

This file archived at UnionOfEgoists.com.

# Union of Egoists

This item was scanned by UoE from Libertarian Microfiche Publishing Peace Plans films. John Zube's LMP project preserved thousands of documents that would otherwise be lost.

More information can be found at our website under "contributors."

-Kevin I. Slaughter

## **What is a UnionOfEgoists.com?**

This is an informational resource provided by Kevin I. Slaughter of Underworld Amusements and Trevor Blake of OVO, initiated in February and publicly launched April 1st of 2016. The website initially focuses on providing historical, biographical and bibliographical details of a few their favorite Egoist philosophers. It is also integrating the archives of egoist website i-studies.com, the former project of Svein Olav Nyberg, and the EgoistArchives.com project of Dan Davies. Further, it will be home to Der Geist, a Journal of Egoism in print 1845 – 1945. UnionOfEgoists.com will be the best resource for Egoism online.

## **What is a Union of Egoists?**

"We two, the State and I, are enemies. I, the egoist, have not at heart the welfare of this "human society," I sacrifice nothing to it, I only utilize it; but to be able to utilize it completely I transform it rather into my property and my creature; i. e., I annihilate it, and form in its place the Union of Egoists."

- Max Stirner, *The Ego and Its Own*

## **What is Egoism?**

"Egoism is the claim that the Individual is the measure of all things. In ethics, in epistemology, in aesthetics, in society, the Individual is the best and only arbitrator. Egoism claims social convention, laws, other people, religion, language, time and all other forces outside of the Individual are an impediment to the liberty and existence of the Individual. Such impediments may be tolerated but they have no special standing to the Individual, who may elect to ignore or subvert or destroy them as He can. In egoism the State has no monopoly to take tax or to wage war."

-Trevor Blake, *Confessions of a Failed Egoist*

```

XXXXXXXXXXXXX X XXXXXXXX X X XXXXXXXX
X X X X X X X X X
X X X X X X X X XXXXXXXX
X X X X X X X X X
X X X X X X X X X
X X X X X X XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX

```

```

minus          XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX
               X X X X X
               X X X X XXXXXX
one            X X X X X
               XXXXXXXX X X XXXXXXXX

```

e. bertran  
benjamin best  
alastair machenry  
enzo martucci

pat parker  
s.e. parker  
john pruit  
and others..

Minus One 1  
May 67

Discussion Centre

## ANOTHER SPEAKOUT

Pat Parker

Some anarchists are dishonest schizophrenics with a genuine hatred of the individual. For example, "Freedom" for March 25 printed an article which, if it had been written by S.E.P., J. P.S. or P. McG., would have been rejected outright as against the party line and unanarchistic. But this was offered by a currently successful playwright, David Halliwell, so the party line was conveniently forgotten. Fame, money and position speak louder than words for these lovers of the creative individual in every man - especially if he's rich and famous!

x x x

Wanted: members for The Society For The Protection Of The Individual Against The Ghouls Who Sell Coffee And Tea To The Public On The Basis Of Gulp-It-Down-Quick-And-Get-Out-Within-Ten-Minutes-Or-Else. A society for the playing of draughts, chess, for reading, writing and making love in coffee bars.

Interested people must be prepared to pay all the costs involved. J.Z.

## ANOTHER APPEAL

I have not had to appeal for money for the continuing publication of MINUS ONE since the September-October issue of 1965. The generous response I got then enabled me to keep on going until now without any further appeals. But the financial "crunch" has come again and I have only enough money in the bank to publish this issue. Although postal subscription, particularly in the U.S.A., have steadily increased and outdoor sales - thanks to Frances Evans and Sharley McClean - have shot up, expenditure has again overtaken income. I do not like publishing while in debt and have never done so unless the debt was covered by future income. If I try to keep MINUS ONE going on the present basis, however, this is what, sooner or later, I will be doing. For the present, then, I intend to abandon the present two-monthly publishing schedule and only publish when there is enough money on hand to cover expenditure. That is why this issue is simply dated "May". If you would like to see this review keep up the "struggle for the individual" then send what you can when you can.

S.E.Parker

The problem of creative individuality versus mob is today not a mere Russian problem. It is as poignant in Ford's factory as it is under Bolshevik dictatorship. Gregory Zilboorg  
*Could central subjects give notice to the Soviet regime ??? J.Z. 12-8-67.*

0237

## MANIFESTO DEI FUORIGREGGE

( Manifesto of the Outsiders )

In present civilization, which transforms the individual into a small cog in the social machine; in a collectivized and herd-like world, which marries its new lies to the old lies of the Church and drives each of us in the name of God and Society, of a heavenly and an earthly paradise, to become a slave, to suppress the particular and the distinct given to him by nature, and to identify himself in everything with everyone else; in a degenerated humanity which neither feels nor thinks, but only acts solidly and automatically as its leaders suggest, and has no egoistic aim outside of a mini-car, a fridge, a beefsteak and a council flat - in such circumstances personality disappears, originality dies, and there remains nothing but a robot which, after it has been fuelled and oiled, looks for nothing else.

And this is precisely what is wanted by the priests and demagogues, the wolves who rule today in place of the eagles and lions who have unfortunately gone. What is wanted is a man who is not that man, but the man - a puppet who can be cheated and manipulated as one wants, using the vile but efficacious tactics which the Grand Inquisitor of Dostoyevsky's "Brothers Karamazov" explains to Christ in the prison of Seville.

The plan has succeeded. Men are eunuchs. The appeasers have given up the struggle for exclusive spiritual and material domination and have agreed to share the power. Gromyko and Nenni have already kissed the hand of the pope. The Vatican has thwarted its own bad actors like La Pira, Father Balducci and similar types, and is reconciled with Communism. The Catholic Smiths and the Marxist Jones have shaken hands. And the new Loyola of the "spiritual exercises" has already brought up to date the great maxim that both bourgeois and proletarian will accept: "It is necessary to believe that the white I see is black if the Church hierarchy so decides."

The vast, submissive mass, in the illusion of obtaining an easy and protected life, let themselves be guided by the cunning, who will soon lead them to the slaughter-house of an atomic war against the fanatical Chinese Colossus which will secure for the Russians, the Americans and the pope the lordship of the earth. But there are still some men who do not want to be led on a leash, who are not content with the prefabricated ideas supplied by the shepherds, and who want to remain arbiters of their own lives. It is to them, the consciously or instinctively discontented, that we turn. To them we say:

1) Don't be made into fools. Don't trust the lies told you by the heads of governments, churches, unions and parties, who

hypocritically declare that they act in the collective interest when it is their own personal, group and class ends that they serve.

2) Don't vote. Don't elect masters who will flatter you to get your vote, but when in power will trample you down like snakes and exploit you like donkeys. Don't let yourselves be organized, but let each one act alone or in a free association with a few comrades, thus beginning the dissolution of a social order based on the obedience and docility of its subjects, and by your example awaken those who are now sheep but still have in them the urge to live and can add their strength to your rebellion.

3) Liberate yourselves from the fatal influence of every social, moral, religious and juridical spook. Remember that the individual is the only reality that moves and stays afloat on the infinite sea of universal nothingness. Above the individual there is nothing and no-one. Therefore you no longer have to stay paralyzed within the narrow limits of the "permitted" and the "prohibited", but can dare what you please, use your freedom to the extent of your power and act as you will - on condition that you know how to use your energies and are willing to face the risks involved. Is it not better to live for one day as a free man than a hundred years as a slave?

3) Destroy the State. This is the worst enemy of the ego. "The State - said Stirner - is always a status, an order destined to paralyze my movements, my liberty, a power supreme to me, ever imminent and threatening." And Nietzsche added: "State I call it where all drink poison, the good and the wicked; state where all lose themselves, the good and the wicked; state where the slow suicide of all is called 'life'." Bring the State to nothing, therefore, and also the herd-spirit, the customs, the prejudices and all those other social influences outside of the State that tyrannize over the individual. Realize that individualist anarchy is the only way of living natural to man when he is not forced away by suggestion, deceit or violence. Use every means - the inflexible decision of a Corrado Breda, the heroic temerity of a Jules Bonnot, the logical proofs of a Max Stirner, to reach the noble end of total liberation. We will be at your side.

This is the call we make to the discontented of the world, the refractories of every country, the "irreducible" everywhere. This is the invitation we make in the hope that our forces, freely united, will be successful in sweeping away this miserable civilization of motorized barbarians and at last return to nature which has created man in order that he remains such, or surpasses himself, but crushes him inexorably if he degenerates and transforms himself into a robot.

(<sup>x</sup>Insert here: "Don't respect their laws which always oppress you. Behave as you feel and believe, and defend yourselves against those who would punish you.")

*Not all of their millions of laws oppress me. Many are not applicable to me or are not applied to me. But those which are are bad enough.*  
J.E. 12.8.97.

## For the Italian Individualist Anarchist Movement

Enzo Martucci  
 Celestino Pomodoro  
 Andre Chanel  
 The 'Edelweiss' Group

Further particulars and clarification can be had from Enzo Martucci, Via Carducci 98, Pescara, Italy. (Translation by S.E.P.)

-----

## A COMMENT...

S.E.Parker

I very much appreciate the spirit of the "Manifesto del Fuorigregge" and agree with much of what it says about the world in which we live, but I cannot/with two points our Italian friends make.  
 agree

1) They optimistically call upon us to "destroy the State" and sweep away "this miserable civilization". It is tempting to believe that these exhortations are more than wishful thinking, but I, for one, cannot.

There is no convincing proof that anarchist ideas and aspirations can appeal to more than a minority of individuals. The authors of the manifesto themselves refer to the "vast, submissive mass" without explaining how it can cease to be such, and they single out the "discontented of the world" as the object of their appeal. Even doctrines that pander to the herd-mentality - e.g. the purist socialist sects - remain the faith of a handful of zealots. Why should one assume that the far more intellectually exacting individualist approach should be any more successful in winning over even a 'mass-minority'?

The outstanding characteristic of 'most people' throughout the ages has been their desire to have their thinking and acting done for them and they have always been willing to let some ruling group take on this chore as long as it did not grind their faces too much into the shit. They may have revolted against 'bad' masters, but only to put 'good' masters in their place. They have never revolted against masters as such. Nor is there any cogent reason to expect them to do so.

Because of this authority will exist in any conceivable kind of society whether it is called 'the State' or something else. Inevitably, the demands of this authority and the demands of the individualist will clash and there will always be a permanent conflict of interests between them. It is here that the relevance of individualist anarchism exists as a 'prophetic analysis' of the nature of such a conflict. In Jean Malaquais' excellent parable on collectivism, "The Joker", a character remarks that it is a matter of *if this could be done via competing principles - which would greatly speed up progress!*

"not denying the City, but of denying oneself to the City". This seems to me to be a far more realistic perspective than to indulge in apocalyptic visions. It is certainly the one sure defence against the forces of conformism and servility that threaten creative individuality. *Let everybody be either as free or as conformist & servile, IN HIS OWN CIRCLES, as he wants to be! Prof. J.E. 12.8.47.*

2) To refer to "Nature" as having "created" men in order to live as individualist anarchists make no sense at all to me. One might just as well say that "God", "History" or "Reason" have destined men to live like this. If the individual is the only authentic reality we can know then individualist anarchism is the expression of an individual preference, an egoistic life style, and is not determined by any purposive extra-personal agency.

HA!

Past, present, future  
Each together  
Now in him.  
All as different  
As water in a puddle

Each instant is new,  
The last will never  
Come again.  
Life moves on,  
Changing each change

No wrong; no right  
No hopelessness  
No hope.  
Water runs downhill  
When it rains

Thinking not  
His life bursts forth  
Upon the world  
Screaming No!  
While his spirit roars in laughter.

John Pruitt

Monopoly

Exploitation

There is no war between exploiters and exploited. The whole people cordially consent to and approve of inequality, privilege, peerage, and monopoly, because they all have (or think they have) a chance in the lottery. The exploiting system could no more stand today without an overwhelming consensus of opinion in its favour- especially among the working classes - than Monte Carlo could stand if people were not willing to lose money there. G.B.S.

## NOTES AND REFLECTIONS..

Alistair MacHenry

## Masochism at Hyde Park

It has long been the proud boast of the London Left that no racist speaker dare open his mouth at Speaker's Corner for fear of being thrown out. The boast is an idle one, because for years now a man named Goss and his confederates have held regular meetings propagating a racist line. Why doesn't the London Left throw Goss and Co. out? The reason is that his racism is directed at the white race, and is therefore quite O.K. by the London Left. Where, anyway, are the stalwarts of the "Left" when Goss is ranting? It is quite true that they keep an eye on Speaker's Corner and certainly no white racist has spoken there for years and got away with it. Could it be that the "left anti-racists" at the Park are to be found in Goss's largely white audience which drools with delight at his every invective against the white race?

## What About This?

I thought there was more in it than meets the eye when the governments of the East and the West signed the Test Ban Treaty and agreed to ban nuclear weapons from outer space. It now seems that nuclear bombs are out of date anyway, so it was safe to "ban" their future development and spread. The latest monstrosity that the scientists and politicians have cooked up is something called the "X-Ray Laser" which, with the flick of a switch, can melt armoured divisions, raze cities, and leave no lingering fall-out or other inconveniences. Connoisseurs of Bond films will remember the scene in "Goldfinger" when the hero was strapped down with a searing laser ray inching towards his genitals. That ray was a tiny laboratory edition of the non-X-ray variety. The X-ray type can push its way through any defensive material and can be produced to a size that can devastate great areas. This spells good-bye to the mass revolution, if not to the human race. There's not much point in rebels seizing a town when scientists in a satellite fifty miles above can vaporize it by throwing a switch. Or could it be that our British rebel sects are themselves stockpiling these weapons, ready for the future day when every government office, town hall and police station is simultaneously annihilated? However, these heat rays do cost a few million quid each, so maybe finance is holding them up.

To Be Taken In Small Doses!

"eraze? raze?"

I have recently been recommended the works of Krishnamurti as an aid in self-liberation. They are excellent - self-knowledge, the cant of idealism, etc - are all clearly discussed. But he argues that individuals should always be serene. How many want to be like this all the time? There could be no place for music, poetry or sex in the life of such a person. Count me out. "To thine own self be true" and this applies as much to getting drunk as to serenity.



## IN DEFENCE OF STIRNER

Enzo Martucci

(Translation by Stephen Marletta)

Professor Ernesto Serafini, who has polemized with me before, now wants to start again and has written, amongst other things:

"You who boast of not being of the school of Malatesta, but rather of that of Stirner, and who present the latter as a philosopher whose thought has a logic free from the contradictions one finds in the great Nietzsche, do not understand, nor wish to understand, the contradictions that also exist in Stirner. But Ettore Zoccoli answers you well in his book 'Anarchy'. Indeed, he writes on page 410: '....Although supposed to be politically and socially disintegrated, other individuals still remain. Well, says Stirner, it is up to the individual to make sure that those who surround him should be only a means to his ends. Briefly, it is an egoistic antinomy raised by a metaphysician, that makes of each individual, at the same time, by a transcendental hypothesis, the supreme end and the most ignored means. In fact, while offering to the individual every possibility against his fellows, it denies them any possibility of being anything but mere means. Then it offers to each of them in relation to the first individual every chance to reduce him to simply being a means. So that, at the same time, in which an individual acts with the aim of considering others as means, he is faced with the actions - not associated and therefore not multiplied, it is true, but numerically additional - of all those others who invert the role regarding him. The absolute autonomy of the individual is obliterated by the absolute autonomy of all others. This imperative of absolute egoism is either impossible if the atomistic aggregation of individuals represents even a system of force in equilibrium, or, if applied, would result in the reduction to nothing of any social aggregate no matter how elementary. It is an ethical imperative that even a cannibal would be ashamed to accept.'"

2/ To Serafini and Zoccoli it seems a contradiction to consider the individual as the only reality there is, having no other end than himself, and, at the same time, to accept that this same reality can be considered by others as a means to their ends. But, in substance, there is no contradiction. There would be if we referred to the same individual, if I should regard myself as the only existing reality who, as the supreme end, cannot be a means, and, at the same time, accept the demand of other individuals to serve them as means to their ends. Then I must choose if I am the ultimate end or the least of means. But since I regard myself as the end and the others as means, the two opposing values are not attributed to the same subject but to different ones, and so there is no contradiction. Can I not regard myself in one way and others to the contrary?

No, says Serafini, because others are individuals like you. But

even if they are individuals like me, I cannot consider them as I do myself. *Nonviolence! Trade! Respect for their equal rights & offer ends & means, that peace rather than eternal fighting. J.Z. 12.8.97.*

? I know myself to be the only reality because I can sense myself. If I did not exist I could not sense. Therefore, I am. And I recognise not only my reality, but also an external "reality" - the material world, the spirit of other men, etc. But is this other "reality" imagined by me, or does it exist in itself?

According to philosophic idealism matter does not exist, but is no more than a representation of the human spirit. The universe is created in the mind which projects it outside thereby giving it objectivity, but retaining the power to differentiate and control it.

"There is no argument", writes Leibnitz, "with which one can demonstrate in any absolute manner that bodies exist and nothing prevents our minds presenting them as well-ordered dreams, which we judge as real and for harmony we accept as equivalent to the truth." *So, put yourself into the path of a speeding truck! J.Z.*

But if the material world is a representation of the spirit in which it alone exists, the spirit of other men can equally, as can their bodies, be a representation of my spirit in which they alone exist, together with the material world. Where is the proof that they continue to exist if I do not think or feel about them? And where is the proof that the universe continues to exist when I neither think of it, nor sense it, given that the only means of knowledge are thought and senses?

In this way one arrives at solipsism and, in accepting it, I become certain only of my own reality, my own being, and I make myself my end and use as my means the world and other individuals, these being my creation which I can make use of as I will. *See how far you get if you try to use everybody else's wallets as your own! J.Z. 12.8.97.*

If, instead, as philosophic realism claims, the material world and human beings have an objective existence, not as I will, but in themselves, then these individuals look like me but are not the same as me. Each of us is a microcosm with his own way of feeling and thinking which gives him particular needs and aspirations which cannot always be satisfied without conflicting with others. In this case, because I live for myself and not for others, to respect and serve them in the way that I respect and serve myself is not obligatory for me.. Since they are different, therefore, I can very well use them as means to my own ends, even if I feel myself being used as means to an end. *Mutual abuse  $\neq$  free exchange! J.Z.*

? Ergo: from the standpoint of all philosophical conceptions of reality, the contradictions which Zoccoli points out in Stirner's thought do not exist.

Nor does one find the "egoistic antinomy raised by a metaphysician, that, while offering to the individual every

possibility against his fellows, denies them any possibility of being anything but mere means."

Stirner says that, for the individual to realize his proper egoism, he can do all that he wants as long as he has the power. But he does not deny to other individuals the possibility of not being used as means. To these he says that they too can defend themselves and not let themselves be reduced to slavery by an aggressor who intends to make them his tools. He urges the attacked to counter-attack anyone who would make them into means. In time, as individuals developed their power to the maximum, they would control each other reciprocally - only the weak, the cowardly, the lazy - in other words, the ballast - would disappear. Then there would remain a select humanity which would form itself into an oscillating equilibrium, which would allow each individual, at least once, to realize himself integrally, to live as he felt and willed. In a social and civic world, however, based on a general mutilation, as Brunetiere called it; in a perfect world, of which the utopians dream, in which each man disciplines himself to the maximum and always restrains and suffocates his own instincts and needs so as not to tread on his neighbor's toes - in such a world there cannot be an equilibrium, which implies a differentiation and opposition of elements and forces, but a stupid, softening harmony which would take everyone through life without ever having lived and would send them to the grave having seen nothing.

*Rather, use everybody else as their means, as good Stirnerians!*

In the meanwhile, in the present world, imperfect but social and civic, a minority of tyrants and cheats impose themselves, making use of every kind of astuteness, violence, riches and power, and reducing everyone else to obedience and misery, trying to convince the oppressed with the nonsense of religion, metaphysics, ethics and legalism, to resign themselves and not to use any means of liberation. And fiercely condemning the few who rebel. So there is formed a stable disequilibrium with the result that a few are always on top, happy and ruling, and the rest are always at the bottom, suffering and serving.

If that which Zoccoli calls "the imperative of absolute egoism" were applied, it would probably reduce all organized society to nothing, and would be willingly accepted by men restored to natural spontaneity and sincerity - men who find insufferable that social and civic hypocrisy which pretends to organize and govern individuals for their own good, but machine-guns them, or throws them into prison, when they try to escape from the exploitation and oppression imposed by their great-hearted directors and masters.

*x) of wife & child abusers  
& other violent criminals!*

(To be continued)

*Stirner*

*J.E.*

XXXXXXXXXX

*Mutual parasitism, domination, enslavement, exploitation, cannibalism - implied as an ideal of anarchistic & individualistic "living"! J.E.*

## NOTES ON INDIVIDUALISM

E. Bertran

For me, being interested in oneself is the most important and legitimate question in life, the greatest problem a human individual may study and defend, the first point and principle he ought never to lose sight of, no matter what may, or ought, to be the interest of the community he is living in. I believe that the interest of the individual prevails over those of the community. The individual first, the community afterwards - the community simply being the whole of the individuals forming it.

A philosopher knows that Right, Good, Evil, the beautiful, the ugly, etc. do not exist in any fixed and definable way. They are relative conditions whose meaning remains doubtful and undecided. There is no question of "right", no question of "morality", in a real and absolute manner. An individual has no more rights than obligations, duties, privileges, licences, immunities. He simply has to move in one way or another, in the most favourable direction he chooses and is able to, even in a noxious or hurtful way if he happens to select such a course. He may be a fool or a smart fellow, gain or lose after he has decided what is true and what is his own interest. The conscious individualist knows his true interest, or ought to. He is not obliged to anything, but he may even give his life if he so decides. He is the most responsible human being in existence.

From our premises it may already appear that an anarchist individualist supplied with such a view can reach full freedom in thinking, elaborating, judging and concluding an argument. I don't mean to say that he is bound to be right all the time, but that his method in reasoning may be accepted as the freest, the safest and the best reasoning an intelligent man of our epoch and time may employ to establish a piece of the truths we are propounding here.

Let us consider the fact that such a reasoning human being is practically and integrally free from spiritual or religious notions, that he does not follow any idealist sect, party or political organisation; that he has no-one above him who compels him to believe something they claim to be The Truth; that this unbeliever even admits that he does not know anything for sure and has become a complete sceptic, placing himself outside the believing world. This man, then, who knows that Truth does not exist, has accepted individualism. *Truth, singular, does not exist - but truths, plural, exists billionfold - as agreements of elements with their billions of*

Anarchism means freedom (absolute, integral), refusing authority. An anarchist aspires after self-government. The word has nothing to do with disorder or confusion, meaning the absence of rulers. As a kind of political party the present, so-called anarchist movement actually tries to struggle against the political forces constituting the national state. Not believing in politics, it has no future and different subject matters. J.E. 12. 8. 97.

is reduced or driven to preach a revolution that is evidently bound to fail. Nowadays it represents a mere waste of time and does not bother the State in the least. The people in charge treat it with contempt, and they are right - it is not "dangerous".

The anarchist movement I have in mind is naturally based on individualism. My anarchism is not a spiritualist system. It contemplates a gradual and total intellectual emancipation in all fields.

The aim - if an aim were wanted - is to help the individual to attain real and practical emancipation. My purpose here is not to offer a plan for a new and imaginative human society absurdly conceived for people who don't, nor ever will, exist. Anarchy and anarchism are eternal, have no end in view, no final revolution in perspective, only research. Action may result incidentally, but no perfect revolution is contemplated. Of course, if or when a revolution appears individualists may or may not decide to take part, and an individualistic inspiration may contribute to certain decisions, but as a political movement individualism does not exist. There is no question of mass-individualism. Logically one must understand that an anarchist could not possibly belong to any party nor to any authoritarian political formation. *Why not?* *2x*

*2* Anarchism has POTENTIAL appeal to the majority - because it consists of numerous minorities. J.B. 12-8-97

From my point of view an individualist anarchist may consent to associate with some group, circle or so-called intellectual assembly, but never to serve and obey them passively. It has even happened that some such individualist anarchist groups appeared to follow a certain rigorous ideological tendency that appeared authoritarian, even sectarian, but in such a case it may be considered as a mere system of action rendered tactically necessary in a temporary or simple struggle against a possible reaction. Very often such a disciplined attitude has been caused by a need to observe a relative purity with the view of obviating a threatened deviation from a plan of action arising from the group.

I consider that anarchism occupies a unique stand in the philosophical field and that an impartial examination of its basic principles would suffice to establish its position in the whole of social agitation. To me you can't very well claim to be an anarchist a votre facon, that is to say after your own way. For me you are an anarchist or not. You could not, for instance, claim to be a patriotic anarchist, a christian anarchist, or a fascist anarchist....this would be nonsensical. *2* *Panarchism would provide these options. J.B.*

Individualism started at the very beginning of human thought, even before Epicurus or Democritus. It arrived at Herbert Spencer, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche and Stirner, and in our own time Palante, Sartre, and many others I could quote if needed. Certainly the Greeks already had properly established the truths needed to work out a standing philosophy, which has been completed now and is ready to be proposed to, examined and accepted - or at least considered - by everybody.

## WELCOME REALITY - R.S.V.P.

Long ago in the beginning of my vegetable-soul which was yesterday

Began sweet sensuous-emotional growth

Tenderly reaching at reality with happy-bright excitement

Growing, wondering, trying, seeking, savouring, cheering

At the height of my buoyant joy....

REALITY flew in like a windless-knocking truck

In my sickly dizziness the long green fingernail pierced my belly-button tearing open my inner warmth

Searing laser-beam analysis dissected my own little-understood emotions and yearnings and threw them to the illuminated sky with a wicked laugh against my insenely-crying frustration-wanting to cloak myself within me

The words became a billion mosquitoes around my head filling my little world with a throbbing cosmos of rapidly-assaulting light-points

I was brutally hurled upon the ski-jump-bed-of-nails down which I sped with flesh and bones flinging omnidirectionally

The speed-nails ripped the body from me and then, oh god-pain-hell then, my tender soul was slashed to shreds and bleazed with grease-fire

Flying off the end it took all the agony of God's holy inferno and was gone

With no soul I flashed-out at reality like four billion shock-troop angels upon a gang of sickly devils

In Galactic-expansive omnipotence I conquered the world with the swift smash of my dirty metal-heeled boot

I matched the firey coldness of eternity and stood in complete power and contempt before the reality which was mine

There is no God! I am God! I triumph forever! I am Dwn, the cosmos is Mine!

I have stood a long while. Reality has made no contact. The night is long and cold.

Within me I detect the tinge of a new soul. My gut has become a dark soil and the soul becomes a suffusive-lush entity giving me warmth and sensitivity

Can I not Own and Feel both?

At this farthest reach of my progress I approach the point of the circle from which I was born.

Benjamin Best

-----

Letters.....

I should like to make clear that I do not regard all anarchist communists, anarcho-syndicalists, etc. as "so-called" anarchists as seems to be implied by the reviewer of my recent pamphlet (MINUS ONE 17). Many anarchist communists, etc., are anarchists in their private beliefs and private lives. My quarrel with them is that what they publicly propagate as anarchism (in such papers as "Freedom") is not only irrelevant, but positively harmful in that it builds up a public image of anarchism as being wholly concerned with the striving for new forms of society. It is also harmful in that many of these proposed new forms of society would only result in new forms of archism and also because the preaching of utopianism now, in this dreadful century, causes people to turn away from consideration of anarchism altogether.

I agree with the reviewer that I slipped in describing such things as Provoism as anarchism, when they are really only forms of libertarian propaganda or other activity which anarchists may or may not choose to take part in. I disagree with the reviewer, however, that Catholic anarchism is a monstrosity. At first sight the idea seems not only monstrous, but absurd. But when one remembers that there are in fact two Catholic churches, one teaches that Catholics must follow church teachings in all things, the other teaches that one should follow one's own beliefs even if it means leaving the church, when one considers this, then Catholic anarchism makes sense. A "Catholic anarchist" is merely an anarchist who just happens to agree with the Catholic faith and whose temperament just happens to be in accord with Catholic teachings on morals. As soon as such an anarchist finds he no longer believes in the Virgin birth or starts to fornicate he leaves the church and becomes an anarchist pure and simple. The Catholic anarchist position is weird and can only apply to a tiny number of people, but it is not illogical.

Jeff Robinson.

I have now read several issues of MINUS ONE and as far as I can gather your general philosophy vis-a-vis social change seems to be that no human society could possibly be perfectly satisfying to individuals, therefore it is futile to work for any sort of social change.

I will willingly grant you the premise, but surely the conclusion is false. The fact that perfection is impossible does not mean that improvements of any sort are impossible. Why, therefore, should one not work to achieve, say, a world of decentralised communes? Even if "Public Opinion" were to limit freedom in such a world - even to the extent of burning books as in "Fahrenheit 451" - I would guess it would still be happier than the rat-race, mass-production, war-and-starvation world of today.

But individuals would, of course, still have to struggle to fulfil themselves.

Geoffrey Boardman

MINUS ONE - an individualist anarchist review, is edited and published by S.E.Parker, 2, Orsett Terrace, London W.2. England. Subscription rate for six issues is 6/- (One Dollar) inc. post.

#### MEETINGS

are held the second Sunday of each month at 7.30 p.m. at the "Marquis of Granby" (Side entrance, first floor) Cambridge Circus, London, W.C.1 (Nearest underground station: Leicester Square)

#### LITERATURE

"Anarchism and Individualism" by E. Armand. 1/3  
 "Pat Parker" - some poems by Pat Parker. 1/3  
 "Individualist Anarchism" by S.E.Parker. 4d.  
 "Anarchism and Modern Society" by Jeff Robinson. 1/3  
 "O Idios" - three essays on individualist anarchism by Jean-Pierre Schweitzer. 1/3  
 "The Ego and His Own" by Max Stirner. 15/11

Obtainable from S.E.Parker at the address given above. All prices include postage

One man is king only because other men stand in the relation of subjects to him. They, on the contrary, imagine that they are subjects because he is king.

Karl Marx.

0250