ed.
the more unpardonable the greater the efforts that our church father continually makes to establish identity. To prove to this same Hess that “Stirner” also possesses the “heroic courage of lying”, that orthodox quality of the egoist in agreement with himself, he sings on page 188: “But Stirner does not say at all—contrary to what Hess makes him say—that the whole mistake of previous egoists was merely that they were not conscious of their egoism.” Cf. “Phenomenology” and the entire “book”. The other quality of the egoist in agreement with himself—credulity—he displays on page 182, where he “does not dispute” Feuerbach’s opinion that “the individual is a communist”. A further exercise of his police powers consists in censuring (on page 154) all his reviewers for not having dealt “in more detail with egoism as Stirner conceives it”. Indeed, they all made the mistake of thinking that it was a question of actual egoism, whereas it was merely a question of “Stirner’s” conception of it.

The “Apologetical Commentary” also proves Sancho’s aptitude for acting as a church father by beginning with a piece of hypocrisy:

“A brief reply may be of benefit, if not perhaps to the reviewers named, then at least to some other reader of the book” (p. 147).

Here Sancho plays the devotee and asserts that he is prepared to sacrifice his valuable time for the “benefit” of the public, although he constantly assures us that he always has in view only his own benefit, and although he is only trying here to save his own clerical skin.

Thereby we have finished with the “special” of the “Commentary”. The “unique” feature, which, however, occurs already in “the book”, on page 491, has been kept by us in reserve not so much for the “benefit” of “some other reader” as for “Stirner’s” own benefit. One hand washes the other, from which it indisputably follows that “the individual is a communist”.

One of the most difficult tasks confronting philosophers is to descend from the world of thought to the actual world. Language is the immediate actuality of thought. Just as philosophers have given thought an independent existence, so they were bound to make language into an independent realm. This is the secret of philosophical language, in which thoughts in the form of words have their own content. The problem of descending from the world of thoughts to the actual world is turned into the problem of descending from language to life.

We have shown that thoughts and ideas acquire an independent

---

\(a\) See Chapter I of Volume I of *The German Ideology*.—*Ed.*
existence in consequence of the personal circumstances and relations of individuals acquiring independent existence. We have shown that exclusive, systematic occupation with these thoughts on the part of ideologists and philosophers, and hence the systematisation of these thoughts, is a consequence of division of labour, and that, in particular, German philosophy is a consequence of German petty-bourgeois conditions. The philosophers have only to dissolve their language into the ordinary language, from which it is abstracted, in order to recognise it as the distorted language of the actual world, and to realise that neither thoughts nor language in themselves form a realm of their own, that they are only manifestations of actual life.

Sancho, who follows the philosophers through thick and thin, must inevitably seek the philosopher's stone, the squaring of the circle and elixir of life, or a "word" which as such would possess the miraculous power of leading from the realm of language and thought to actual life. Sancho has been so infected by his long years of association with Don Quixote that he fails to notice that this "task" of his, this "vocation", is nothing but the result of his faith in weighty philosophical books of knight-errantry.

Sancho begins by showing us once again the domination of the holy and of ideas in the world, this time in the new form of the domination of language or phrase. Language, of course, becomes a phrase as soon as it is given an independent existence.

On page 151, Sancho calls the modern world "a world of phrases, a world where in the beginning was the word". He describes in more detail the motives for his chase after the magic word:

"Philosophical speculation strove to find a predicate which would be so universal as to include everyone in itself... In order that the predicate should include everyone in it, each should appear in it as subject, i.e., not merely as what he is, but as who he is" (p. 152).

Since speculation "sought" such predicates, which Sancho had previously called vocation, designation, task, species, etc., therefore actual people up to now "sought" themselves "in the word, the logos, the predicate" (p. 153). Up to now one has used the name when one wanted to distinguish in language one individual from another, merely as an identical person. But Sancho is not satisfied with ordinary names; because philosophical speculation has set him the task of finding a predicate so universal that it would include in itself everyone as subject, he seeks the philosophical, abstract name, the "Name" that is above all names, the name of names, name as a category which, for example, would distinguish Sancho from Bruno,
and both of them from Feuerbach, as precisely as their own proper names, and which would nevertheless be applicable to all three and also to all other people and corporeal beings—an innovation which would introduce the greatest confusion into all bills of exchange, marriage contracts, etc., and at one blow put an end to all notaries and registry offices. This miraculous name, this magic word, which in language spells the death of language, this asses' bridge leading to life and the highest rung of the Chinese celestial ladder is—the unique. The miraculous properties of this word are sung in the following stanzas:

"The unique one should be only the last, dying statement of you and me, should be only that statement which is transformed into opinion:
"a statement that is no longer a statement,
"a muted, mute statement" (p. 153).
"With him" (the unique one) "what is not expressed is the chief thing" (p. 149).
He "is without determination" (ibid.).
"He points to the content, lying outside or beyond the concept" (ibid.).
This is "a concept without determination and cannot be made more definite by any other concept" (p. 150).
This is the philosophical "christening" of worldly names (p. 150).
"The unique is a word devoid of thought.
"It has no thought content."
"It expresses a person" "that cannot exist a second time, and consequently cannot be expressed either;
"For if he could be expressed actually and completely, then he would exist a second time, he would exist in the expression" (p. 151).

Having thus sung the properties of this word, he celebrates in the following antistrophic stanzas the results obtained by the discovery of its miraculous power:

"With the unique one the realm of absolute thoughts is completed" (p. 150).
"He is the keystone of our world of phrases" (p. 151).
"He is logic that comes to an end as a phrase" (p. 153).
"In the unique one, science can merge in life,
"By transforming its this into such-and-such a one,
"Who no longer seeks himself in the word, the logos, the predicate" (p. 153).

True, as regards his reviewers Sancho has had the unpleasant experience of learning that the unique, too, can be "fixed as a concept", and "that is what the opponents do" (p. 149), who are so opposed to Sancho that they do not feel at all the expected magical effect of the magical word, but instead sing, as in the opera: Ce n'est pas ça, ce n'est pas ça! With great exasperation and solemn seriousness Sancho turns particularly against his Don Quixote-Szeliga, for in him the misunderstanding presupposes an open "rebellion" and a complete misapprehension of his position as a "creature".
“If Szeliga had understood that the unique, being a completely empty phrase or category, whereby is no longer a category, he might, perhaps, have recognised it as the name of that for which he still has no name” (p. 179).

Here, therefore, Sancho expressly recognises that he and his Don Quixote are striving towards one and the same goal, with the only difference that Sancho imagines that he has discovered the true morning star, whereas Don Quixote, still in darkness

\[ \text{àf dem wildin leber-mer} \\
\text{der grunt-lösen werlde swebt.*} \]

Feuerbach said in his *Philosophie der Zukunft*, p. 49:

“Being, based on sheer inexpressibles, is therefore itself something inexpressible. Yes, the inexpressible. Where words end, only there does life begin, only there can the secret of being be deduced.”

Sancho has found the transition from the expressible to the inexpressible, he has found the word which is simultaneously more and less than a word.

We have seen that the whole problem of the transition from thought to reality, hence from language to life, exists only in philosophical illusion, i.e., it is justified only for philosophical consciousness, which cannot possibly be clear about the nature and origin of its apparent separation from life. This great problem, insofar as it at all entered the minds of our ideologists, was bound, of course, to result finally in one of these knights-errant setting out in search of a word which, as a word, formed the transition in question, which, as a word, ceases to be simply a word, and which, as a word, in a mysterious superlinguistic manner, points from within language to the actual object it denotes; which, in short, plays among words the same role as the Redeeming God-Man plays among people in Christian fantasy. The emptiest, shallowest brain among the philosophers had to “end” philosophy by proclaiming his lack of thought to be the end of philosophy and thus the triumphant entry into “corporeal” life. His philosophising mental vacuity was already in itself the end of philosophy just as his unspeakable language was the end of all language. Sancho’s triumph was also due to the fact that of all philosophers he was least of all acquainted with actual relations, hence philosophical categories with him lost the last


---

a Swims in the wild liver-sea
of the unfathomable world.

(Liver-sea—mythical congealed sea in which ships stuck fast.)—Ed.

b Ludwig Feuerbach, *Grundsätze der Philosophie der Zukunft*.—Ed.
vestige of connection with reality, and with that the last vestige of meaning.

So now go forth, pious and faithful servant Sancho, go or, rather, ride forth on your ass, to your unique’s self-enjoyment, “use up” your “unique” to the last letter, the unique whose miraculous title, power and courage have already been sung by Calderón in the following words:

The unique—
El valiente campeón,
El generoso adalid,
El gallardo caballero,
El ilustre Paladín,
El siempre fiel Cristiano,
El Almirante feliz
De África, el Rey soberano
De Alejandría, el Cadí
De Berbería, de Egipto el Cid,
Moravito, y Gran Señor
De Jerusalén.\footnote{—The valiant fighter, the generous leader, the gallant knight, the illustrious Paladin, the always faithful Christian, the fortunate Admiral of Africa, the sovereign King of Alexandria, the Judge of Barbary, the Cid of Egypt, Marabout, and \textit{Grand Seignior} of \textit{Jerusalem}. (Calderón, \textit{La puente de Mantible}, Act I. The words “El siempre fiel Cristiano” (“The always faithful Christian”) have been inserted by Marx and Engels.)—Ed.}

“In conclusion, it would not be unsuitable to remind” Sancho, the Grand Seignior of Jerusalem, of Cervantes' “criticism” of Sancho in \textit{Don Quixote}, Chapter 20, page 171, Brussels edition, 1617. (Cf. the “Commentary”, p. 194.)
CLOSE OF THE LEIPZIG COUNCIL

After driving all their opponents from the Council, Saint Bruno and Saint Sancho, also called Max, conclude an eternal alliance and sing the following touching duet, amicably nodding their heads to one another like two mandarins.

Saint Sancho.

"The critic is the true spokesman of the mass... He is its sovereign and general in the war of liberation against egoism." (The book, p. 187.)

Saint Bruno.

"Max Stirner is the leader and commander-in-chief of the Crusaders" (against criticism). "At the same time he is the most vigorous and courageous of all fighters." (Wigand, a p. 124.)

Saint Sancho.

"We pass on now to placing political and social liberalism before the tribunal of humane or critical liberalism" (i.e., critical criticism). (The book, p. 163.)

Saint Bruno.

"Confronted by the unique and his property, the political liberal, who desires to break down self-will, and the social liberal, who desires to destroy property, both collapse. They collapse under the critical" (i.e., stolen from criticism) "knife of the unique." (Wigand, p. 124.)

Saint Sancho.

"No thought is safe from criticism, because criticism is the thinking mind itself ... Criticism, or rather he" (i.e., Saint Bruno). (The book, pp. 195, 199.)

---

a Bruno Bauer, "Charakteristik Ludwig Feuerbachs".—Ed.
Saint Bruno (interrupts him, making a bow).

"The critical liberal alone ... does not fall [before] criticism because he himself is [the critic]." [Wigand, p. 124.]

Saint Sancho.

"Criticism, and criticism alone, is abreast of the times.... Among social theories, criticism is indisputably the most perfect.... In it the Christian principle of love, the true social principle, reaches its purest expression, and the last possible experiment is made to release people from exclusiveness [and] repulsion; it is a struggle against egoism in its simplest and therefore its most rigid form." (The book, p. 177.)

Saint Bruno.

"This ego is ... the completion and culminating point of a past historical epoch. The unique is the last refuge in the old world, the last hiding-place from which the old world can deliver its attacks" on critical criticism.... “This ego is the most extreme, the most powerful and most mighty egoism of the old world” (i.e., of Christianity).... “This ego is substance in its most rigid rigidity.” (Wigand, p. 124.)

After this cordial dialogue, the two great church fathers dissolve the Council. Then they silently shake hands. The unique “forgets himself in sweet self-oblivion” without, however, getting “completely lost”, and the critic “smiles” three times and then “irresistibly, confident of victory and victorious, pursues his path”.
Volume II

CRITIQUE OF GERMAN SOCIALISM
ACCORDING TO ITS VARIOUS PROPHETS
TRUE SOCIALISM

The relation between German socialism and the proletarian movement in France and England is the same as that which we found in the first volume (cf. "Saint Max", "Political Liberalism") between German liberalism, as it has hitherto existed, and the movement of the French and English bourgeoisie. Alongside the German communists, a number of writers have appeared who have absorbed a few French and English communist ideas and amalgamated them with their own German philosophical premises. These "socialists" or "true socialists", as they call themselves, regard foreign communist literature not as the expression and the product of a real movement but as purely theoretical writings which have been evolved—in the same way as they imagine the German philosophical systems to have been evolved—by a process of "pure thought". It never occurs to them that, even when these writings do preach a system, they spring from the practical needs, the conditions of life in their entirety of a particular class in a particular country. They innocently take on trust the illusion, cherished by some of these literary party representatives, that it is a question of the "most reasonable" social order and not the needs of a particular class and a particular time. The German ideology, in the grip of which these "true socialists" remain, prevents them from examining the real state of affairs. Their activity in face of the "unscientific" French and English consists primarily in holding up the superficiality and the "crude" empiricism of these foreigners to the scorn of the German public, in eulogising "German science" and declaring that its mission is to reveal for the first time

---

a See this volume, pp. 193-94.—Ed.
the truth of communism and socialism, the absolute, true socialism. They immediately set to work discharging this mission as representatives of "German science", although they are in most cases hardly more familiar with "German science" than they are with the original writings of the French and English, which they know only from the compilations of Stein, Oelckers,¹ etc. And what is the "truth" which they impart to socialism and communism? Since they find the ideas contained in socialist and communist literature quite unintelligible—partly by reason of their ignorance even of the literary background, partly on account of their above-mentioned misunderstanding of this literature—they attempt to clarify them by invoking the German ideology and notably that of Hegel and Feuerbach. They detach the communist systems, critical and polemical writings from the real movement, of which they are but the expression, and force them into an arbitrary connection with German philosophy. They detach the consciousness of certain historically conditioned spheres of life from these spheres and evaluate it in terms of true, absolute, i.e., German philosophical consciousness. With perfect consistency they transform the relations of these particular individuals into relations of "Man"; they interpret the thoughts of these particular individuals concerning their own relations as thoughts about "Man". In so doing, they have abandoned the real historical basis and returned to that of ideology, and since they are ignorant of the real connection, they can without difficulty construct some fantastic relationship with the help of the "absolute" or some other ideological method. This translation of French ideas into the language of the German ideologists and this arbitrarily constructed relationship between communism and German ideology, then, constitute so-called "true socialism", which is loudly proclaimed, in the terms used by the Tories for the English constitution, to be "the pride of the nation and the envy of all neighbouring nations".

Thus "true socialism" is nothing but the transfiguration of proletarian communism, and of the parties and sects that are more or less akin to it, in France and England within the heaven of the German mind and, as we shall also see, of the German sentiment. True socialism, which claims to be based on "science", is primarily another esoteric science; its theoretical literature is intended only for those who are initiated into the mysteries of the "thinking mind". But it has an exoteric literature as well; the very fact that it is concerned with social, exoteric relations means that it must carry on

¹ Lorenz von Stein, Der Socialismus und Communismus des heutigen Frankreichs. Theodor Oelckers, Die Bewegung des Socialismus und Communismus.—Ed.
some form of propaganda. In this exoteric literature it no longer appeals to the German “thinking mind” but to the German “sentiment”. This is all the easier since true socialism, which is no longer concerned with real human beings but with “Man”, has lost all revolutionary enthusiasm and proclaims instead the universal love of mankind. It turns as a result not to the proletarians but to the two most numerous classes of men in Germany, to the petty bourgeoisie with its philanthropic illusions and to the ideologists of this very same petty bourgeoisie: the philosophers and their disciples; it turns, in general, to that “common”, or uncommon, consciousness which at present rules in Germany.

The conditions actually existing in Germany were bound to lead to the formation of this hybrid sect and the attempt to reconcile communism with the ideas prevailing at the time. It was just as inevitable that a number of German communists, proceeding from a philosophical standpoint, should have arrived, and still arrive, at communism by way of this transition while others, unable to extricate themselves from this ideology, should go on preaching true socialism to the bitter end. We have, therefore, no means of knowing whether the “true socialists” whose works were written some time ago and are criticised here still maintain their position or whether they have advanced beyond it. We are not at all concerned with the individuals; we are merely considering the printed documents as the expression of a tendency which was bound to occur in a country so stagnant as Germany.

But in addition true socialism has in fact enabled a host of Young-German literary men, \textsuperscript{129} quacks and other literati to exploit the social movement. Even the social movement was at first a merely literary one because of the lack of \textit{real}, passionate, practical party struggles in Germany. True socialism is a perfect example of a social literary movement that has come into being without any real party interests and now, after the formation of the communist party, it intends to persist in spite of it. It is obvious that since the appearance of a real communist party in Germany, the public of the true socialists will be more and more limited to the petty bourgeoisie and the sterile and broken-down literati who represent it.
We begin with this essay because it displays quite consciously and with great self-confidence the national German character of true socialism.

Page 168: "It seems that the French do not understand their own men of genius. At this point German science comes to their aid and in the shape of socialism presents the most reasonable social order, if one can speak of a superlative degree of reasonableness."

"German science" here, therefore, presents a social order, in fact "the most reasonable social order", "in the shape of socialism". Socialism is reduced to a branch of that omnipotent, omniscient, all-embracing German science which is even able to set up a society. It is true that socialism is French in origin, but the French socialists were "essentially" Germans, for which reason the real Frenchmen "did not understand" them. Thus the writer can say:

"Communism is French, socialism is German; the French are lucky to possess so apt a social instinct, which will serve them one day as a substitute for scientific investigation. This result has been determined by the course of development of the two nations; the French arrived at communism by way of politics" (now it is clear, of course, how the French people came to communism); "the Germans arrived at socialism" (namely "true socialism") "by way of metaphysics, which eventually changed into anthropology. Ultimately both are resolved in humanism."

After having transformed communism and socialism into two abstract theories, two principles, there is, of course, nothing easier than to excogitate at will any Hegelian unity of these two opposites and to give it any vague name one chooses. One has thereby not only

---

a The author of this article is Hermann Semmig.—Ed.
submitted "the course of development of the two nations" to a piercing scrutiny but has also brilliantly demonstrated the superiority of the speculative individual over both Frenchmen and Germans.

Incidentally, the sentence is copied more or less literally from Püttermann's Bürgerbuch, p. 43 and elsewhere; the writer's "scientific investigation" of socialism is likewise limited to a reinterpretative reproduction of ideas contained in this book, in the Einundzwanzig Bogen and in other writings dating from the early days of German communism.

We will only give a few examples of the objections raised to communism in this essay:

Page 168: "Communism does not combine the atoms into an organic whole."

The demand that the "atoms" should be combined into an "organic whole" is no more realistic than the demand for the squaring of the circle.

"Communism, as it is actually advocated in France, its main centre, takes the form of crude opposition to the egoistical dissipation of the shopkeeper's state; it never transcends this political opposition; it never attains to unconditional, unqualified freedom" (ibid.).

Voilà the German ideological postulate of "unconditional, unqualified freedom", which is only the practical formula for "unconditional, unqualified thought". French communism is admittedly "crude" because it is the theoretical expression of a real opposition; however, according to the writer, French communism ought to have transcended this opposition by imagining it to be already overcome. Compare also Bürgerbuch, p. 43, etc.

"Tyranny can perfectly well persist within communism, since the latter refuses to permit the continuance of the species" (p. 168).

Hapless species! "Species" and "tyranny" have hitherto existed simultaneously; but it is precisely because communism abolishes the "species" that it can allow "tyranny" to persist. And how, according to our true socialist, does communism set about abolishing the "species"? It "has the masses in view" (ibid.).

"In communism man is not conscious of his essence ... his dependence is reduced by communism to the lowest, most brutal relationship, to dependence on crude matter—the separation of labour and enjoyment. Man does not attain to free moral activity."

To appreciate the "scientific investigation" which has led our true socialist to this proposition, it is necessary to consider the following passage:

---

a This refers to the article "Ueber die Noth in unserer Gesellschaft und deren Abhilfe" by Moses Hess published in Deutsches Bürgerbuch für 1845.—Ed.
“French socialists and communists ... have by no means theoretically understood the essence of socialism ... even the radical” (French) “communists have still by no means transcended the antithesis of labour and enjoyment ... have not yet risen to the idea of free activity.... The only difference between communism and the world of the shopkeeper is that in communism the complete alienation of real human property is to be made independent of all fortuity, i.e., is to be idealised” (Bürgerbuch, p. 43).

That is to say, our true socialist is here reproaching the French for having a correct consciousness of their actual social conditions, whereas they ought to bring to light “Man’s” consciousness of “his essence”. All objections raised by these true socialists against the French amount to this, that they do not consider Feuerbach’s philosophy to be the quintessence of their movement as a whole. The writer proceeds from the already existing proposition of the separation of labour and enjoyment. Instead of starting with this proposition, he ideologically turns the whole thing upside-down, begins with the missing consciousness of man, deduces from it “dependence on crude matter” and assumes this to be realised in the “separation of labour and enjoyment”. Incidentally we shall see later on where our true socialist gets to with his independence “from crude matter”.

In fact, all these gentlemen display a remarkable delicacy of feeling. Everything shocks them, especially matter; they complain everywhere of crudity. Earlier we have already had a “crude antithesis”, now we have “the most brutal relationship” of “dependence on crude matter”.

With gaping jaws the German cries:
Too crude love must not be
Or you’ll get an infirmity.

German philosophy in its socialist disguise appears, of course, to investigate “crude reality”, but it always keeps at a respectable distance and, in hysterical irritation, cries: noli me tangere!

After these scientific objections to French communism, we come to several historical arguments, which brilliantly demonstrate the “free moral activity” and the “scientific investigation” of our true socialist and his independence of crude matter.

On page 170 he arrives at the “result” that the only communism which “exists” is “crude French communism” (crude once again).

---

a Modified quotation from Heine’s poem “Sie sassen und tranken am Teetisch...” in Lyrisches Intermezzo. The first line of Heine’s poem reads: With gaping jaws the canon cries.—Ed.

b Touch me not! (John 20:17).—Ed.
The construction of this truth *a priori* is carried out with great "social instinct" and shows that "man has become conscious of his essence". Listen to this:

"There is no other communism, for what Weitling has produced is only an elaboration of Fourierist and communist ideas with which he became acquainted in Paris and Geneva."

"There is no" English communism, "for what Weitling", etc. Thomas More, the Levellers, Owen, Thompson, Watts, Holyoake, Harney, Morgan, Southwell, Goodwyn Barmby, Greaves, Edmonds, Hobson, Spence will be amazed, or turn in their graves, when they hear that they are no communists "for" Weitling went to Paris and Geneva.

Moreover, Weitling's communism does seem to be different in kind from the "crude French" variety, in vulgar parlance, from Babouvism, since it contains some of "Fourier's ideas" as well.

"The communists were particularly good at drawing up systems or even complete social orders (Cabet's *Icarie*, *La Félicité*, Weitling). All systems are, however, dogmatic and dictatorial" (p. 170).

By this verdict on systems in general true socialism has, of course, saved itself the trouble of acquainting itself at first hand with the communist systems. With one blow it has overthrown not only *Icarie* but also every philosophical system from Aristotle to Hegel, the *Système de la nature*, the botanical systems of Linné and Jussieu and even the solar system. Incidentally, as to the systems themselves they nearly all appeared in the early days of the communist movement and had at that time propaganda value as popular novels, which corresponded perfectly to the still undeveloped consciousness of the proletarians, who were then just beginning to play an active part. Cabet himself calls his *Icarie* a "roman philosophique" and he should on no account be judged by his system but rather by his polemical writings, in fact his whole activity as a party leader. In some of these novels, e.g., Fourier's system, there is a vein of true poetry; others, like the systems of Owen and Cabet, show not a shred of imagination and are written in a business-like calculating way or else with an eye to the views of the class to be influenced, in sly lawyer fashion. As the party develops, these systems lose all importance and are at best retained purely nominally as catchwords. Who in France believes in *Icarie*, who in England believes in the plans of Owen,

---

*a* Étienne Cabet, *Voyage en Icarie*; François de Chastellux, *De la Félicité publique*.—*Ed.*

*b* The author of this work is Paul Henri Holbach.—*Ed.*
which he preached in various modifications with an eye to propaganda among particular classes or with respect to the altered circumstances of the moment? Fourier’s orthodox disciples of the Démocratie pacifique show most clearly how little the real content of these systems lies in their systematic form; they are, for all their orthodoxy, doctrinaire bourgeois, the very antipodes of Fourier. All epoch-making systems have as their real content the needs of the time in which they arose. Each one of them is based on the whole of the antecedent development of a nation, on the historical growth of its class relations with their political, moral, philosophical and other consequences. The assertion that all systems are dogmatic and dictatorial gets us nowhere with regard to this basis and this content of the communist systems. Unlike the English and the French, the Germans did not encounter fully developed class relations. The German communists could, therefore, only base their system on the relations of the class from which they sprang. It is, therefore, perfectly natural that the only existing German communist system should be a reproduction of French ideas in terms of a mental outlook which was limited by the petty circumstances of the artisan.

“The madness of Cabet, who insists that everybody should subscribe to his Populaire", p. 168, is proof of the tyranny that persists within communism. If our friend first distorts the claims which a party leader makes on his party, impelled by particular circumstances and the danger of failing to concentrate limited financial means, and then evaluates them in terms of the “essence of man”, he is indeed bound to conclude that this party leader and all other party members are “mad” whereas purely disinterested figures, like himself and the “essence of man”, are of sound intellect. But let him find out the true state of affairs from Cabet’s Ma ligne droite.

The whole antithesis of our author, and of German true socialists and ideologists in general, to the real movements of other nations is finally epitomised in one classic sentence. The Germans judge everything sub specie aeterni (in terms of the essence of Man), foreigners view everything practically, in terms of actually existing men and circumstances. The thoughts and actions of the foreigner are concerned with temporariness, the thoughts and actions of the German with eternity. Our true socialist confesses this as follows:

“The very name of communism, the contrary of competition, reveals its one-sidedness; but is this bias, which may very well have value now as a party name, to last for ever?”

a From the standpoint of eternity (cf. Benedict Spinoza, Ethica. Pars quinta).—Ed.
After having thus thoroughly disposed of communism, the writer proceeds to its contrary, socialism.

"Socialism establishes that anarchic system which is an essential characteristic of the human race and the universe" (p. 170) and for that very reason has hitherto never existed for "the human race".

Free competition is too "crude" to be regarded by our true socialist as an "anarchic system".

"Relying entirely on the moral core of mankind, socialism" decrees that "the union of the sexes is and should be merely the highest intensification of love; for only what is natural is true and what is true is moral" (p. 171).

The reason why "the union, etc., etc. is and should be," can be applied to everything. For example, "socialism, relying entirely on the moral core" of the apes, might just as well decree that the masturbation which occurs naturally among them "is, and should be, merely the highest intensification of" self-"love; for only what is natural is true and what is true is moral".

It would be hard to say by what standard socialism judges what is "natural".

"Activity and enjoyment coincide in the peculiar nature of man; they are determined by this and not by the products external to us."

"But since these products are indispensable for activity, that is to say, for true life, and since by reason of the common activity of mankind as a whole they have, so to speak, detached themselves from mankind, they are or should be the common substratum of further development for all (community of goods)."

"Our present-day society has indeed relapsed into savagery to such an extent that some individuals fall upon the products of another's labour with beastly voracity and at the same time they indolently allow their own essence to decay (rentiers); as a necessary consequence, others are driven to mechanical labour; their property (their own human essence) has been stunted, not by idleness, but by exhausting exertion (proletarians).... The two extremes of our society, rentiers and proletarians, are, however, at the same stage of development. Both are dependent upon things external to them" or are "Negroes", as Saint Max would say (pp. 169, 170).

The "results" reached above by our "Mongol" concerning "our Negroism" are the most perfect achievements which true socialism has, "so to speak, detached from itself, as a product indispensable for true life"; our Mongol, by reason of "the peculiar nature of man", believes that "mankind as a whole" is bound to "fall upon" them with "beastly voracity".

The four concepts—"rentiers", "proletarians", "mechanical" and "community of goods"—are for our Mongol at any rate "products external to him"; as far as they are concerned, his "activity" and his "enjoyment" consist in representing them simply as anticipated terms for the results of his own "mechanical labour".

Society, we learn, has relapsed into savagery and consequently the
individuals who form this very society suffer from all kinds of infirmities. Society is abstracted from these individuals, it is made independent, it relapses into savagery on its own, and the individuals suffer only as a result of this relapse. The expressions—beast of prey, idler and possessor of “one’s own decaying essence”—are the first result of this relapse; whereupon we learn to our horror that these expressions define the “rentier”. The only comment necessary is that this “allowing one’s own essence to decay” is nothing but a philosophically mystified manner of speaking used in an endeavour to comprehend “idleness”, the actual character of which seems to be very little known.

The two expressions, “stunted growth of their own human essence as a result of exhausting exertion” and “being driven to mechanical labour”, are the second “necessary consequence” of the first result of the relapse into savagery. These two expressions are a “necessary consequence of the fact that the rentiers allow their own essence to decay”, and are known in vulgar parlance, we learn, once more to our horror, as “proletarians”.

The sentence, therefore, contains the following sequence of cause and effect: It is a fact that proletarians exist and that they work mechanically. Why are proletarians driven to “mechanical labour”? Because the rentiers “allow their own essence to decay”. Why is it that the rentiers allow their own essence to decay? Because “our present-day society has relapsed into savagery to such an extent”. Why has it relapsed into savagery? Ask thy Maker.

It is characteristic of our true socialist that he sees “the extremes of our society” in the opposition of rentiers and proletarians. This opposition has pretty well been present at all fairly advanced stages of society and has been belaboured by all moralists since time immemorial; it was resurrected right at the beginning of the proletarian movement, at a time when the proletariat still had interests in common with the industrial and petty bourgeoisie. Compare, for example, the writings of Cobbett and P. L. Courier or Saint-Simon, who originally numbered the industrial capitalists among the travailleurs as opposed to the oisifs, the rentiers. Stating this trivial antithesis, which moreover it expresses, not in ordinary language, but in the sacred language of philosophy, presenting this childish discovery in abstract, sanctified and quite inappropriate terms—this is what here, as in all other cases, the thoroughness of that German science which has been perfected by

\*a Workers.—Ed.
\*b Idlers.—Ed.
true socialism amounts to. The conclusion puts the finishing touch to this kind of thoroughness. Our true socialist here merges the totally dissimilar stages of development of the proletarians and the rentiers into “one stage of development”, because he ignores their real stages of development and subsumes them under the philosophic phrase: “dependence upon things external to them”. True socialism has here discovered the stage of development at which the dissimilarity of all the stages of development in the three realms of nature, in geology and history, vanishes into thin air.

Although he detests “dependence upon things external to him”, our true socialist nevertheless admits that he is dependent upon them, “since products”, i.e., these very things, “are indispensable for activity” and for “true life”. He makes this shamefaced admission so that he can clear the road for a philosophical construction of the community of goods—a construction that lapses into pure nonsense so that we need merely draw the reader’s attention to it.

We now come to the first of the passages quoted above. Here again, “independence from things” is claimed in respect of activity and enjoyment. Activity and enjoyment “are determined” by “the peculiar nature of man”. Instead of tracing this peculiar nature in the activity and enjoyment of the men who surround him—in which case he would very soon have found how far the products external to us have a voice in the matter, too—he makes activity and enjoyment “coincide in the peculiar nature of man”. Instead of visualising the peculiar nature of men in their activity and their manner of enjoyment, which is conditioned by their activity, he explains both by invoking “the peculiar nature of man”, which cuts short any further discussion. He abandons the real behaviour of the individual and again takes refuge in his indescribable, inaccessible, peculiar nature. We see here, moreover, what the true socialists understand by “free activity”. Our author imprudently reveals to us that free activity is activity which “is not determined by things external to us”, i.e., actus purus, pure, absolute activity, which is nothing but activity and is in the last instance tantamount to the illusion of “pure thought”. It naturally sullies the purity of this activity if it has a material basis and a material result; the true socialist deals only reluctantly with impure activity of this kind; he despises its product, which he terms “a mere refuse of man”, and not “a result” (p. 169). The subject from whom this pure activity proceeds cannot, therefore, be a real sentient human being; it can only be the thinking mind. This “free activity”, thus translated into German, is nothing but the foregoing “unconditional, unqualified freedom” expressed in a different way. Incidentally, that this talk of “free activity”, which merely serves the true
socialists to conceal their ignorance of real production, amounts in
the final analysis to "pure thought" is also shown by the fact that the
writer gives us as his last word the postulate of true cognition.

"This separation of the two principal parties of this age" (namely, French crude
communism and German socialism) "is a result of the developments of the last two years,
which started more particularly with Hess' Philosophie der That, in Herwegh's
Einundzwanzig Bogen. Consequently it was high time to throw a little more light on the
shibboleths of the social parties" (p. 173).

Here we have, on the one hand, the actually existing communist
party in France with its literature and, on the other, a few German
pseudo-scholars who are trying to comprehend the ideas of this
literature philosophically. The latter are treated just as much as the
former as a "principal party of this age", as a party, that is to say, of
infinite importance not only to its immediate antithesis, the French
communists, but also to the English Chartists and communists, the
American national reformers and indeed to every other party "of
this age". It is unfortunate that none of these know of the existence
of this "principal party". But it has for a considerable time been the
fashion among German ideologists for each literary faction,
particularly the one that thinks itself "most advanced", to proclaim
itself not merely "one of the principal parties", but actually "the
principal party of this age". We have among others, "the principal
party" of critical criticism, the "principal party" of egoism in
agreement with itself and now the "principal party" of the true
socialists. In this fashion Germany can boast a whole horde of
"principal parties", whose existence is known only in Germany and
even there only among the small set of scholars, pseudo-scholars and
literati. They all imagine that they are weaving the web of world
history when, as a matter of fact, they are merely spinning the long
yarn of their own imaginings.

This "principal party" of the true socialists is "a result of the
developments of the last two years, which started more particularly
with Hess' Philosophie". It is "a result", that is to say, of the
developments "of the last two years" when our author first got
entangled in socialism and found it was "high time" to enlighten
himself "a little more", by means of a few "shibboleths", on what he
considers to be "social parties".

Having thus dismissed communism and socialism, our author
introduces us to the higher unity of the two, to humanism. Now we
are entering the domain of "Man" and the entire true history of our
true socialist will be enacted in Germany alone.

"All quibbles about names are resolved in humanism; wherefore communists,
wherefore socialists? We are human beings" (p. 172)—tous frères, tous amis.
Swim not, brothers, against the stream,
That's only a useless thing!
Let us climb up on to Templow hill
And cry: God save the King!\(^a\)

Wherefore human beings, wherefore beasts, wherefore plants, wherefore stones? We are bodies!

There follows an historical discourse which is based upon German science and which "will one day help to replace the social instinct" of the French. Antiquity—naïveté, the Middle Ages—Romanticism, the Modern Age—Humanism. By means of these three trivialities, the writer has, of course, constructed his humanism historically and showed it to be the truth of the old *Humaniora*.\(^b\) Compare "Saint Max" in the first volume for constructions of this kind; he manufactures such wares in a much more artistic and less amateurish way.

On page 172 we are informed that

"the final result of scholasticism is that cleavage of life which was abolished by Hess".

Here then, the cause of the "cleavage of life" is shown to be theory. It is difficult to see why these true socialists mention society at all if they believe with the philosophers that all real cleavages are caused by conceptual cleavages. On the basis of this philosophical belief in the power of concepts to make or destroy the world, they can likewise imagine that some individual "abolished the cleavage of life" by "abolishing" concepts in some way or other. Like all German ideologists, the true socialists continually mix up literary history and real history as equipotential. This habit is, of course, very understandable among the Germans, who conceal the abject part they have played and continue to play in real history by equating the illusions, in which they are so rich, with reality.

And now to the "last two years", during which German science has so thoroughly disposed of all problems that nothing remains to the other nations but to carry out its decrees.

"Feuerbach only partially completed, or rather only began, the task of anthropology, the regaining by man of his estranged essence" (the essence of man or the essence of Feuerbach?): "he destroyed the religious illusion, the theoretical abstraction, the God-Man, whereas Hess annihilates the political illusion, the abstraction of his ability [Vermögen\(^b\)], of his activity" (does this refer to Hess or to man?), "that is, he annihilates wealth. It was the work of Hess which freed man from the last of the forces external to him, and made him capable of moral activity—for all the unselfishness of earlier times" (before Hess) "was only an illusory unselfishness—and

\(^a\) From Heine's poem "Verkehrte Welt" in his verse cycle *Zeitgedichte*. — Ed.

\(^b\) Vermögen can mean ability, faculty, power, or fortune, wealth, property.— Ed.
Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

raised him once more to his former dignity; for was man ever previously” (before Hess) “esteemed for what he actually was? Was he not judged by what he possessed? He was esteemed for his money” (p. 171).

It is characteristic of all these high-sounding phrases about liberation, etc., that it is always “man” who is liberated. Although it would appear from the pronouncements made above that “wealth”, “money”, and so on, have ceased to exist, we nevertheless learn in the following sentence:

“Now that these illusions” (money, viewed sub specie aeterni, is, indeed, an illusion, l’or n’est qu’une chimère) “have been destroyed, we can think about a new, human order of society” (ibid.).

But this is quite superfluous since “the recognition of the essence of man has as a necessary and natural result a life which is truly human” (p. 172).

To arrive at communism or socialism by way of metaphysics or politics, etc., etc.—these phrases beloved of true socialists merely indicate that such and such a writer has adopted communist ideas (which have reached him from without and have arisen in circumstances quite different from his) translating them into the mode of expression corresponding to his former standpoint, and formulating them in accordance with this standpoint. Which of these points of view is predominant in a nation, whether its communist outlook has a political or metaphysical or any other tinge depends, of course, upon the whole development of the nation. The fact that the attitude of most French communists has a political complexion—this is, on the other hand, countered by the fact that very many French socialists have abstracted completely from politics—causes our author to infer that the French “have arrived at communism by way of politics”, by way of their political development. This proposition, which has a very wide circulation in Germany, does not imply that the writer has any knowledge either of politics, particularly of French political developments, or of communism; it only shows that he considers politics to be an independent sphere of activity, which develops in its own independent way, a belief he shares with all ideologists.

Another catchword of the true socialists is “true property”, “true, personal property”, “real”, “social”, “living”, “natural”, etc., etc., property, whereas it is very typical that they refer to private property as “so-called property”. The Saint-Simonists were the first to adopt

---

*a* Gold is but a chimera. From Giacomo Meyerbeer’s opera Robert le Diable (libretto Eugène Scribe and Germain Delavigne), Act I, Scene 7.—Ed.
this manner of speaking, as we have already pointed out in the first volume; but they never lent it this German metaphysical-mysterious form; it was with them at the beginning of the socialist movement to some extent justified as a counter to the stupid clamour of the bourgeoisie. The end to which most of the Saint-Simonists came shows at any rate the ease with which this “true property” is again resolved into “ordinary private property”.

If one takes the antithesis of communism to the world of private property in its crudest form, i.e., in the most abstract form in which the real conditions of that antithesis are ignored, then one is faced with the antithesis of property and lack of property. The abolition of this antithesis can be viewed as the abolition of either the one side or the other; either property is abolished, in which case universal lack of property or destitution results, or else the lack of property is abolished, which means the establishment of true property. In reality, the actual property-owners stand on one side and the propertyless communist proletarians on the other. This opposition becomes keener day by day and is rapidly driving to a crisis. If, then, the theoretical representatives of the proletariat wish their literary activity to have any practical effect, they must first and foremost insist that all phrases are dropped which tend to dim the realisation of the sharpness of this opposition, all phrases which tend to conceal this opposition and may even give the bourgeois a chance to approach the communists for safety’s sake on the strength of their philanthropic enthusiasms. All these bad qualities are, however, to be found in the catchwords of the true socialists and particularly in “true property”. Of course, we realise that the communist movement cannot be impaired by a few German phrase-mongers. But in a country like Germany—where philosophic phrases have for centuries exerted a certain power, and where, moreover, communist consciousness is anyhow less keen and determined because class contradictions do not exist in as acute a form as in other nations—it is, nevertheless, necessary to resist all phrases which obscure and dilute still further the realisation that communism is totally opposed to the existing world order.

This theory of true property conceives real private property, as it has hitherto existed, merely as a semblance, whereas it views the concept abstracted from this real property as the truth and reality of the semblance; it is therefore ideological all through. All it does is to give clearer and more precise expression to the ideas of the petty

---

a See this volume, pp. 231-32.—Ed.
bourgeois; for their benevolent endeavours and pious wishes aim likewise at the abolition of the lack of property.

In this essay we have had yet further evidence of the narrowly national outlook which underlies the alleged universalism and cosmonationalism of the Germans.

The land belongs to the Russians and French,
The English own the sea.
But we in the airy realm of dreams
Hold sovereign mastery.

Our unity is perfect here,
Our power beyond dispute;
The other folk in solid earth
Have meanwhile taken root.~

With infinite self-confidence the Germans confront the other peoples with this airy realm of dreams, the realm of the “essence of man”, claiming that it is the consummation and the goal of all world history; in every sphere they regard their dreamy fantasies as a final verdict on the actions of other nations; and because everywhere their lot is merely to look on and be left high and dry they believe themselves called upon to sit in judgment on the whole world while history attains its ultimate purpose in Germany. We have already observed several times that the complement of this inflated and extravagant national pride is practical activity of the pettiest kind, worthy of shopkeepers and artisans. National narrow-mindedness is everywhere repellent. In Germany it is positively odious, since, together with the illusion that the Germans are superior to nationality and to all real interests, it is held in the face of those nations which openly confess their national limitations and their dependence upon real interests. It is, incidentally, true of every nation that obstinate nationalism is now to be found only among the bourgeoisie and their writers.

B. “SOCIALISTISCHE BAUSTEINE”

RHEINISCHE JAHRBUCHER, P. 155 ET SEQ.

In this essay the reader is first of all prepared for the more difficult truths of true socialism by a belles-lettres and poetic prologue. The prologue opens by proclaiming “happiness” to be the

~ Heinrich Heine, Deutschland, ein Winternäichten, Caput VII.— Ed.
~ “Cornerstones of Socialism”—title of an article by Rudolph Matthäi.—Ed.
“ultimate goal of all endeavour, all movements, of all the arduous
and untiring exertions of past millennia”. In a few brief strokes,
so to speak, a history of the struggle for happiness is sketched for us:

“When the foundations of the old world crumbled, the human heart with all its
yearning took refuge in the other world, to which it transferred its happiness”
(p. 156).

Hence all the bad luck of the terrestrial world. In recent times man
has bidden farewell to the other world and our true socialist now
asks:

“Can man greet the earth once more as the land of his happiness? Does he once
more recognise earth as his original home? Why then should he still keep life and
happiness apart? Why does he not break down the last barrier which cleaves earthly
life into two hostile halves?” (ibid.).

“Land of my most blissful feelings!” etc.

He now invites “Man” to take a walk, an invitation which “Man”
readily accepts. “Man” enters the realm of “free nature” and utters,
among other things, the following tender effusions of a true
socialist’s heart:*

“.! gay flowers ... tall and stately oaks ... their satisfaction, their happiness lie in
their life, their growth and their blossoming ... an infinite multitude of tiny creatures
in the meadows ... forest birds ... a mettlesome troop of young horses ... I see” (says
“man”) “that these creatures neither know nor desire any other happiness than that
which lies for them in the expression and the enjoyment of their lives. When night
falls, my eyes behold a countless host of worlds which revolve about each other
in infinite space according to eternal laws. I see in their revolutions a unity of life,
movement and happiness” (p. 157).

“Man” could also observe a great many other things in nature,
e.g., the bitterest competition among plants and animals; he could
see, for example, in the plant world, in his “forest of tall and stately
oaks”, how these tall and stately capitalists consume the nutriment of
the tiny shrubs, which might well complain: terra, aqua, aere et igni
interdici sumus; he could observe the parasitic plants, the ideologists
of the vegetable world, he could further observe that there is open
warfare between the “forest birds” and the “infinite multitude of
tiny creatures”, between the grass of his “meadows” and the
“mettlesome troop of young horses”. He could see in his “countless
host of worlds” a whole heavenly feudal monarchy complete with
tenants and satellites, a few of which, e.g., the moon, lead a very poor
life aere et aqua interdici; a feudal system in which even the homeless

---

* Paraphrase of the title of Wilhelm Wackenroder’s book Herzensergiessungen
eines kunstliebenden Klosterbruders.—Ed.

b We are banned from earth, water, air and fire.—Ed.
vagabonds, the comets, have been apportioned their station in life and in which, for example, the shattered asteroids bear witness to occasional unpleasant scenes, while the meteors, those fallen angels, creep shamefaced through the “infinite space”, until they find somewhere or other a modest lodging. In the further distance, he would come upon the reactionary fixed stars.

“All these beings find their happiness, the satisfaction and the enjoyment of their life in the exercise and manifestation of the vital energies with which nature has endowed them.”

That is, “man” considers that in the interaction of natural bodies and the manifestation of their forces these natural bodies find their happiness, etc.

“Man” is now reproached by our true socialist with his discord:

“Did not man too spring from the primeval world, is he not a child of nature, like all other creatures? Is he not formed of the same materials, is he not endowed with the same general energies and properties that animate all things? Why does he still seek his earthly happiness in an earthly beyond?” (p. 158).

“The same general energies and properties” which man has in common with “all things”, are cohesion, impenetrability, volume, gravity, etc., which can be found set out in detail on the first page of any textbook of physics. It is difficult to see how one can construe this as a reason why man should not “seek his happiness in an earthly beyond”. However, he admonishes man as follows:

“Consider the lilies of the field.”

Yes, consider the lilies of the field, how they are eaten by goats, transplanted by “man” into his buttonhole, how they are crushed beneath the immodest embraces of the dairymaid and the donkey-driver!

“Consider the lilies of the field, they toil not, neither do they spin: and thy Heavenly Father feedeth them.”

Go thou and do likewise!

After learning in this fashion of the unity of “man” with “all things”, we now learn how he differs from “all things”.

“But man knows himself, he is conscious of himself. Whereas in other beings, the instincts and forces of nature manifest themselves in isolation and unconsciously, they are united in man and become conscious ... his nature is the mirror of all nature, which recognises itself in him. Well then! If nature recognises itself in me, then I recognise myself in nature. I see in its life my own life [...]. We are thus giving living expression to that with which nature has imbued us” (p. 158).

---

a Cf. Matthew 6: 28, 26.—Ed.
This whole prologue is a model of ingenuous philosophic mystification. The true socialist proceeds from the thought that the dichotomy of life and happiness must cease. To prove this thesis he summons the aid of nature presupposing that this dichotomy does not exist in nature and from this he deduces that since man, too, is a natural body and has the properties which such bodies generally possess, this dichotomy ought not to exist for him either. Hobbes had much better reasons for invoking nature as a proof of his *bellum omnium contra omnes,* and Hegel, on whose construction our true socialist depends, for perceiving in nature the cleavage, the slovenly period of the Absolute Idea, and even calling the animal the concrete anguish of God. After shrouding nature in mystery, our true socialist shrouds human consciousness in mystery too, by making it the "mirror" of this mystified nature. Of course, when the manifestation of consciousness ascribes to nature the mental expression of a pious wish about human affairs, it is self-evident that consciousness will only be the mirror in which nature contemplates itself. That "man" has to abolish in his own sphere the cleavage, which is assumed to be non-existent in nature, is now proved by reference to man in his quality as a mere passive mirror in which nature becomes aware of itself; just as it was earlier proved by reference to man as a mere natural body. But let us inspect the last proposition more closely; all the nonsense of these arguments is concentrated in it.

The first fact asserted is that man possesses self-consciousness. The instincts and energies of individual natural beings are transformed into the instincts and forces of "Nature", which then, as a matter of course, "are manifested" in isolation in these individual beings. This mystification was needed in order later to effect a unification of these instincts and forces of "Nature" in the human self-consciousness. Thereby the self-consciousness of man is, of course, transformed into the self-consciousness of nature within him. This mystification is apparently resolved in the following way: in order to pay nature back for finding its self-consciousness in man, man seeks his, in turn, in nature—a procedure which enables him, of course, to find nothing in nature except what he has imputed to it by means of the mystification described above.

He has now arrived safely at the point from which he originally started, and this way of turning round on one's heel is now called in Germany—*development.*

After this prologue comes the real exposition of true socialism.

---

Page 160: "Saint-Simon said to his disciples on his death-bed: 'My whole life can be expressed in one thought: all men must be assured the freest development of their natural capacities.' Saint-Simon was a herald of socialism."

This statement is now treated according to the true socialist method described above and combined with that mystification of nature which we saw in the prologue.

"Nature as the basis of all life is a unity which proceeds from itself and returns to itself, which embraces the immense multifariousness of its phenomena and apart from which nothing exists" (p. 158).

We have seen how one contrives to transform the different natural bodies and their mutual relationships into multifarious "phenomena" of the secret essence of this mysterious "unity". The only new element in this sentence is that nature is first called "the basis of all life", and immediately afterwards we are informed that "apart from it nothing exists"; according to this it embraces "life" as well and cannot merely be its basis.

After these portentous words, there follows the pivotal point of the whole essay:

"Every one of these phenomena, every individual life, exists and develops only through its antithesis, its struggle with the external world, and it is based upon its interaction with the totality of life, with which it is in turn by its nature linked in a whole, the organic unity of the universe" (pp. 158, 159).

This pivotal sentence is further elucidated as follows:

"The individual life finds, on the one hand, its foundation, its source and its subsistence in the totality of life; on the other hand, the totality of life in continual struggle with the individual life strives to consume and to absorb it" (p. 159).

Since this statement applies to every individual life, "therefore", it can be, and is, applied to men as well:

"Man can therefore only develop in and through the totality of life" (No. I, ibid.).

Conscious individual life is now contrasted with unconscious individual life; human society with natural life in general; and then the sentence which we quoted last is repeated in the following form:

"By reason of my nature, it is only in and through community with other men that I can develop, achieve self-conscious enjoyment of my life and attain happiness" (No. II, ibid.).

This development of the individual in society is now discussed in the same way as "individual life" in general was treated above:

"In society, too, the opposition of individual life and life in general becomes the condition of conscious human development. It is through perpetual struggle, through
perpetual reaction against society, which confronts me as a restricting force, that I achieve self-determination and freedom, without which there is no happiness. My life is a continuous process of liberation, a continuous battle with and victory over the conscious and unconscious external world, in order to subdue it and use it to enjoy my life. The instinct of self-preservation, the striving for my own happiness, freedom and satisfaction, these are consequently natural, i.e., reasonable, expressions of life” (ibid.).

Further:

“I demand, therefore, from society that it should afford me the possibility of winning from it my satisfaction, my happiness, that it should provide a battlefield for my bellicose spirit. Just as the individual plant demands soil, warmth and sun, air and rain for its growth, so that it may bear leaves, blossoms and fruit, man too desires to find in society the conditions for the all-round development and satisfaction of all his needs, inclinations and capacities. It must offer him the possibility of winning his happiness. How he will use that chance, what he will make of himself, of his life, depends upon him, upon his individuality. I alone can determine my happiness” (pp. 159, 160).

There follows, as the conclusion of the whole argument, the statement by Saint-Simon which is quoted at the beginning of this section. The Frenchman’s idea has thus been vindicated by German science. What does this vindication consist in?

The true socialist has already earlier imputed various ideas to nature which he would like to see realised in human society. While formerly it was the individual human being, whom he made the mirror of nature, it is now society as a whole. A further conclusion can now be drawn about human society from the ideas imputed to nature. Since the author does not discuss the historical development of society, contenting himself with this meagre analogy, it remains incomprehensible why society should not always have been a true image of nature. The phrases about society, which confronts the individual in the shape of a restricting force, etc., are therefore relevant to every form of society. It is quite natural that a few inconsistencies should have crept into this interpretation of society. Thus he must now admit that a struggle is waged in nature, in contrast to the harmony described in the prologue. Society, the “totality of life”, is conceived by our author not as the interaction of the constituent “individual lives”, but as a distinct existence, and this moreover separately interacts with these “individual lives”. If there is any reference to real affairs in all this it is the illusion of the independence of the state in relation to private life and the belief in this apparent independence as something absolute. But as a matter of fact, neither here nor anywhere in the whole essay is it a question of nature and society at all; it is merely a question of the two categories, individuality and universality, which are given various
names and which are said to form a contradiction, the reconciliation of which would be highly desirable.

From the vindication of "individual life" as opposed to the "totality of life" it follows that the satisfaction of needs, the development of capacities, self-love, etc., are "natural, reasonable expressions of life". From the conception of society as an image of nature, it follows that in all forms of society existing up to now, the present included, these expressions of life have attained full maturity and are recognised as justified.

But we suddenly learn on page 159 that "in our present-day society" these reasonable, natural expressions of life are nevertheless "so often repressed" and "usually only for that reason do they degenerate into an unnaturalness, malformation, egoism, vice, etc."

And so, since society does not, after all, correspond to its prototype, nature, the true socialist “demands” that it should conform to nature and justifies his claim by adducing the plant as an example—a most unfortunate example. In the first place, the plant does not “demand” of nature all the conditions of existence enumerated above; unless it finds them already present it never becomes a plant at all; it remains a grain of seed. Moreover, the state of the “leaves, blossoms and fruit” depends to a great extent on the “soil”, the “warmth” and so on, the climatic and geological conditions of its growth. Far from “demanding” anything, the plant is seen to depend utterly upon the actual conditions of existence; nevertheless, it is upon this alleged demand that our true socialist bases his own claim for a form of society which shall conform to his individual “peculiarity”. The demand for a true socialist society is based on the imaginary demand of a coco-nut palm that the “totality of life” should furnish it with “soil, warmth, sun, air and rain” at the North Pole.

This claim of the individual on society is not deduced from the real development of society but from the alleged relationship of the metaphysical characters—individuality and universality. You have only to interpret single individuals as representatives, embodiments of individuality, and society as the embodiment of universality, and the whole trick is done. And at the same time Saint-Simon’s statement about the free development of the capacities has been correctly expressed and placed upon its true foundation. This correct expression consists in the absurd statement that the individuals forming society want to preserve their “peculiarity”, want to remain as they are, while they demand of society a transformation which can only proceed from a transformation of themselves.
SECOND CORNERSTONE

"You've forgotten the rest of the charming refrain?
Well, just give it up and start over again!"a

"Infinite in their variety, all individual
beings as unity taken together are World Organism" (p. 160).

And so we find ourselves thrown back again to the beginning of the essay and have to go through the whole comedy of individual life and totality of life for the second time. Once more we are initiated into the deep mystery of the interaction of these two lives, restauré a neuf by the introduction of the new term "polar relationship" and the transformation of the individual life into a mere symbol, an "image" of the totality of life. Like a kaleidoscopic picture this essay is composed of reflections of itself, a method of argument common to all true socialists. Their approach to their arguments is similar to that of the cherry-seller who was selling her wares below cost price, working on the correct economic principle that it is the quantity sold that matters. As regards true socialism, this is the more essential because its cherries were rotten before they were ripe.

A few examples of this self-reflection follow:

Cornerstone No. I, pp. 158, 159.

"Every individual life exists and develops only through its antithesis ... is based upon its interaction with the totality of life.

"With which it is in turn, by its nature, linked in a whole.

"Organic unity of the universe.

"The individual life finds, on the one hand, its foundation, its source and its subsistence in the totality of life.

"On the other hand, the totality of life in continual struggle with the individual life strives to consume it.

"Therefore (p. 159):

"Human society is to conscious ... life what unconscious universal life in general is to the unconscious individual life.


"Every individual life exists and develops in and through the totality of life; the totality of life only exists and develops in and through the individual life." (Interaction.)

"The individual life develops ... as a part of life in general.

"The world organism is combined unity.

"Which" (the totality of life) "becomes the soil and subsistence of its" (the individual life's) "development ... that each is founded upon the other....

"That they struggle against one another and oppose one another.

"It follows (p. 161):

"That conscious individual life is also conditioned by the conscious totality of life and" ... (vice versa).

---

a The refrain of a German nursery song.—Ed.
"I can only develop in and through community with other men.... In society, too, the opposition of individual life and life in general becomes", etc.

"Nature ... is a unity ... which embraces the immense multifariousness of its phenomena."

But our author is not satisfied with this kaleidoscopic display. He goes on to repeat his artless remarks about individuality and universality in yet another form. He first puts forward these few arid abstractions as absolute principles and then concludes that the same relationship must recur in the real world. Even this gives him the chance of saying everything twice under the guise of making deductions, in abstract form and, when he is drawing his conclusion, in seemingly concrete form. Then, however, he sets about varying the concrete names which he has given to his two categories. Universality appears variously as nature, unconscious totality of life, conscious ditto, life in general, world organism, all-embracing unity, human society, community, organic unity of the universe, universal happiness, common weal, etc., and individuality appears under the corresponding names of unconscious and conscious individual life, individual happiness, one's own welfare, etc. In connection with each of these names we are obliged to listen to the selfsame phrases which have already been applied often enough to individuality and universality.

The second cornerstone contains, therefore, nothing which was not already contained in the first. But since the words égalité, solidarité, unité des intérêts are used by the French socialists, our author attempts to fashion them into "cornerstones" of true socialism by turning them into German.

"As a conscious member of society I recognise every other member as a being different from myself, confronting me and at the same time supported by and derived from the primary common basis of existence and equal to me. I recognise every one of my fellow-men as opposed to me by reason of his particular nature, yet equal to me by reason of his general nature. The recognition of human equality, of the right of every man to existence, depends therefore upon the consciousness that human nature is common to all; in the same way, love, friendship, justice and all the social virtues are based upon the feeling of natural human affinity and unity. If up to now these have been termed obligations and have been imposed upon men, then in a society founded upon the consciousness of man's inward nature, i.e., upon reason and not upon external compulsion, they will become free, natural expressions of life. In a society which conforms to nature, i.e., to reason, the conditions of existence must accordingly be equal for all its members, i.e., must be general" (pp. 161, 162).

The author displays a marked ability for first putting forward a proposition in assertive fashion and then legitimising it as a conse-
quence of itself by inserting an accordingly, a consequently, etc. He is equally skilful at incidentally smuggling into his peculiar deductions traditional socialistic statements by the use of "if they have", "if it is"—"then they must", "then it will become", etc.

In the first cornerstone, we saw, on the one hand, the individual and, on the other, universality which confronted him as society. This antithesis now reappears in another form, the individual now being divided within himself into a particular and a general nature. From the general nature of the individual, conclusions are drawn about "human equality" and community. Those conditions of life which are common to men thus appear here as a product of "the essence of man", of nature, whereas they, just as much as the consciousness of equality, are historical products. Not content with this, the author substantiates this equality by stating that it rests entirely "on the primary common basis of existence". We learned in the prologue, p. 158, that man "is formed of the same materials and is endowed with the same general energies and properties that animate all things". We learned in the first cornerstone that nature is "the basis of all life", and so, the "primary common basis of existence". Our author has, therefore, far outstripped the French since, being "a conscious member of society", he has not only demonstrated the equality of men with one another; he has also demonstrated their equality with every flea, every wisp of straw, every stone.

We should be only too pleased to believe that "all the social virtues" of our true socialist are based "upon the feeling of natural human affinity and unity", even though feudal bondage, slavery and all the social inequalities of every age have also been based upon this "natural affinity". Incidentally, "natural human affinity" is an historical product which is daily changed at the hands of men; it has always been perfectly natural, however inhuman and contrary to nature it may seem, not only in the judgment of "Man", but also of a later revolutionary generation.

We learn further, quite by chance, that present-day society is based upon "external compulsion". By "external compulsion" the true socialists do not understand the restrictive material conditions of life of given individuals. They see it only as the compulsion exercised by the state, in the form of bayonets, police and cannons, which far from being the foundation of society, are only a consequence of its structure. This question has already been discussed in Die heilige Familie and also in the first volume of this work.

The socialist opposes to present-day society, which is "based upon external compulsion", the ideal of true society, which is based
upon the “consciousness of man’s inward nature, i.e., upon reason”. It is based, that is, upon the consciousness of consciousness, upon the thought of thought. The true socialist does not differ from the philosophers even in his choice of terms. He forgets that the “inward nature” of men, as well as their “consciousness” of it, “i.e.”, their “reason”, has at all times been an historical product and that even when, as he believes, the society of men was based “upon external compulsion”, their “inward nature” corresponded to this “external compulsion”.

There follow, on page 163, individuality and universality with their usual retinue, in the form of individual and public welfare. You may find similar explanations of their mutual relationship in any handbook of political economy under the heading of competition and also, though better expressed, in Hegel.

For example, Rheinische Jahrbücher, p. 163:

“By furthering the public welfare, I further my own welfare, and by furthering my own welfare, I further the public welfare.”

Cf. Hegel’s Rechtsphilosophie, p. 248 (1833):

“In furthering my ends, I further the universal, and this in turn furthers my ends.”

Compare also Rechtsphilosophie, p. 323 et seq., about the relation of the citizen to the state.

“Therefore, as a final consequence, we have the conscious unity of the individual life with the totality of life, harmony” (Rheinische Jahrbücher, p. 163).

“As a final consequence”, that is to say, of “this polar relationship between the individual and the general life, which consists in the fact that sometimes the two clash and oppose one another, while at other times, the one is the condition and the basis of the other”.

The “final consequence” of this is at most the harmony of disharmony with harmony; and all that follows from the constant repetition of these familiar phrases is the author’s belief that his fruitless wrestling with the categories of individuality and universality is the appropriate form in which social questions should be solved.

The author concludes with the following flourish:

“Organic society has as its basis universal equality and develops, through the opposition of the individuals to the universal, towards unrestricted concord, towards the unity of individual with universal happiness, towards social” (!) “harmony of society” (!!), “which is the reflection of universal harmony” (p. 164).

It is modesty indeed to call this sentence a “cornerstone”. It is the primal rock upon which the whole of true socialism is founded.
THIRD CORNERSTONE

"Man's struggle with nature is based upon the polar opposition of my particular life to, and its interaction with, the world of nature in general. When this struggle appears as conscious activity, it is termed 'labour' (p. 164).

Is not, on the contrary, the idea of "polar opposition" based upon the observation of a struggle between men and nature? First of all, an abstraction is made from a fact; then it is declared that the fact is based upon the abstraction. A very cheap method to produce the semblance of being profound and speculative in the German manner.

For example:

Fact: The cat eats the mouse.

Reflection: Cat—nature, mouse—nature, consumption of mouse by cat=consumption of nature by nature=self-consumption of nature.

Philosophic presentation of the fact: Devouring of the mouse by the cat is based upon the self-consumption of nature.

Having thus obscured man's struggle with nature, the writer goes on to obscure man's conscious activity in relation to nature, by describing it as the manifestation of this mere abstraction from the real struggle. The profane word labour is finally smuggled in as the result of this process of mystification. It is a word which our true socialist has had on the tip of his tongue from the start, but which he dared not utter until he had legitimised it in the appropriate way. Labour is constructed from the mere abstract idea of Man and nature; it is thereby defined in a way which is equally appropriate and inappropriate to all stages in the development of labour.

"Therefore, labour is any conscious activity on the part of man whereby he tries to acquire dominion over nature in an intellectual and material sense, so that he may utilise it for the conscious enjoyment of his life and for his intellectual or bodily satisfaction" (ibid.).

We shall only draw attention to the brilliant deduction:

"When this struggle appears as conscious activity, it is termed labour—therefore labour is any conscious activity on the part of man", etc.

We owe this profound insight to the "polar opposition".

The reader will recall Saint-Simon's statement concerning libre développement de toutes les facultés mentioned above, and also remember that Fourier wished to see the present travail répugnant replaced by travail attrayant. We owe to the "polar opposition" the

---

a Free development of all capacities.—Ed.

b "Repellent labour" replaced by "attractive labour" (Charles Fourier, Nouveau monde industriel).—Ed.
following philosophic vindication and explanation of these propositions:

"But since" (the "but" is meant to indicate that there is no connection here) "for life every manifestation, exercise and expression of its forces and faculties should be a source of enjoyment and satisfaction, it follows that labour should itself be a manifestation and development of human capacities and should be a source of enjoyment, satisfaction and happiness. Consequently, labour must itself become a free expression of life and so a source of enjoyment" (ibid.).

Here we are shown what we were promised in the preface to the Rheinische Jahrbücher, namely, "how far German social science differs in its development up to the present from French and English social science" and what it means "to present the doctrine of communism in a scientific form".

It would be a lengthy and boring procedure to expose every logical lapse which occurs in the course of these few lines. But let us first consider the offences against formal logic.

To prove that labour, an expression of life, should be a source of enjoyment, it is assumed that life should afford enjoyment in all its expressions. From this the conclusion is drawn that life should be a source of enjoyment also in its expression as labour. Not satisfied with this periphrastic transformation of a postulate into a conclusion, the author draws a false conclusion. From the fact that "for life every manifestation should be a source of enjoyment", he deduces that labour, which is one of these manifestations of life, "should itself be a manifestation and development of human capacities", that is to say, of life once again. Hence it ought to be what it already is. How could labour ever be anything but a "manifestation of human capacities"? But he does not stop there. Because labour should be so, it "must consequently" be so, or still better: because labour "should be a manifestation and development of human capacities", it must consequently become something completely different, namely, "a free expression of life", which did not enter into the question at all before this. And whereas earlier the postulate of labour as enjoyment was directly deduced from the postulate of the enjoyment of life, the former postulate is now put forward as a consequence of the new postulate of "free expression of life in labour".

As far as the content of the proposition is concerned, one cannot quite see why labour has not always been what it ought to be, why it must now become what it ought to be, or why it should become something which up to now it was not bound to be. But, of course, up to now the essence of man and the polar opposition of man and nature were not properly explained.
A “scientific vindication” of the communist view about the common ownership of the products of labour follows:

“*But*” (the recurrent “*but*” has the same meaning as the previous one) “the product of labour must serve at one and the same time the happiness of the individual, of the labouring individual, and the general happiness. This is effected by reason of the fact that all social activities are complementary and reciprocal” (ibid.).

This statement is merely a copy of what any political economy has to say in praise of competition and the division of labour; except that the argument has been weakened by the introduction of the word “happiness”.

Finally, we are given a philosophic vindication of the French organisation of labour:

“Labour as a free activity, which is enjoyable, affords satisfaction and at the same time serves the common weal, is the basis of the *organisation of labour*” (p.165).

But since labour *should* and *must* become a free activity “which is enjoyable”, etc., and therefore this state of affairs has not yet been reached, one would have expected on the contrary the organisation of labour to be the basis of “labour as an enjoyable activity”. But the concept of labour as such an activity is quite sufficient [for the writer].

At the end of the essay the author believes to have reached “results”.

These “cornerstones” and “results”, together with those other granite boulders which are to be found in the *Einundzwanzig Bogen*, the *Bürgerbuch* and the *Neue Anekdota*, form the rock upon which *true socialism*, alias *German social philosophy*, will build its church.

We shall have occasion to listen to a few of the hymns, a few of the fragments of the *cantique allégorique hébraïque et mystique* which are chanted in this church.

---

*a* Cf. Matthew 16:18.—*Ed.*

*b* Evariste Parny, *La guerre des dieux*. Chant premier.—*Ed.*
"In sooth, if it were not a matter of discussing the whole horde of them ... we should probably throw down our pen.... And now, with that same arrogance, it" (Mundt's Geschichte der Gesellschaft) "appears before a wide circle of readers, before that public which seizes voraciously upon everything displaying the word social because a sure instinct tells it what secrets of future times are hidden in this little word. Hence a double responsibility rests on the writer and he deserves double reproof, if he sets to work inexpertly!"

"We shall not reproach Herr Mundt with not knowing anything of the actual achievements of French and English social literature apart from what Herr L. Stein has revealed to him. When it appeared, Stein's book... was worthy of note.... But to coin phrases nowadays ... about Saint-Simon, to call Bazard and Enfantin the two branches of Saint-Simonism, to follow this up with Fourier and to repeat idle chit-chat about Proudhon, etc.!... And yet we would willingly overlook this if he had only portrayed the genesis of social ideas in a new and original way."

With this haughty and Rhadamanthine pronouncement Herr Grün begins a review (in the Neue Anekdota, pp. 122, 123) of Mundt's Geschichte der Gesellschaft.

The reader will be amazed at the artistic talent shown by Herr Grün, who actually gives, in this guise, a criticism of his own book, which at that time was not yet born.

We observe in Herr Grün a fusion of true socialism with Young-German literary pretensions—a highly diverting spectacle. The book mentioned above is in the form of letters to a lady, from which the reader may surmise that here the profound divinities of true socialism are garlanded with the roses and myrtles of "young literature". Let us hasten to pluck a few roses:

"The Carmagnole was running through my head ... in any case it is terrible that the Carmagnole should be permitted to take breakfast in the head of a German writer, even if not to take up permanent quarters there" (p. 3).
"If I had old Hegel here, I should collar him: What! So nature is the otherness of mind? What! You dullard!" (p. 11).

"Brussels is to some extent a reproduction of the French Convention; it has its parties of the Mountain and the Valley" (p. 24).

"The Lüneburg Heath of politics" (p. 80).

"Gay, poetic, inconsistent, fantastic chrysalis" (p. 82).

"Restoration liberalism, the groundless cactus, which as a parasite coiled round the seats in the Chamber of Deputies" (pp. 87, 88).

That the cactus is neither "groundless", nor a "parasite", and that "gay", "poetic" or "inconsistent" "chrysalises" or pupae do not exist, does not detract from these lovely images.

"Amid this sea" (of newspapers and journalists in the Cabinet Montpensier) "I myself, however, feel like a second Noah, despatching his doves to see if he can possibly build a dwelling or plant a vineyard anywhere or come to a reasonable agreement with the infuriated Gods" (p. 259).

No doubt this refers to Herr Grün’s activity as a newspaper correspondent.

"Camille Desmoulins was a human being. The Constituent Assembly was composed of philistines. Robespierre was a virtuous magnetiser. Modern history, in a word, is a life-and-death struggle against the shopkeepers and the magnetisers!!!" (p. 111).

"Happiness is a plus, but a plus to the nth power" (p. 203).

Hence, happiness = +ⁿ, a formula which can only be found in the aesthetic mathematics of Herr Grün.

"Organisation of labour, what is it? And the peoples replied to the Sphinx with the voices of a thousand newspapers... France sings the strophe, Germany the antistrophe, old mystic Germany" (p. 259).

"North America is even more distasteful to me than the Old World because its shopkeeping egoism has on its cheeks the bloom of impertinent health... because everything there is so superficial, so rootless, I might almost say so provincial... You call America the New World; it is the oldest of all Old Worlds; our worn-out clothes set the fashion there" (pp. 101, 324).

So far we were only aware that unworn stockings of German manufacture were worn there; although they are of too poor a quality to set the "fashion".

"The logically stable security-mongering of these institutions" (p. 461).

Unless these flowers your heart delight
To be a "man" you have no right!

What wanton grace, what saucy innocence! What heroic wrestling with aesthetic problems! This nonchalance and originality are worthy of a Heine!

* An adaptation of a couplet from Mozart’s opera The Magic Flute (libretto by Emanuel Schikaneder), Act II, aria of Sarastro.—Ed.
We have deceived the reader. Herr Grün’s literary graces are not an embellishment of the science of true socialism, the science is merely the padding between these outbursts of literary gossip, and forms, so to speak, its “social background”.

In an essay by Herr Grün, “Feuerbach und die Socialisten”, the following remark occurs (Deutsches Bürgerbuch, p. 74):

“When one speaks of Feuerbach one speaks of the entire work of philosophy from Bacon of Verulam up to the present; one defines at the same time the ultimate purpose and meaning of philosophy, one sees man as the final result of world history. To do so is a more reliable, because a more profound, method of approach than to bring up wages, competition, the faultiness of constitutions and systems of government... We have gained man, man who has divested himself of religion, of moribund thoughts, of all that is foreign to him, with all their counterparts in the practical world; we have gained pure, genuine man.”

This one proposition is enough to show what kind of “reliability” and “profundity” one can expect from Herr Grün. He does not discuss small questions. Equipped with an unquestioning faith in the conclusions of German philosophy, as formulated by Feuerbach, viz., that “man”, “pure, genuine man”, is the ultimate purpose of world history, that religion is externalised [entäusserte] human essence, that human essence is human essence and the measure of all things—equipped with all the other truths of German socialism (see above)—i.e., that money, wage-labour, etc., are also externalisations [Entäusserungen] of human essence, that German socialism is the realisation of German philosophy and the theoretical truth of foreign socialism and communism, etc. a—Herr Grün travels to Brussels and Paris with all the complacency of a true socialist.

The powerful trumpetings of Herr Grün in praise of true socialism and of German science exceed anything his fellow-believers have achieved in this respect. As far as these eulogies refer to true socialism, they are obviously quite sincere. Herr Grün’s modesty does not permit him to utter a single sentence that has not already been pronounced by some other true socialist in the Einundzwanzig Bogen, the Bürgerbuch and the Neue Anekdota. Indeed, he devotes his whole book to filling in an outline of the French social movement sketched in the Einundzwanzig Bogen (pp. 74-88) by Hess, and thereby answering a need expressed in the same work on page 88. b As regards the eulogies to German philosophy, the latter must value them all the more, seeing how little he knows about it. The

---

a See this volume, pp. 467-68.—Ed.

b See Moses Hess, “Socialismus und Communismus”.—Ed.
Karl Grün:
Die soziale Bewegung in Frankreich und Belgien
(Darmstadt 1847.)
oder
Die Geschichtschreibung des wahren Sozialismus.*)

„Wahrlich, gäbe es hier nicht zugleich eine ganze Nonne zu zechen, ... wir würden die Feder noch wegwerfen ... Und jetzt tritt sie (Mundt's Gesichter der Gesellschaft) mit derselben Anmaßung vor den großen Leserkreis des Publikums, des Publikums, das heisgluigig nach Allem greift, was nur das Wort: sozial an der Stirne trägt, weil ein richtiger Takt ihm sagt, welche Geheimnisse der Zukunft in diesem Wörtern vermögen liegen. Doppelte Verantwortlichkeit des Schriftstellers, doppelter Züchtigung, wenn er unberufen ans Werk ging!“

„Darüber wollen wir eigentlich mit Herrn Mundt nicht rechten, dass er von den faktischen Leistungen der sozialen Literatur Frankreichs und Englands durchaus Nichts weiß, als was ihm Herr L. Stein verrathen, dessen Buch anerkannt werden konnte, als es erschien ... Aber heute noch ... über St. Simon Phrasen machen, Bazar und Infantin die beiden Zweige des St. Simonismus nennen, Fourier folgen lassen, über Proudhon ungenügendes Zeug nachplappern u. s. w., u. s. w! ... Dennoch würden wir gerne ein Auge zubrück, wäre mindestens die Genese der sozialen Ideen eigen und neu dargestellt.“

Mit dieser hochfahrenden, rhadamatischen Sentenz eröffnet Sr. Grün (Neue Anekdoten, S. 122 und 123) eine Rezension von Mundts „Geschichte der Gesellschaft.“

Wie überrascht wird der Leser von dem artistischen Talent des Hrn. Grün, das unter der obigen Maske nur eine Selbstkritik seines eigenen, damals noch ungeborenen Buches versteckte!

Sr. Grün bietet uns das amüsante Schauspiel einer Verschmelzung des wahren Sozialismus mit jungdeutschem Literatenthum. Das obige Buch ist in Briefen an eine Dame geschrieben, woraus der Leser schon

*) Indem wir unfern Lesern im Folgenden die schon vor längerer Zeit von Karl Marx in der Tierrischen Ztg. angekündigte Kritik mitteilen, benachrichtigen wir sie zugleich, dass sich durch unlösliche Umstände das Manuskript über zwei Monate in Deutschland herumgetrieben hat, ohne uns zuzugehen. Sr. Marx musste unter solchen Umständen dasselbe längst in unserem Besitz vermuten, und konnte deshalb nichts erklären, wonach unsere frühere Erklärung zu berichtigen. P.R.
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national pride of the true socialists, their pride in Germany as the land of “man”, of “human essence”, as opposed to the other profane nationalities, reaches its climax in him. We give below a few samples of it:

“But I should like to know whether they won't all have to learn from us, these French and English, Belgians and North Americans” (p. 28).

He now enlarges upon this.

“The North Americans appear to me thoroughly prosaic and, despite their legal freedom, it is from us that they will probably have to learn their socialism” (p. 101).

Particularly because they have had, since 1829, their own socialist and democratic school, against which their economist Cooper was fighting as long ago as 1830.

“The Belgian democrats! Do you really think that they are half so far advanced as we Germans are? Why, I have just had a tussle with one of them who considered the realisation of free humanity to be a chimera!” (p. 28).

The nationality of “man”, of “human essence”, of “humanity” shows off here as vastly superior to Belgian nationality.

“Frenchmen! Leave Hegel in peace until you understand him.” (We believe that Lerminier’s criticism of the philosophy of law, however weak it may be, shows more insight into Hegel than anything which Herr Grün has written either under his own name or that of “Ernst von der Haide”). “Try drinking no coffee, no wine for a year; don’t give way to passionate excitement; let Guizot rule and let Algeria come under the sway of Morocco” (how is Algeria ever to come under the sway of Morocco, even if the French were to relinquish it?); “sit in a garret and study the Logik and the Phänomenologie. And when you come down after a year, lean in frame and red of eye, and go into the street and stumble over some dandy or town crier, don’t be abashed. For in the meantime you will have become great and mighty men, your mind will be like an oak that is nourished by miraculous sap; whatever you see will yield up to you its most secret weaknesses; though you are created spirits, you will nevertheless penetrate to the heart of nature; your glance will be fatal, your word will move mountains, your dialectic will be keener than the keenest guillotine. You will present yourself at the Hôtel de Ville—and the bourgeoisie is a thing of the past. You will step up to the Palais Bourbon—and it collapses. The whole Chamber of Deputies will disappear into the void. Guizot will vanish, Louis Philippe will fade into an historical ghost and out of all these forces which you have annihilated there will rise victorious the absolute idea of free society. Seriously, you can only subdue Hegel by first of all becoming Hegel yourselves. As I have already remarked—Moor’s beloved can only die at the hands of Moor” (pp. 115, 116).

The belletristic aroma of these true socialist statements will be noticed by everyone. Herr Grün, like all true socialists, does not

---

a Eugène Lerminier, Philosophie du droit.—Ed.
b Friedrich Schiller, Die Räuber, Act V, Scene 2.—Ed.
forget to bring up again the old chatter about the superficiality of the French:

"For I am fated to find the French mind inadequate and superficial, every time that I come into close contact with it" (p. 371).

Herr Grün does not conceal from us the fact that his book is intended to glorify German socialism as the criticism of French socialism:

"The riff-raff of current German literature call our socialist endeavours an imitation of French perversities. No one has so far considered it worth while to reply to this. The riff-raff must surely feel ashamed, if they have any sense of shame at all, when they read this book. It probably never entered their head that German socialism is a criticism of French socialism, that far from considering the French to be the inventors of a new Contrat social, it demands that French socialism should make good its deficiencies by a study of German science. At this moment, an edition of a translation of Feuerbach's Wesen des Christenthums is being prepared here in Paris. May their German schooling do the French much good! Whatever may arise from the economic position of the country or the constellation of politics in this country, only the humanistic outlook will ensure a human existence for the future. The Germans, unpolitical and despised as they are, this nation which is no nation, will have laid the cornerstone of the building of the future" (p. 353).

Of course, there is no need for a true socialist, absorbed in his intimacy with "human essence", to know anything about what "may arise from the economic position and the political constellation" of a country.

Herr Grün, as an apostle of true socialism, does not merely, like his fellow-apostles, boast of the omniscience of the Germans as compared with the ignorance of the other nations. Utilising his previous experience as a man of letters, he forces himself, in the worst globe-trotter manner, upon the representatives of the various socialist, democratic and communist parties and when he has sniffed them from all angles, he presents himself to them as the apostle of true socialism. All that remains for him to do is to teach them, to communicate to them the profoundest discoveries concerning free humanity. The superiority of true socialism over the French parties now assumes the form of the personal superiority of Herr Grün over the representatives of these parties. Finally, this gives him a chance not only of utilising the French party leaders as a pedestal for Herr Grün, but also of talking all sorts of gossip, thereby compensating the German provincial for the exertion which the more pregnant statements of true socialism have caused him.

"Kats pulled a face expressive of plebeian cheerfulness when I assured him of my complete satisfaction with his speech" (p. 50).
Herr Grün lost no time in instructing Kats about French terrorism and "had the good fortune to win the approval of my new friend" (p. 51).

His effect on Proudhon was important too, but in a different way. "I had the infinite pleasure of acting, so to speak, as the tutor of the man whose acumen has not perhaps been surpassed since Lessing and Kant" (p. 404).

Louis Blanc is merely "his swarthy young friend" (p. 314).

"He asked very eagerly but also very ignorantly about conditions with us. We Germans know" (?) "French conditions almost as well as the French themselves; at least we study" (?) "them" (p. 315).

And we learn of "Papa Cabet" that he "has limitations" (p. 382). Herr Grün raised a number of questions, and Cabet "confessed that he had not exactly been able to fathom them. I" (Grün) "had noticed this long ago; and that, of course, meant an end of everything, especially as it occurred to me that Cabet's mission had long ago been fulfilled" (p. 381).

We shall see later how Herr Grün contrives to give Cabet a new "mission".

Let us first deal with the outline and the few well-worn general ideas which form the skeleton of Grün's book. Both are copied from Hess, whom Herr Grün paraphrases indeed in the most lordly fashion. Matters which are quite vague and mystical even in Hess, but which were originally—in the Einundzwanzig Bogen—worthy of recognition, and have only become tiresome and reactionary as a result of their perpetual reappearance in the Bürgerbuch, the Neue Anekdoten and the Rheinische Jahrbücher, at a time when they were already out of date, become complete nonsense in Herr Grün's hands.

Hess synthesises the development of French socialism and the development of German philosophy—Saint-Simon and Schelling, Fourier and Hegel, Proudhon and Feuerbach. Compare, for example, Einundzwanzig Bogen, pp. 78, 79,\textsuperscript{a} 326, 327\textsuperscript{b}; Neue Anekdoten, pp. 194, 195, 196, 202 ff.\textsuperscript{c} (Parallels between Feuerbach and Proudhon, e.g., Hess: "Feuerbach is the German Proudhon", etc., Neue Anekdoten, p. 202. Grün: "Proudhon is the French Feuerbach", p. 404.)

This schematism in the form given it by Hess is all that holds Grün's book together. But, of course, Herr Grün does not fail to add a few literary flourishes to Hess' propositions. Even obvious
blunders on the part of Hess, e.g., that theoretical constructions form the "social background" and the "theoretical basis" of practical movements (e.g., *Neue Anekdoten*, p. 192) are copied faithfully by Herr Grün. (E.g., Grün, p. 264: "The social background of the political question in the eighteenth century ... was the simultaneous product of the two philosophic tendencies"—that of the sensationists and that of the deists.) He copies, too, the opinion that it is only necessary to put Feuerbach into practice, to apply him to social life, in order to produce the complete critique of existing society. If one adds the other critical remarks which Hess directed against French communism and socialism, for example: "Fourier, Proudhon, etc., did not get beyond the category of wage-labour" (*Bürgerbuch*, p. 46 and elsewhere); "Fourier would like to present new associations of egoism to the world" (*Neue Anekdoten*, p. 196); "Even the radical French communists have not yet risen above the opposition of labour and enjoyment. They have not yet grasped the unity of production and consumption, etc." (*Bürgerbuch*, p. 43); "Anarchy is the negation of the concept of political rule" (*Einundzwanzig Bogen*, p. 77), etc., if one adds these, one has pocketed the whole of Herr Grün's critique of the French. As a matter of fact he had it in his pocket before he went to Paris. In settling accounts with the French socialists and communists Herr Grün also obtains great assistance from the various traditional phrases current in Germany about religion, politics, nationality, human and inhuman, etc., which have been taken over by the true socialists from the philosophers. All he has to do is to hunt everywhere for the words "Man" and "human" and condemn when he cannot find them. For example: "You are political. Then you are narrow-minded" (p. 283). In the same way, Herr Grün is enabled to exclaim: You are national, religious, addicted to political economy, you have a God—then you are not human, you are narrow-minded. This is a process which he follows throughout his book, thereby, of course, providing a thorough criticism of politics, nationality, religion, etc., and at the same time an adequate elucidation of the characteristics of the authors criticised and their connection with social development.

One can see from this that Grün's fabrication is on a much lower level than the work by Stein, who at least tried to explain the connection between socialist literature and the real development of French society. It need hardly be mentioned that in the book under discussion, as in the *Neue Anekdoten*, Herr Grün adopts a very grand and condescending manner towards his predecessor.

---

a Moses Hess, "Ueber die Noth in unserer Gesellschaft und deren Abhülfe".—Ed.