

The Antichrist in Egoism and Marxism

A tale of the Marxist paradise lost - and how to lose it more

*Should we storm Heaven only the Tyrant in charge will change, rather we must annihilate
Eden by bringing Hell with us in every step.*

Written by Helena de Oliveira

Introduction: The State of God.....	2
Chapter I: Humanism and its Assassins.....	3
Chapter II: Saint Marx.....	8
Chapter III: Hate the Prole.....	12
End: The Egoist Communist Singularity.....	14
Bibliography.....	16

Introduction: The State of God

In 1793 the era of God that was feudalism finally met its end -or the beginning of its end-, the old christian God was thrown off, rejected by a revolutionary spirit that sought to burn the old to find a new order based on humanity itself. However, despite a well endowed courage for progress this flame only ended up burning the revolutionaries themselves, the iconoclastic flame burned through their human bodies to meld and shape the God of this new age: the Human Being. And so after a couple centuries of its existence in the realm of ideas the phantasm of Humanism was finally able to take “concrete shape” in the Republic and the constitutions that spread afterwards. Very quickly it showed its tyrannical nature -typical of every phantom- when those revolutionaries, as Stirner points out, “Because the revolutionary priests and schoolmasters serve the human being, they cut off the head of human beings.”¹ In the bourgeois nation-state laid yet another leviathan of alienation and oppression; a phantasmagoric force of slave morality and control was what replaced the feudal order. Now God wasn't one and only in His place, God was inside all of us, as the Human Being, the state too took the same shape, an ever encompassing, ever reaching and assimilating phantasm. As Stirner puts it: “if God has tormented us, the “human being” is capable of pressing on us more agonizingly.”²

Very quickly then since these developments fully took shape criticism started to flow abound as the contradictions present in every current of Humanism -in different forms but ever present nonetheless- became ever more clear, freshly from killing God, Humanism had found its own deicide. And that's what brings us to the topic of this essay, the two most potent weapons against the crushing presence of Humanism: Marxism and Egoism, how one of them failed while the other holds true, and how combining those by giving Marxism the Stirnerite edge it requires can give any individual the most potential weapon for the destruction of the present phantasms that haunt our modern age. Both born from the same Hegelian basket, both daring to raise the sword against the phantoms of Moralism and Humanism and to commit iconoclasm, such a bond between these two theories is a source for powerful destructiveness.

Though in the past attempts of syncretism of these two modes of thought were based in ideas around property, the “nature” of expropriation and the conjoined advocacy for breaking idealistic barriers to individual self-assertion -and its true that those two theories can be simultaneously used to justify such a social-individual interaction-, as well as a similar insurrection and idea of rebellion, their connection runs deeper. And because of the word “syncretism” too many of these attempts are just a mesh between these views, leading to these attempts often taking an inevitably universalist approach and being unable to advance either theory into something new. What follows is only the shape of an insurrectionary and liberating ideology that nevertheless remains stuck in the ground and unable to fully act as a progressive and creative force.

¹ Stirner, Max 1844. *The Unique and It's Property*. Baltimore: Underworld Amusements, 2017

² Ibid.

Instead the realization of the full potential of the combination of these two modes of thought comes not through syncretism but through anthropophagy, by consuming and breaking down these theories into their core component of Anti-Humanism, creating not a mesh but a strictly unified and concrete weapon that is nonetheless still the product of these two supposedly and presently divergent forces.

Chapter I: Humanism and its Assassins

The Human Being's development is very much the same as any other god from a world religion, a phantasm born from the ideal object created in the Renaissance and the act of tying itself to it, fixing its position on the objective of anthropocentrism and thus making the position of the human sacred and untouchable. God was overthrown as the center of the universe but what came after was another center, instead of orbiting God we came to orbit the Vitruvian Man. In this development lies the ultimate contradiction in Humanism, that despite such heaven storming no liberation could be found as the rope of sacredness kept tightly on our necks. The endless chase for a fixed idea, that as an idea is unreachable, is not only a destruction of vitality because of its impossibility, but also because it is a chase away from ourselves, drowning ourselves in alienation as we throw away and cover our own bodies for the sake of chasing the ideal, a religious self-sacrifice for a God. The Human Being achieves this through the hammer of constitution and law as well as the civil state, basing itself in a contract between the individual and the State. In exchange for following the duties decided by the state the Individual will be granted its "Human Rights", this blank puppet that takes the shape of the individual, but is made only of Humanist idealism -rights and duties-, is the ultimate project of the Human Being. And so the very space inside of us -as the human being- and outside of us -as the state- was made into something sacred, an ever encompassing jail that leaves no room for the unique to assert itself under its own rules, to do so, to leave this supposed "contract" is to go against the state and lose your rights as "Human". As Stirner puts it:

"The true human being is the nation, but the individual is always an egoist. Therefore cast off your individuality or separation in which egoistic inequality and discord dwell, and devote yourself entirely to the true human being, the nation, or the state. Then you will count as human beings and have all that is the human being's; the state, the true human being, will entitle you to all that belongs to it, and give you "human rights"; the human being gives you its rights!

Such is the speech of the bourgeoisie."³

A criminal despite having rights is not seen in the same light as a non-criminal, both socially as well as by the law, which makes sense, as "Human Rights" and therefore the "Human Being" can only be given by the state.

³ Ibid.

For Humanism to have taken such a form is not surprising, as not only by structure but by mode of thought does Humanism seek to imitate Christianity. From its birth in the Renaissance Humanism sought not a real break from Christianity but a simple change in perspective, all of the alienating and resentment filled miseries and moralities present in Christian thought was kept, though we had rescued the Ancients we had only done so in the aesthetic of their art and not their art itself. And so the Christian spirit kept itself deeply tied to the developments of humanism and liberalism, making sure to infect its development with its alienating universalities, no wonder then the next revolution in Europe came not in a secular movement but in the Protestant movement. Look deeply in all of these political developments and you see the same old Christian base in everything, the Renaissance and the Reformation only separated the Church from the Earth, but the phantom of God continued on tying itself deeply to us through the doctrine of society and collectivism, sustained by the phantasms of slave morality.

The opposition to Humanism, or Anti-Humanism, is at a glance very heterodox, but in truth there is only one Anti-Humanist mode of action, as many of the supposed alternatives to Humanism fail to fully escape the same trap that Humanism fell into, and thus degenerate back into Humanism again, as did Humanism with Christianity. Humanism is simply another layer of alienation, for one to destroy it and break itself free the simple placing of or swapping with another layer in the pile of alienation and causes that crushes us in our current society is counter-productive. A lack of creativity thus comes about as the main issue, the internal logic of this sacred association is so ingrained that reaching out of its bounds is an idea that's out of the minds of many people, the boundary that Humanism creates binds even the mind of the unique itself. The ideals of morality, politics and society are the cause of this, the change in Phantasm is just a change in preference of the interpretation of those three other ideals, therefore the inevitable ideas of human association that stem from those all carry the same specter of alienation. Humanism was built with the same cloth that was torn off of Christianity, and so too do the alternatives of Humanism wish to use the same cloth. As to give examples of these alternatives there can be mentioned a couple forms that show the degeneration of the Opposition to Humanism into Pseudo-Humanism.

The first alternative to Humanism is, in essence, more Humanism. Perhaps the earlier progressive opposition to Humanism is the very idea that Humanism as it is defended in its classical liberal form is simply not enough, from the hardliner progressives to the philanthropists and social democrats arises an idea that the Liberal "Live and Let Live" attitude let far too much human suffering pass. The Humanist Principles that were the basis of Liberal Democracy ended up being discarded when it suited political or economical pragmatism, in State governance Humanism was only used as a guiding ideology for herding sheep and at the baseline it was political interest and monetary gain that held real power. The laissez-faire treatment of Human Beings would thus run contrary to Humanism as humans would be led to suffer and their "Human Rights" would far too often depend on their material conditions rather than their Humanity itself. The counter-proposal then, was a far-reaching humanity, that the being human itself is what grants one "Human Rights", and that society should organize itself for the betterment of Humanity, and not the few. Despite being clearly

still Humanist this is a worthy current to look at as it can be seen as a solution that does not solve the actual problem, by that I mean that despite the betterment of welfare and raising up of “Human Beings” leading to admittedly less human suffering -standards of living in welfare states compared to non-welfare states prove this very well-, the core of what makes Humanism an alienating force is still held up. The approval and insertion of the individual into such a social space still depends on the search of an imagined ideal, people still end up being trapped in surviving, as actually living requires an individual self-assertion that the assimilating of one’s self into the Human Being does not permit. Every spark of destructive flame that lights up in the heart of the unique faces an attempt of being drown out as to not disturb the sacred Human Being that exists all around, at the end leaving only a sterile environment of far away and alienated people forced to forget themselves to be a part of an empty and dead whole.

Moving away from Humanism -and i can only say moving away and not opposing when it comes to the following ideologies we will talk about-, we can see specially in modern times a more existential view of the necessity to oppose Humanism, while previously we saw an opposition in a material basis -that the ideology was good enough, but its material applications were unorthodox to the actual thought-, in both Deep Ecology and Post-Humanism -here needing to be understood as Posthumanism- Humanism is an outdated idea in the basis of its reach. It is rejected as a political project of identity first and foremost, and thus such a rejection happens to be only an aesthetic change, whether the inclusion in “worthy life” is expanded to include all of nature or the “ideal man” is changed into the “post-man” the logic remains fundamentally collectivist and restrictive, and thus alienating. In either case the contradictions and coercive forces present in Humanism as well as the abandoning one’s self for the sake of a sacred thing is still held up, either by simply expanding humanity to include all life, only leading to a larger cage or a new “Good Man” that is nevertheless that center we are supposed to gravitate around. Taking off this layer of Humanism then we see where its alienating potential comes from, not from its contradiction in ideology and action -as extending humanism to be universal and over the State only maintains it-, not in its mandate of existence as anthropocentric -as leaving anthropocentrism while maintaining the rest only gets us a different aesthetic of humanism-, but in its force of ideological alienation, of keeping the individual from asserting itself for the sake of assimilating into an idealized blob that is the “Human Being” or its variations. When difference is rejected in the space of ideas the search of actual self-interest by self-asserted people becomes a sin. As Stirner writes:

“So the state betrays its hostility against me by demanding that I should be a human being, which assumes that I am not one and can count for it as an “inhuman monster”; it imposes being human on me as a duty. Further it requires that I do nothing which would stop it from persisting. Its continued existence is supposed to be sacred for me. Then I should not be an egoist, but an “honest, upright,” i.e., moral human being.

Enough: I am supposed to be powerless and respectful before it and its continued existence.”⁴

Humanism, however, isn't the source of this alienation, while we can point Christianity as its base origin, and that very religion as the basis of the moral, ethical and political prisons that lock us today, the essence of this alienation is far older and more fundamental than that. In reality Christianity is as well only another social manifestation of a deeper existential crisis, that of the collective identity and the overpowering shroud of culture around each and every one of us. A tribal collectivism and directioning to group thinking caused by social pressure is the common ancestor of every mode of alienation, Christianity to Humanism to Socialism is just one of the branches of this tree of death. Such an example of this can be seen in Ultrationalism, an idea that spawned from the Humanism it tries its best to reject, only not realizing it falls into the same logic of creating a leviathan of death. Though the Ultrationalist opposition to Humanism is one that calls out the latter's alienating and life-sucking essence and attempts to go against this by creating something more “grounded” it fails in doing so because the very same pillars of Humanism also built the church of Ultrationalism. Its effect on the individual is the same even if the mode of action is different, first the Ultrationalist's search for some “living” interest is still one based entirely on idealism, the Nation itself is a phantom and no more of a fake god as God or the Human Being, rendering any search for meaning ultimately self-defeating and ending any life, second that Humanity and the Nation are both totalities, their differences existing only in exclusivity, just as Humanity makes each one forget themselves for the sake of becoming equal under the Human Being so does the Nation makes each one of a given group forget themselves for the sake of becoming one with the National Body.

A necessary realization in this Satanic Iconoclasm against Humanity is that the actual reason for the creation of such a totality is not based upon idealistically constructed morality, ethics and politics, but on the construction of an universality itself, in this issue does Marx find his positioning falling upon Pseudo-Humanism. Though Communism and the ideal of Class Consciousness is not inherently moralistic, and certainly not necessarily idealist, the specter of an universality still creeps into it and creates these conditions nonetheless in most of the forms these ideas take place. The ideal of a dialectical between material conditions and social conditions fails to note how both are one in the same, and that both are first and foremost individual creations, even though these structures can be noted in society the uniformity of action and the fixation of oneself's into a class and historical position is idealistic as well as essentialist. This is because they are in essence still based on the locking of the unique in an imagined and ideal struggle, in the sense that it is manifested through the acceptance of this universe of thought that as such holds control over the individual. Society and Classes are phantasms, and their presence can be thrown off by the very method of idea itself, it's in this that insurrection bases itself on and why it is truly liberatory, to accept an idea of universal system of operation, as those who wish for a dictatorship of the proletariat do, is to fall into yet another universality, it is to have any of your own subjectivity made a vassal to a wider

⁴ Ibid.

sacred system. If the universality of Humanism was to be thrown off by the proletariat one then the change would once again be of different masters, as the position of the individual as a slave to an idea would remain the very same

To combat Humanism with yet another universality is to simply play into the universality of Religion again, its to look up at the ceiling in this room built around us and claim there's no sky, rather, the whole logic of the Human needs to be thrown off to evade the crushing alienating tide of Humanism. Morals, Ethics and Politics have the justification of oppressive institutions as their only roles since humanity invented every one of those things, to reshape them into something that allows us to fit comfortably in is counter-productive to any attempt to live. There can be no accepting to "fit" for a free person, any box is an outside barrier to infinite subjective expansion. It is in that way than that we see Anti-Humanism's real form, the Inhuman Monster, the will to break away from everything else built to sustain humanity because those drain the unique, the rejection of Morality and any other sacredness is a must in order to oppose the true matter of Humanism. Insurrection starts with creativity, the vision of the outside of the religious room and a beautiful sky.

And so in our iconoclastic pilgrimage do we reach the point of Deicide, Egoism. Max Stirner developed Egoism as something that served as the final conclusion to the Hegelian dialectic, though he would criticize Hegelianism and the Young Hegelians, the Egoism of Max Stirner was one that claimed a position as an heir to the ideas of Hegel, as its destroyer, as did Marx. Egoism thus became the final point of this dialectic, the egoist nihilism and iconoclastic insurrection becoming the end result of not just the Hegelian project itself, but the war against theocracy as a whole. As Deleuze puts it in *Nietzsche and Philosophy*:

"Stirner is the dialectician who reveals nihilism as the truth of the dialectic. It is enough for him to pose the question "which one?" The unique ego turns everything but itself into nothingness, and this nothingness is precisely its own nothingness, the ego's own nothingness."⁵

Though it must be stated that unlike what Deleuze proposes, Stirner does not actually get himself stuck in the dialectic, nor is his position one of negative nihilism, rather, Stirner creates a positive and creatively destructive nihilism. With the premise that the sacred itself is a source of alienation and that therefore any surrendering to fixed ideas is oppressive suddenly any action becomes null in concrete value. There can be no universality if it all comes from nothing, to uphold an universality is necessarily to hold some outside idea as sacred and making it so it cannot be trespassed, therefore limiting the unique in its potential for self-creation and self-assertion. This is not only the core of any ideological system but the core of alienation itself, when a destructive force is brought up against any dominating status quo it is that element of universality and sacredness that it wishes to destroy. The reason why revolutionary movements betray themselves follow from this as well, as they come to reject the destructive force for a force that seeks to create something else, therefore inevitably

⁵ Deleuze, Gilles 1962. *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. London: The Athlone Press, 1983

falling upon universality and creating another system of alienation again. Stirner's Anti-Humanism finds its success in opposing Humanism by rejecting such a constructive force, instead relying entirely on the subjective power of insurrection. Seeing universalities as fundamentally meaningless and alienating makes the only real opposition to it lie in their rejection entirely, it becomes up to the unique's self-assertion in their own to allow for moments of liberation. Insurrection destroys Humanism by ending every sacredness that it holds up, making the unique a free-flowing edge of difference that cuts through the alienating assimilating mass of Humanism, in this process do we find the liberatory charm of Anti-Humanism.

Chapter II: Saint Marx

That Socialism both fails to achieve anything beyond Pseudo-Humanism and that it has potential to go beyond it given the correct measures have been things pointed out by Stirner and the Egoist thinkers that follow after him while maintaining some form of sympathy towards socialism. In a sense, Stirner's talk of "Sacred Socialism" in *Stirner's Critics*⁶ is the main ideological bridge between Egoism and Marxism in the modern day, if there's a single sentence from which the whole movement of Socialist Egoism stems from, it is that one. But for as much as the distinction of "Socialism" and "Sacred Socialism" are brought up, the way in which these two are compared often fails to fully understand what the fundamental difference between these two manifestations of the proletariat movement is. Although the essence of the Egoist opposition to Sacred Socialism is the self-sacrifice towards a cause, something present in every ideology, such an analysis generalizes the ways in which the Socialist cause in particular becomes sacred, and often reduces Socialism itself as a tool for an individual's advancement rather than a set of ideological assertions and principles.

Socialism as detached from Egoism in that manner becomes meaningless and at the same time too meaningful, meaningless in the sense that Socialism loses any point as it becomes an ideology separated from any ideological character and too meaningful in the sense that it becomes its own institution. Rather than a creative manifestation becoming a set of behaviors, Stirner becomes Marxized and in that way loses any insurrectionary character, the individual gets stuck in politics and though the Egoist might see these relations as voluntary, Socialism as something separate directly implies that engaging in such relations is an absorption of the individual into the socialist body, diluting the individual character for the sake of participating in the contracts and expectations of that social relation. Though such a process can be painted as based in self interest it clarifies a contrast between Egoism and Socialism, making any insurrection in that form a compromise. "I will engage in Socialism and get what I want from it" is counter-productive to actual liberation, rather "I will be insurrectionary, and that's Communism" is a much better description of where the true Egoist Communism lies.

⁶ Stirner, Max 1845. *Stirner's Critics*. Berkeley, CA: LBC Books, Oakland, CA: Columbia Alternative Library, Press, 2012

These relations towards socialism tie directly to the Sacred Socialism that Stirner mentioned before, the dedication towards a cause and the lowering of one's self into the unrealness of politics, the sacrifice to a fixed idea. Such a thing isn't only apparent in the total dedication of one's self towards a particular ideology but in each individual action of self-sacrifice. That said, Communism seems to have the unique potential to act as and contribute to a distinctly Egoist form of insurrection and liberation, As can be seen in the Egoist Communism described in D.Z Rowan's *A Brief Description of Egoist Communism*⁷. This potential is something that is evident since Marx, and in a sense, was Marx's greatest contribution to Communism, which is to tie it with Anti-Humanism, to attempt to view it not as another ideologically constructed heaven but the concrete manifestation of the will of the proletariat, it was the will of a political class to assert itself against the ideological constructs they were chained to. At the core of communism is not an idea but the assertion of a movement, and by movement I don't mean an ideological proposition, but the moving of parts itself, it's the defense and propagation of the power of the proletariat under our current liberal conditions, Communism as an "end goal" takes a backseat to this, instead, Communism as the thought of the proletariat movement is the true key towards such economic warfare.

However, despite all of this Marx still failed to grasp the concrete ground in which Communism stood on, how the proletariat movement was something entirely unpolitical in the sense that it broke the bonds of politics and was the chasing of self-interest in of itself. Instead, Marxism would develop in a party, as a program and as a structure, Marx and Engels still didn't see the Unique, and too blinded by idealism, and with a lack creativity still sought to see the world only as the phantasmagorical groupings that society created, the proletariat were seen as a concrete unit, and so was every other factor in society, which was expected to march in a historical process as that was their nature as the institutional organs in which they existed. This was only another universality, another injection of morality in the sense that it still created an ideal world, a materialist ideal world but an ideal world nonetheless. The alienating nature of such institutions of the proletariat were reinforced rather than thrown off, the replication and continuation of a cycle of universalities over subjectivity became ingrained within Marxism and the communist-as-proletariat chase of self-interest was chosen over the individual-as-proletariat chase of self-interest, which is to say, the now political movement saw it as their duty as communist to advance the interests of the proletariat. Marxian theory plays a critical role in the fight for liberation if once the proletariat condition is understood it is then thrown off in iconoclastic fury through a process of insurrection in which Communism is lived, the Union of Egoists and the Communist Space are one in the same.

The Marxist surrender to politics is the point in which Marxist theory fails to accomplish its Communist promises, as long as the supposed proletarian Movement is chained to history and universality it cannot make the proletariat move as movement requires iconoclasm. It requires a persistent inhumanity that constantly destroys the wall around the individual, history is lost in such a process as iconoclasm devours time itself, it is not for the progression of history that

⁷ D.Z Rowan 2017. *A Brief Description of Egoist Communism*

an iconoclast labors, but for the enjoyment and consumption of every bit of every single moment. It's in the acknowledgement of the Unique's supremacy over sacredness that Communism is realized, only when subjectivity fully takes over that the proletariat abolishes itself, alongside classes, states and all else that goes against the progression of the Individual. The opposition to Sacred Socialism is not Socialism, its Satanic Socialism, an opposition towards the sacredness of everything, the self-seeking mentality that makes one the adversary of all at the same time that it connects every subjectivity in a harmonic union.

In that sense Anti-Humanist Communism isn't only a branch of Communism but the actual realization of Communism itself, evident by how deviations from the amoralist, anti-humanist basis of Communism leads to a revisionist Socialism that loses all of its actual communist essence, as can be observed in the cases of Social Democracy and Marxism-Leninism. The socialist degeneration into Social Democracy, despite being largely attributed to opportunism and a maintained dedication to capitalism still happens in large part because of a rejection of Anti-Humanism and Amoralism for the sake of maintaining a Humanist and therefore liberal order. Marxism-Leninism too comes about in a similar way, being another strand of revisionism created from the removal of Anti-Humanism from Communism. Though it differs from Social Democracy in that at least in its revolutionary stage it attempts to reject liberal humanism, but requiring such an alienating ideology to justify its own regime Marxism-Leninism cannot simply endorse Anti-Humanism, rather it creates another idol to control the people with instead, once again moving away from Communism.

The reason why Social Democracy sticks to capitalism and liberalism lies in the fact that Social Democracy is either the liberal portion of the proletariat movement, maintaining ideological liberal presumptions -Most evident in the Liberal Socialist tendency- while still seeking some form of betterment of the conditions of the working class, or the application of expanded Humanism in a liberal society -Such as in the case of more corporatist Social Democratic movements-, seeking class collaboration as it sees not a material fight for the individual proletariat's interest, but an united social organism that human beings must organize around. Either way, class collaborationist or engaged in a pseudo-class conflict the issue in Social Democracy comes from its preference of the liberal Human Being over Anti-Humanism, making it thus more logical a society structured around liberalism rather than the destructive inhumane conflict inherent to Communism.

The Marxist-Leninist movements of the 20th Century and specially the 21st Century have proven to be simply another moving gear of the liberal democratic world order, from the intra-imperialist conflict that was the Cold War to the current geopolitical chess between Capitalist potencies and China it is clear that whatever revolutionary fervor was born with Lenin has at this point been snuffed out as Marxism-Leninism settles in with civilized humanity. To chalk up such a failure to simple ideological miscalculation, to the wrong "application" of socialism, would simplify far too much the process that led the move of Marxism-Leninism away from Communism. No, rather than political application, Marxism-Leninism failed in achieving Communism in its very philosophical conception, the

dedication to the proletariat as an idolized force and its upholding of party, national or personalistic leadership being the main culprits. This “untouchable structures” fundamental not just to Marxism-Leninism but to any Statism run contrary to the potential of Communism in that they only serve to reaffirm past structures and dwell in conservatism rather than engage in any destruction of the present world-order, both the party as well as the nation being liberal inventions that can only operate as a liberal idea. The bourgeois nature of the liberal ideas that Marxist-Leninists keep has already been pointed out by Marx:

“Your very ideas are but the outgrowth of the conditions of your bourgeois production and bourgeois property, just as your jurisprudence is but the will of your class made into a law for all, a will whose essential character and direction are determined by the economical conditions of existence of your class.”⁸

To prioritize party politics and national mysticism over communism is the abolishment of any communist potential itself as the realization of it is thrown over for the sake of liberal politics. This criticism extends as well to the personalism present in many Marxist-Leninist States though in most cases it is a symptom of such intense and uncommunistic idol worship. From this position Anti-Humanism in its iconoclasm is the only key to protect Communism from such deviations, making the unity of both necessary for the actual process of achieving Communism.

Socialist Humanism, as well as the two previously mentioned strands of degenerated Communism, suffers from the problem of essentialism and icons, which is at the heart of the failure of any development of a socialist movement into a Communist one, whether it be upholding morality or the idealized proletariat, the justification of continuous action breaks the momentum of iconoclastic action in the sense that it fully relies on fixed ideas, and so must be pulled back when the individual turns its target towards those as well, as such ending revolutionary progression and creating emergent icons that contradict with Communism’s classlessness and statelessness. Humanism is something that is inherently liberal and idealistic, and a Socialist idea that is based in its ideas is one that will only reaffirm the Human Being, drowning the individual once again in a system of social alienation, morality would remain, and with moral systems still in place the fundamental blocks that create the walls of human imprisonment also remain, creating a movement that chains the individual to a fight for a rightful morality that justifies itself as a Social one.

Morality however does not have any material hold over the actual justification and progressive destruction of Communism, the fight for proletariat liberation does not take place under the justification of Moral law, as Moral law itself is only a phantasm relative to each unique interest, but under the self-propelling will of the proletariat. The proletariat, upon engaging in the destructive actions of Communism does so because it is in its interest, morality and ethical considerations only serve to weaken the march of proletariat liberation, and Communism itself dissolves any morality and ethics the moment that it moves forward to

⁸ Marx, Karl 1818-1883. *The Communist Manifesto*. London ; Chicago, III. : Pluto Press, 1996

overthrow all for the sake of the proletariat. And so, when Socialist movements base their existence on a justification of morality and of ennobling the proletariat because of its oppression it is only further assimilating its movement into the present christian status quo and christian slave morality. Communism does not propose the utilization of the revolutionary proletariat class for the ending of its own oppression and the overthrowing of the present system on the basis that the proletariat are oppressed, rather it is the affirmation of the strength of the proletariat to break the chains that bind it and bring its own power for the sake of its own interest against the present system.

Such a process should not be confused with the reaffirmation of the proletariat above the individual as Marx does through the Dictatorship of the proletariat, rather the proletariat is only a vehicle to be thrown off and threaded on eternally by the individual, the realization of Communism is the abolishment of the proletariat, and the maintaining of the proletariat for the sake of its own worship is an action that goes against the Egoist Anti-Humanism that actually establishes Communism.

Chapter III: Hate the Prole

It is upon the unity of Communism and Egoism that the liberation from states and classes lie, as such the form in which Communism must take in order to follow its promise of liberation is one of the rejection of the proletariat and by extension the very economy and the state. Though the communist movement might find itself flowing through the minds of the proletariat, to subjugate the individual to such an organization would be to maintain the proletariat and therefore maintain the conditions that create the proletariat, the industrial mode of production and liberal humanist relations. In this sense the Egoist facing off the system through the manner of insurrection is more directly destroying the liberal structure and putting a communist way of living in its place than any proletariat structure, as the proletariat structure only reinforces the proletariat itself and therefore not the abolition of it.

Syndicalism is a great example of this, today it is often criticized as a counter-revolutionary mode of organization that only reinforces liberal labor relations, however, this is incorrect, as syndicates themselves are the vehicle of worker power placed in an antagonist position to liberal democracy, making it a strictly proletariat structure that reinforces workers' positions against the capitalist order. Such a reason is exactly why Syndicalism fails to achieve any sort of actual liberation, and instead seems to just further integrate into the alienating and systematic meat grinder of industry. Syndicates are the organ of the proletariat and as such must function to preserve and extend the power of the proletariat, which are forever defined by their position as workers, which is an inherently oppressed position. The continuation of the proletariat as a class and therefore the continuation of the proletariat Struggle will only keep the proletariat struggling as alienated workers since that is their position in society, the defining quality of the proletariat. To hold on to that idealized description is to hold on to your own oppression.

Rather, liberatory movements must at their core realize the inherent conservatism in any opposition to Uniqueness, the same way that Syndicalism melts through liberal democracy by instating the labor aristocracy so too does Communism melt through the very idea of the proletariat via the establishment of classlessness and statelessness. Ego-Communism being the ultimate manifestation of this, as the final singularity in the progression of iconoclasm is the very Unique itself, which exists at the center of its own Creation, only by ending the dogmatism of objective universalities can the web of phantoms be destroyed in such a way that it allows for the full destruction of class and state, and the allowing of the Egoist blooming over the ashes. In this sense the establishment of Communism lies not within the proletariat but in the action of the Unique in the moment that it throws away its mark of proletarian and decides to take and do for Itself, any opposition to such destruction is an opposition to Communism and to the achievement of total liberation. At this point does the opposition to the moralist view of class struggle also show its face. The position into which many “socialists” seem to put themselves in which views the proletariat struggle as an inherently moral one, based on the moral need to oppose the supposedly immoral bourgeoisie is an inherently liberal one, as it views the justification of the movement stemming from a humanitarian ideology rather than the necessity for material action by the proletariat. To play in this game of morality, in which the bourgeoisie and its defenders hold up the liberal democratic world order and humanistic capitalism as the center of morality and the communist as an immoral thief, and the Moralistic Communist sees the bourgeoisie as immoral oppressors and the proletariat as the morally pure, “down to earth” and just oppressed is to ultimately subjugate the workers movement into its own web of idealism.

This “Ressentiment“ shown by the proletariat is its own pit of miserableness and the origin point of oppressive moralism, the hatred of the bourgeoisie only catalyzes the creation of an idea of purity within the proletariat, creating its own proletarian morality that then only reinvents the core systems of oppression and alienation present in every other moralist system. Furthermore, such a materialization of morality around the “being-a-proletariat” only serves to crystallize a proletarian icon, as being a worker is the moral position the opposition to working becomes an immoral position, the proletariat emerges as a fixed idea and suddenly the miserable position of worker becomes the position of saints. Such a reason is why there are among the common such a reflexive moral response to someone being a worker. For example, here in Brazil being a “working man” is pretty much a mark of dignity, everyone wants to be seen as a “working man” and it's seen as a compliment to call one a worker, “Look at Gustavo, he works so much, what a great man!”- What a sucker! Good job on spending your life slaving away instead of looking for any sort of liberation. In many “socialist” movements and states do we see the same glorification of the worker, a position that can only be oppressive is held up as the great moral one and the idea that the communist loves the workers keeps pushing on, something that Stirner himself had already pointed out:

“But the work that is considered as an “honor for the human being” and as his “calling” has become the creator of economics and remains the mistress of sacred socialism,

where, in its quality as “human labor,” it is supposed to “develop human capacities,” and where this development is a human calling, an absolute interest.”⁹

No, the true communist despises the proletariat and work itself, because it is in those that lies its oppression, the true communist wants to do away and eliminate those things, leaving only itself. There must be no proletarian morality, work is torture and the love of such torture is nothing else but the deepest christian delusion.

The understanding of the class struggle as a moral one is a perversion of the communist movement itself, not only in the matter in which it preserves the proletariat by establishing its own directives instead of destroying such systems absolutely, but because it creates a idealist “cloud” of morality that morphs the actual meaning of the class struggle. The moment that the class struggle finds itself justified by morality it ceases to be a material struggle, rather instead it becomes an idealist one, as the narrative of morality is one that only leaves room for morality, good and evil, phantasmagorical concepts, become the sole reason for any movement in said narrative. As such, class action rather than basing itself in its own material condition and its direct and logical betterment is molded into simply another tool into the self-discourse of humanism, the very movements of communism chained and assimilated into the wider discussion of what is a “true humanist society”, instead of workers and bosses the conflict becomes only humanists and more radical humanists.

End: The Egoist Communist Singularity

The destructive potential of Egoist Communism, as mentioned before, does not lie in a syncretism of those ideologies, rather it is the understanding of the core point present in both that is the origin point of both of their destructive potential, that key to destruction is the Anti-Humanism and Amoralism present in both. Beneath the criticism present in both ideologies their ability to resonate among each other and among the individual itself is the way in which both of them reach out to the Egoist destructive center. Along the lines of Egoism and Communism we find a common thread, a point in both of their criticisms in which their revolutionary potential displays the same thing, a connection point like two roads that connect to the same third road. That connected line in which Communism and Egoism becomes one is where the destructive Anti-Humanism and Amoralism emerges, and where the Individual finds its key to liberation. That iconoclastic point is the great destroyer, the weapon that will turn all of present society into ash.

Only by realizing this connection, taking from both these theories the point in which they intersect and holding that up as the one and only weapon of liberation can the phantoms that haunt humanity since the beginning be excised, at any other ideological position these inherently alienating and oppressive forces reverberate and encompass the whole of human existence. If one is to go to the core of the opposition of those, to form something truly

⁹ Stirner, Max 1845. *Stirner's Critics*. Berkeley, CA: LBC Books, Oakland, CA: Columbia Alternative Library, Press, 2012

liberatory and iconoclastic that destroys the phantom chains in society then one will only arrive again at the Anti-Humanist, Amoralist conclusion of Egoist Communism. If society, religion, economy, morality, culture all form a single or overarching sacred being, it is then that the satanic rebel against those things can only fall out into one place, the one place that neither of those reach: The position of Egoist Communism. The true and authentic liberation is one, not in the sense of a dogmatic path of understanding, but in the sense that it is One, it is the understanding of the Unique, the manifestation of their Will, the ultimate weapon that pierces through the sacred veil can only be wielded by the Unique, not any phantom or other fixed idea, Communism requires not only Class Consciousness, but the Conscious Egoist.

At what other point are the state and class systems thrown off? At what other point is the present reality truly abolished? It is not only through the movements of phantoms that change comes about, as to keep change in a political and social landscape is to fail to change what truly affects the individual, a simple change in jail, not a freeing from it. It is thus that as a precondition to such a classless and stateless system, to the abolishment of humanism and liberalism, to morality itself and all of its chains it is necessary the initiation of active insurrection by the Egoist. It is through the understanding of one's own power and the powerlessness of every phantom around it that the belief in the possibility of another motion of things comes about. Every individual who first thought to take up arms and raise the barricades first had this moment of realization of their own iconoclastic power and Egoism, even if many forgot them later.

The spark of every destruction, that first fission bomb that triggers the chain reaction that will bring into life the beautiful destructive glow of a thermonuclear explosion that annihilates all, that is the Egoist fire, the blaze of Individual Will.

Bibliography

Stirner, Max 1844. *The Unique and It's Property*. Baltimore: Underworld Amusements, 2017

Deleuze, Gilles 1962. *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. London: The Athlone Press, 1983

Stirner, Max 1845. *Stirner's Critics*. Berkeley, CA: LBC Books, Oakland, CA: Columbia Alternative Library, Press, 2012

D.Z Rowan 2017. *A Brief Description of Egoist Communism*

Marx, Karl 1818-1883. *The Communist Manifesto*. London ; Chicago, III. : Pluto Press, 1996