

This file archived at UnionOfEgoists.com.

Union of Egoists

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

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

-Kevin I. Slaughter

What is a UnionOfEgoists.com?

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

What is a Union of Egoists?

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

– Max Stirner, The Ego and Its Own

What is Egoism?

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

-Trevor Blake, Confessions of a Failed Egoist

M	M	I	N	N	U	U	S	S	S	S	0	0	0	0	N	N	E	E	E	E	E
M	M	M	I	N	N	N	U	U	S		0	0	R	N	N	E					
M	M	M	I	N	N	N	U	U	S	S	0	0	N	N	N	E	E	E	E	E	
M	M	I	N	N	N	U	U		S		0	0	N	N	N	E	E	E	E	E	
M	M	I	N	N	N	U	U		S		0	0	N	N	N	E	E	E	E	E	
M	M	I	N	N	N	U	U	U	S	S	0	0	0	0	N	N	E	E	E	E	

MINUS ONE

No. 41, 1976

Twelvepence

INDIVIDUALISM

Pierre Chardon

There are words rubbed as smooth as old coins, vague words, whose meaning, formerly precise, has become blurred by long usage. These words are receptacles into which are dumped both pearls and rubbish, so much so that people do not know their proper meaning. The word "individualism" is one of these. Certain people have spoiled it and changed it to suit themselves. But does not the same sort of thing happen to many other words with which people quarrel less: socialism, freethought, etc.?

In spite of this, whole-hearted individualists are not discouraged or disgusted, nor do they easily weaken.

The individual is ruled by attraction and repulsion. In turn he retires within himself and goes out from himself, all mental concentration being normally followed by expansion. And this is life. "Our individualism" rests on the need for individualisation and differentiation that men carry within themselves. It cannot consist of resignation, since the social set-up paralyses all attempts at self-realisation. The ego and that which ancient philosophers called the City, and which is today called the State, are locked in an eternal struggle. Only he who despairingly resigns himself, feels disgust and discouragement, atrophies individualism, bows before Moloch, and asserts himself no more. Every affirmation of revolt is an affirmation of individualism - any individual who asserts himself differentiates himself. Social life, essential for satisfying men's material needs, has created in the ethical sphere some concepts and traditions from which the individual must free himself if he wants to be himself.

Every society, no matter what kind, is gregarious, fanatical, sectarian. The man in the crowd is a nasty individual. To dive into the mass is to plunge into the mire and to come out soiled. Individualists, we have no faith in the mass. We do not despise it, but we do know it. That is enough for us. Whenever a man becomes aware of himself he must fight against his surroundings. The deepest instinct of the people is that of hypocrisy, cowardice, servility and brutality.

The instinct for liberty is an individual instinct. In order to become libertarian, men must shatter the confines of society. The struggle between liberty and authority is not a struggle between an allegedly popular libertarian current and the will of the masters - it is the struggle between the individual and the City, the one against all. No doubt the rebel will not always remain isolated and will form a libertarian elite, but the study of the past and the present shows us that the mass is incapable of achieving true liberty and is hostile towards those who strive towards it.

Anyway history bears this out. It teaches us that the people in revolt either returned passively to their chains, or simply abandoned themselves to the rule of the bourgeois, the role of whom, as guardian

and mediator, was certainly considerable in the movements of the past. They proved incapable of going further along the road of liberation than their new guides saw fit.

It may seem that by stating these historical facts, in recognizing the servility and cowardice of three quarters of the working class, one is defending authority. I have dealt elsewhere with that suggestion. Authority cannot point to the torpor of the masses to justify its exploitation because it adroitly maintains that torpor. The Father, spiritual or temporal, by exploiting his "children", by profiting from their labour and servitude, gives the lie to his self-appointed role of tutor. The injustices heaped upon those who cannot, or do not know how to, repel them are odious to any humane man. But we know the people. The life of the factories, with its mutual suspicion and continual toadying, its crude rivalry over wages and grades; the kowtowing to physical force and the contempt for women; the servility of those who want to "get on" and the high and mighty airs of the skilled workers who treat the unskilled as inferiors - we know these things.

Certainly, not all workers are brutes...but in getting to the heart of the matter one must recognize that small-mindedness and brutishness are deeply rooted in their lives. Proudhon saw this well when he wrote: "People themselves have produced and organised the ideas of authority, property, government and justice, without the help of initiators."

If the world submits to war, exploitation and authority it is because the majority cannot imagine anything else. And then we are told to go to the masses for guidance!

Individualists, we expect nothing that we cannot get for ourselves. The mass for a long time will be ranged against us -- perhaps we will always be "lost in a desert of men". Our will, our faith? The will to live as men and faith in the struggle, our struggle. Not to reject anyone systematically, but not to join ourselves to the herd. Only individualist awareness can dispel the great collective sentiments of religious or patriotic faith which are the tools of murder and domination. Not to scorn the rest, but to confirm reality and defend ourselves against all who uphold the status quo.

We are not among those who seek to create "from the weakness of each, the strength of all" (Jaures). What a paltry strength would result from a crowd of weaknesses! Our main aim is to awaken the power of individuals, a power which is profound and real.

Never has the individual been so sacrificed; never has the world suffered so much from its contempt for individualism; never has the collective principle been so powerful. We only find the "libertarian tradition in the individual, some individuals, and individualism as we see it is the tool with which to forge our own happiness, without presuming to forge the happiness of the masses.

(Pierre Chardon's real name was Maurice Charron. He was a close associate of E.Armand during World War 1 and took over the editing of Armand's paper when the latter was imprisoned on a charge of "harbouring a deserter". Chardon died on May 2, 1919. He was 27 years old. The above article is an abridged version of an English translation by J.R. that appeared in MINUS ONE No. 3, July/August 1964)

xxxxxxxxxxxx

Insanity is the exception in individuals. In groups, parties, peoples, and times, it is the rule. Friedrich Nietzsche.

JOHN CLARK AND STIRNER'S NEGATIVITY

Francis Ellingham

John P. Clark's book "Max Stirner's Egoism" (Freedom Press 1976) was discussed in MINUS ONE no. 38, where S.E. Parker dealt with Clark's views on Stirner's relationship to anarchism and individualism. In the present article, I am concerned with Clark's account of Stirner's egoism. The basic defect of that, I would say, is that Clark fails to grasp Stirner's total negativity.

Stirner's negativity is recognized in R.W.K. Paterson's book "The Nihilistic Egoist: Max Stirner" (O.U.P. 1971). The term "egoist", Paterson writes (p.56), is reserved, in Stirner's "The Ego and His Own", for "the man who has freed himself both from the reign of instinct and from the tyranny of fixed ideas" - a negative definition. And Stirner's general purpose, Paterson writes, "is a purely negative one: namely, to expose all moral imperatives as essentially verbal figments" (p.264). Clark, however, thinks Paterson is mistaken. "It is true," he writes, "that Stirner rejects all values which are not created by the individual ego..... Yet I think that in spite of his rejection of the moral standpoint of impartiality and objectivity, he is taking an ethical position, and accepting the validity of some sort of values" (p.53). Stirner's ethical position, Clark contends, is "ethical egoism" - the theory that one should always try to pursue one's own interest. And Stirner's values, he thinks, are "egoistic": "much of his writing shows that his egoistic values perform for him the same function of giving meaning and direction to existence as do objective or transcendent values for others" (p.53). Well, let us examine Clark's account of these egoistic values and this ethical egoism.

Stirner has, according to Clark, two egoistic values - freedom and "ownness". But Clark complains that Stirner is unclear about the relation between them: "At times he seems to treat the two as radically different.... At other times he implies that ownness itself is really a type of freedom" (p.65). And Clark finds that Stirner never develops a satisfactory concept of either. As to freedom, Stirner "argues that one is only free if one acts with self-determination, self-awareness and free-will. Unfortunately, he does not develop this point, and these criteria are left unexplained" (p.64). As to ownness, Clark thinks that this concept is self-contradictory. On the one hand, it involves concepts of power and property, and it implies that the ego's "highest goal is to reap the benefits of its exploitation of the world" (p.68). On the other hand, it also means that the ego is satisfied with "ownership of itself", thus implying "a position of almost Stoic resignation" (p.67). How such confused values could "give meaning and direction to existence" Clark never tells us.

Stirner's ethical egoism, as expounded by Clark, is equally confused. At times Stirner's position seems to be that one should be self-interested without thinking that others should be. At other times it seems to be that everybody should be self-interested. If he means the former, he fails to justify it: one may be "unique", but so is everyone else. If he means the latter, he cannot consistently advocate it: by teaching others to be self-interested he would be encouraging them to ignore his interests - the last thing a true egoist would want. Similarly, Stirner sometimes seems to justify universal self-interest as the best thing for everybody - not a truly egoistic justification. At other times he seems to justify it (most implausibly) as the best thing for himself - which throws him back to the unjustifiable position that only his self-interest is ethically required. What, then,

4

we may ask, in Stirner's ethical position? Clark can only suggest, in the end, that "his philosophy is the reductio ad absurdum of classical capitalism" (p.58) - that is, an empty absurdity.

Thus Clark's contention that Stirner puts forward a system of principles and values is confuted by his own self-confessed failure to discover it. And in any case, as Paterson points out, Stirner himself expressly denied having such a system. When one of his critics, Kuno Fischer, accused him of erecting the self-centred individual into an absolute principle, and of advocating egoism as a kind of categorical imperative, Stirner replied that his egoism, far from being a dogmatic category, was never intended to be more than "a 'phrase', albeit the last possible 'phrase', which is fitted to put an end to the whole regiment of phrases" (see Paterson's book, pp.96-97).

Similarly, in "The Ego and His Own", Stirner writes: "I am no dogmatist....If I were a 'dogmatist', I should place at the head a dogma, a thought, an idea, a principle, and should complete this as a 'systematist', spinning it out to a system, a structure of thought" (p. 147, Libertarian Book Club edition, 1963). And in a passage comparing a man to a flower, he clearly rejects ethical egoism: "The flower does not follow the calling to complete itself, but it spends all its forces to enjoy and consume the world as well as it can." A man is similar: "One might call out to the man, 'use your force'. Yet to this imperative would be given the meaning that it was man's task to use his force. It is not so. Rather, each one really uses his force without first looking upon this as his calling." (pp.326-7). Plainer evidence that Stirner was not an ethical egoist believing in a calling to pursue one's own interest, is hard to imagine.

The fact is that all the nonsensical principles and values attributed to Stirner by Clark are the product, not of Stirner's thought, but of Clark's attempt to extract a positive teaching from Stirner's negative philosophy; and once Stirner's negativity is recognized, all the problems Clark sees in Stirner can be cleared up. Thus when Clark complains that Stirner never defines "self-determination, self-awareness, and free will", it is because Clark fails to see that in Stirner's thought such concepts are negative: to be self-determined means, to Stirner, not to be determined either by instinct or by fixed ideas, "phrases". Similarly, "ownness", which so baffles Clark, is the state of being non-determined by those factors. In that negative sense it is also "freedom" - but it is distinguished by Stirner from the positive ideal of freedom, freedom the sacred "phrase" for which one is supposed to sacrifice oneself. That distinction is perfectly clear; but Clark, always for something positive, can only discern that ownness and freedom are sometimes distinguished by Stirner and sometimes not. Unable to understand, he sees a problem in Stirner.

Again, when Clark complains of a contradiction between "exploitative" and "Stoical" elements in Stirner's thought, it is because he cannot understand Stirner's negativity. Stirner, in point of fact, is neither Stoical nor exploitative; but to the bourgeois mind - full of positive assertion, and unaware of the significance of negation - he will seem now one, now the other. He will seem exploitative when he negates the "phrases" of morality and religion (love, reverence, gratitude, etc.), and Stoical when he negates the "phrases" of so-called worldly wisdom (success, ambition, competition, etc.) That Stirner negates both sets of phrases is clear in "The Ego and His Own", where he writes, "Along with worldly goods, all sacred goods too must be put away as no longer valuable" (p.347), and "avarice and longing for heaven stand on a level" (p.337). Stirner's egoist lives on an entirely different level, where there are no "phrases" of any kind: he is neither avaricious nor pietistical.

Clark, however, roundly condemns Stirner as advocating egoism in the worst possible sense. "His thought as a whole," he writes, "advocates a ruthless will to power - power over things, persons, and above all, oneself - which is not necessarily guided by rationality" (pp.25-6). Soon after Clark's book appeared I pointed out, in a letter to the anarchist paper FREEDOM (Vol.38. No.3), that such a condemnation hardly squares with Stirner's statement that "worldly goods" must be regarded as "no longer valuable". In a long reply (Vol.38. No.8.) Clark wrote, of that statement, "Stirner's position here is far from an assertion that the ego should not seek power." That is true; but, in saying it, Clark again shows his ignorance of Stirner's negativity. It is not that Stirner asserts that one must not seek power: he simply negates the assertion (of the ambitious man) that one must. "I must not" is as positive an assertion as "I must"; true negation - Stirner's egoism - is to live without thinking either "I must" or "I must not" do anything. Clark presumes that Stirner's egoism must be a ruthless and irrational struggle for power, but he knows nothing about it: it is beyond his ken.

In the same reply, Clark says: "Ellingham's error is that he misrepresents Stirner's attitude to the world....Stirner saw the world as a field in which the ego could exercise its will to power." To support that view he refers to such apparently shocking remarks of Stirner as: "Where the world comes in my way - and it comes in my way everywhere - I consume it to quiet the hunger of my egoism" (p.296). Taken positively such remarks are shocking. But, as we have seen, they must be taken negatively. To consume the world egoistically means, in Stirner's thought, to be non-determined by "phrases" and instincts - and "instincts" include "appetites, pleasures, emotions, etc." (p.333). Like a flower, the egoist "consumes" the world regardless of moral imperatives; but, also, he is not determined by "the impulses of nature" (as the flower is), nor is he "possessed" by sensuality, or any other "mania" or "passion" (p.333). Such an attitude to the world is neither ruthless nor irrational. On the contrary, it is intelligent, in the deepest sense.

If you are intelligent you can do what you will: that is Stirner's basic point. If he expresses it in shocking terms it is to show, as vividly as he can, that it means negating the respectable, conventional, and thoroughly hypocritical attitude of the so-called "good citizen". Of course, in bourgeois eyes, anything that shocks must be wrong: as Stirner says, "the moral man can never comprehend the egoist" (p.55). And John Clark, unfortunately, is very moral indeed. x

Stirner's egoism, then, is intelligence; and, like intelligence, it can only be defined negatively. It flowers naturally when the factors that choke its roots - "instincts" and "the whole regiment of phrases" - are not determining us. Nobody can predict what it will do. The world cannot organise or exploit it. On the contrary, it "consumes" the world. It includes love - not sentimentality, but the love which, again, can only be defined negatively. "I love men too," Stirner writes (p.291), "not merely individuals, but every one. But I love them with the conscious of egoism...I know no 'commandment of love'."

There are no positive values or principles, and when that negative fact is deeply understood then egoism, oneness, freedom, intelligence, love - call it what you will - comes into being. It is a state of negation (but not, as Paterson supposes, a dreadful spiritual vacuum) which some people have called enlightenment.

x) As if individual & collective xxxxxxxxxx morality had the same high ideal. J.E

IBSEN'S LAST BLOW AT MORALISM

T.J.Carlin

(Note: Terry Carlin was a well-known figure in radical and bohemian circles in Chicago and New York during the first decades of this century. His friend, the playwright Eugene O'Neill, made him, as "Larry Slade", one of the main characters of his play "The Iceman Cometh". For a long time I believed that Carlin's published writings were confined to Hutchin Hapgood's study of him and his friend "Marie" entitled "An Anarchist Woman". Then Paul Avrich called my attention to the fact that Carlin had contributed two essays to Benjamin Tucker's "Liberty" in the 1890s. I wish to thank him for this information and also Henry Meulen, editor of "The Individualist", and his granddaughter for providing me with a copy of the second of these essays. First published in "Liberty", April 1897, it is reprinted below. Carlin died in 1934 at the age of 77. S.E.P.)

Those who are acquainted with Ibsen's dramas only through the literary dumping ground of morbid Nordau's "Degeneration" should read "John Gabriel Borkman", Ibsen's latest work. I consider it the most destructive blow ever dealt by a modern dramatist poet to the masquerading moralists. In this drama Ibsen sweeps away the imaginary foundations of moralism, leaving nothing for the moralists to stand on - in which position he leaves them as the curtain descends. He shows that, under the cloak of moralism, each of these petty praters is, consciously or unconsciously, an egotist at bottom, a moralist on the surface, and you may be sure he lets the bottom drop out, exposing to view the muddled and befuddled moralists.

The play opens on the culminating events of 20 years, and all takes place in one night. It deals with certain phases of the social and financial life of the "upper ten", and John Gabriel Borkman is the principal character. He is a sort of Norwegian Saccard, such as Zola depicts in "Money", with this exception, - that Borkman is a masquerading moralist. In seeking to further his financial and moral schemes he stops at nothing, and brings derision and disaster on those most intimately connected with him. As a consequence of his financial downfall, he is an ex-convict and hermit when the play opens. His wife seeks to rehabilitate the family name through her only son (a man of 24 years), by attempting to impose on him, from boyhood up, a "mission" in life, to that effect. But this young man happens to be an intelligent Egoist: he "Wasn't born to be a missionary". And right here is where the trouble begins for the whole raft of moralists.

The good people all have their little plans of how he shall live for them, but this young man happens also to have plans of his own and realises that "there are others" only in relation to self. To the question of the moralists as to "what he wants to do then", he replies (with a sudden glow): "I am young, I want to live, for once in a way, as well as other people! I want to live my own life!" His mother, who sees her fancied power over her son slipping away, insinuates that he is in the power of another, to which he replies defiantly: "I am in my own power, Mother! And working my own will."

So this young man resists and upsets all the claims and plans of the clamorous moralists by asserting and maintaining in the teeth of tyrannical and truckling moralism the invincible claims of the Ego. To all their taunts and cant about duty his refrain is: "I want to live, live, live !" With happiness and for happiness, "I am only determined to live my own life - at last!"

In one scene particularly, between Borkman and one of his dupes, Ibsen, with remorseless logic, lays bare the cynical basis of moralistic friendship - exposing, from that point of view, "the steel hard, dreamless world of reality". Here are some extracts where both dupes are unmasked:

Borkman - Here you have been lying to me all the time.

Foldal (shaking his head) - Never lying, John Gabriel.

Borkman - Haven't you sat here feeding me with hope, and trust, and confidence - that was all a lie?

Foldal - It wasn't a lie so long as you believed in my vocation. So long as you believed in me, I believed in you.

Borkman - Then we've been all the time deceiving each other. And perhaps deceiving ourselves - both of us.

Foldal - But isn't that just the essence of friendship, John Gabriel?

Borkman (smiling bitterly) - Yes, you're right there. Friendship means deception. I have learnt that once before.

Yet even these cocksure moralists have their terrible doubts sometimes; at least, one of them says he is haunted by the horrible doubt that he may have bungled his life for the sake of a delusion.

And so Ibsen goes on smashing the idols and driving the worshippers from the temples of tradition. As they take their last stand, he relentlessly cuts the ground from under their feet. As he progresses with his work, the social atmosphere becomes cleared of the odor of dead dogmas.

I think it was Douglas Jerrold who said that dogmatism is puppyism full grown; this is especially so of moral dogmas. Those who read "John Gabriel Borkman" in the light of modern science, and in connection with Ibsen's previous works, can hardly fail to see that the old and new breeds of moralists are the same. Today, as of old, the costermongers of moralistic dogmas are forcing their wares on the gullible public with the aid of a scientific (S) and unscientific priesthood, who pull the strings, while political puppets keep up the "moral show", insisting so strenuously the while on self-sacrifice that one would imagine there were no "ethers" only too anxious to sacrifice us whenever we refuse to bow down to the new social god of Evolutionary Ethics.

I think it is not too much to say that Ibsen has unmasked the moralist in all his phases, revealing in his latest aspect the face of the tyro-tyrant of the new moralism. Moralism always insists on the subjugation of self to an abstract formula laid down by an imaginary self. Its "categorical imperative" issues always from the mouth of an abstraction, whether ~~is~~ God, Society or Evolution itself. Most of us must have some moral code (or cud) on which to chew. Still, it is infinitely refreshing to see that Ibsen shows no mercy to the saviours of society who delude themselves and others with so vain phrases as the "Tribal Self" and other well-known and well-worn catchwords.

XXXXXXXXXXXX

THE STORM! A Journal for Free Spirits. Edited and published by Mark A. Sullivan, 227 Columbus Avenue., Apt.2e, New York, N.Y. 10023, USA. \$2.00 for six (N.America) \$2.75 (Elsewhere). Published quarterly.

Il DIVERSO. New Italian individualist review. Per tutto quanto concerne questo giornale indirizzare a: Partesana Renzo Barachin, Piazza XXV E, 23035 Sondalo (SO) Italy.

XXXXXXXXXXXX

REVIEWS

Lysander Spooner and Natural Rights

(Vices Are Not Crimes. By Lysander Spooner. Taanstaaf!, PO Box 257, Cupertino, CA 95014, USA. \$2.95)

"Vices Are Not Crimes" was an essay contributed anonymously by Lysander Spooner to a book on temperance reform by Dio Lewis in 1875. Overlooked by the compiler of Spooner's collected works, it was discovered by Carl Watner and is now republished as a well produced but rather expensive pamphlet.

Spooner's thesis is that "crime" and "vice" are not the same thing. "Crimes" are those acts by means of which one individual harms the person or property of another. "Vices" are simply errors which an individual makes "in his search after his own happiness". Government therefore has no business interfering with "vice". Its sole concern should be with the punishment of "crime".

Spooner argues his thesis with his usual display of tight-wired reasons expressed in the clear, dry style that is his hallmark. But he seriously weakens his case by his attachment to a moralistic viewpoint. Indeed, "vice" is a moral spook of the first water and his attempt to identify it with an error made in "the search after happiness" is open to all manner of objections. For example, if I rush across a busy street on my way to see a film I have long looked forward to and am knocked down by a car, I certainly make an error in my "search after happiness", but this can hardly be called a "vice".

Again, Spooner's deistic beliefs lead him to personalise "Nature" in such fantastic statements as "Nature knows....what she designs each individual for, what knowledge he requires and how he must get it." To which one can only answer: Bullshit! Voltairine de Cleyre, who also knew how to personalise "Nature" when it suited her, effectively put the contrary case to Spooner when she wrote "Nature knows nothing of rights, she knows power only, and a louse has as much natural right as a man to the extent of its power."

Of course, that arch-moralist Murray Rothbard, who introduces the pamphlet, is not slow to seize on Spooner's moralism and elaborate it. He dismisses Spooner's successors in the "individualist anarchist movement" who "led by Benjamin R. Tucker all proclaimed arbitrary whim and might-makes-right as the foundation of libertarian moral theory." Spooner, he claims, "knew that this was no foundation at all; for the State is far mightier than the individual, and if the individual cannot use a theory of justice as his armour against State oppression, then he has no solid base from which to roll back and defeat it."

What pious nonsense! What State has ever taken any notice of a "theory of justice" as a barrier to its oppression of the individual? Hitler never repealed the Weimar Constitution, but the "theory of justice" that it contained did not prevent him from suppressing anyone who stood in his way. Only counter-power can curb the power of the State in practice, for "right" means nothing in the face of "might". *

Rothbard also wants to recapture "the once great tradition of an objectively grounded rights of the individual". "Objectively" grounded in what? Rothbard does not say, not suprisingly since his "objectivity" has no other ground than his "subjectivity". Indeed, the whole theory of "natural rights" is based upon nothing but the say-so of its champions. If we look at nature we find nothing there that corresponds to it. It has

* A genuine individual right (there are no others) is associated with the authority to enforce it, individually or by group action. J.E. 21.8.97.

See Kant's definition of rights - & try to demolish it! J.E. v. 197.

{ no referent except the wish of certain theoreticians to foist their particular conception of morality upon us.

"Vices Are Not Crimes" is completed by a foreword by Carl Watner and Tucker's obituary of Spooner.

Typically, ANARCHISTS - & other right-wingers - never attack well defined individual rights in their particulars & one by one. They fight they refuse S.E.Parker then by spewing out the individual 'rights' concept, of which they Inconvenient History have nothing understood in the first place, except its spelling. J.E. v. 197

(The Saga Of Hog Island and Other Essays In Inconvenient History. By James J. Martin. Ralph Nyles Publisher, Inc. \$3.95)

In this latest collection of essays, James J. Martin exhumes one of the biggest defence and war scandals of World War 1 in the USA, the shipbuilding yard known as Hog Island. He acidly delineates the decline of Britain as a world power following participation in World War 2. In a controversial piece on Mussolini's campaign against the Mafia, he claims that Mussolini's regime was not as repressive as it was usually depicted. The attack on Pearl Harbour is shown by him to have been deliberately allowed by the Roosevelt government in order to provide a cogent excuse to declare war on the Axis powers. He deplores the legend of Colin Kelly, a now forgotten "hero" of the Japanese attack on the Philippine Islands. In his final essay he gives a masterly account of the legal framing of "Tokyo Rose", a Japanese-American woman named Iva Toguri D'Aquino, who was accused of being a radio propagandist for Japan between 1941 and 1945 and who, after a long fight, was completely pardoned by President Ford just before he gave way to President Pepsodent.

Three appendices deal with the hypocrisy of the American State on blacklisting, the "Morgenthau Plan", made public in 1944, "for the partitioning, devastation, pillaging and pastorilization of Germany", and "Fifty Years of Political Assassination", a beautifully ironic and succinct account of one of the expanding industries of our time.

2

S.E.P.

Kropotkin and Goodman

(Anarchism. By Peter Kropotkin, Kropotkin's Lighthouse Publications, c/o Housman's Bookshop, 5 Caledonian Road, London N.1. 25p (pp).

The Black Flag of Anarchy. By Paul Goodman. 15p (pp) Same publisher)

Kropotkin's oft-quoted contribution to the Encyclopedia Britannica has now been reprinted as a pamphlet. Kropotkin, as usual, defines anarchism as a secular variant of the Christian Heaven and indulges in his classic populist mystifications about the masses. Despite an attempt to be "objective" in his presentation, he singles out Stirner and Tucker as villains whose ideas encourage "amoralism" and "super-man-theory". Somewhat inconsistently, in his concluding paragraph, he instances the works of Nietzsche as being among those "full of ideas which show how closely anarchism is interwoven with the work that is going on in modern thought"! How close is "closely"?

Paul Goodman's "The Black Flag of Anarchy" is an irritating mixture of sense and nonsense. The latter apparently derives from the Kropotkinian tradition by which he is strongly influenced and leads him to support "participatory democracy" which "encompasses no taxation without representation, grass-roots populism, the town-meeting, congregationalism, federalism, Student Power, Black Power, workers' management, soldiers' democracy, guerilla organization". These things are "the essence of Anarchist social order". Well, it's nice to know that an "anarchist

social order" will still have majority rule, taxation, student power, black power (but only workers' management!) and democratically organized soldiers. And if, in the face of all this, an anarchist individualist might be tempted to resort to guerilla action - even this would be suitably "organized"! I can never understand why Paul Goodman, like Herbert Read, are pushed so much as "anarchist" thinkers. Could it be that their confusions are compensated for by their "fame"?

S.E.P.

Individualistischer Anarchismus

(Individualistischer Anarchismus: Eine Autorenauswahl. Anarchistische Texte 6/7. Libertad-Verlag, Dezember 1977. Anarchistischer Bund, Berlin 2.50 DM. Postfach 153, 1 Berlin 44)

A well printed booklet containing texts by K.H.Z. Solneman, John Henry Mackay, P.J. Proudhon, Max Stirner, St.Ch. Waldecke, Benj. R. Tucker, Victor Yarros, E. Armand, S.E. Parker and Uwe Timm. Since I do not know any German I cannot write a proper review of this interesting work. Any reader who would like to try is welcome.

S.E.P.

Libertad

(Un Provocatore Ante Litteram: Albert Libertad. By Hem Day. Centro Studi Hem Day, Via Tittoni, 5, 00153 Roma, Italy)

A sixteen biography of Albert Libertad (1875-1908), a dynamic figure in the French anarchist movement. Edited a paper called "Anarchy". Wrote a few essays. Perhaps better known for his "Joy of Living" and his remarks to the effect "Don't wait for the revolution. Those who promise revolution are frauds like the others. Make your own revolution by being free men and living in comradeship."

Carlo Cavalletti has performed a good service in translating from the French into the Italian.

Good print, easy on the eye. No price given.

Stephen Marletta

XXXXXXXXXXXX

Ballad Of The Modern American Pioneer

Just bury me in my car when I die,
Want no fuss and want no flowers,
No ceremony goin' on for hours -
Just bury me in my car when I die.

Fasten my safety belt around me
For the Good Lord he has bound me
For that Holy Golden Garage in the sky -
Oh, bury me in my car when I die!

E.T.

Why should it matter, to a rational egoist, HOW he is
Buried, after he died? J.Z. 21.8.97.

Kids and Kings

(Daily Mirror Annual Exhibition of Children's Art. Paintings, Collages and Embroideries on "Our Kings and Queens". National Portrait Gallery. Trafalgar Square.)

Rumour has it that all through his childhood the editor of Minus One believed that he had been born the son of a prince. A visit to this exhibition would confirm that this is not an uncommon fantasy as more than a few of the exhibits are obviously portraits of the children themselves or their parents.

The exhibition is divided into three main sections: Historical Monarchy, Present Day Monarchy, and Imaginative Free Association. The British Royal Family is most unflatteringly portrayed. The Queen, especially, is shown as worried, harassed, frowning, falsely smiling, more masculine than feminine, often black-haired, a bad witch or evil figure, rather than a benevolent one, as in children's fairy stories. One fact stood out very clearly: the older the artist the more pleasing and flattering the style and the more conventional the painting, etching, or collage; whereas the younger artists - who have still some way to go before the boss, the tax-man, and the politician get into their line of vision - are still in some measure "gruesome little artists of the impulse".

From the Historical Section two portraits are memorable. One, three Eastern kings attired in opulent purples, browns and pinks reminding me of jet-set pop-stars, and another, entitled "The Burdens of Monarchy", a family bereft of crowns, trinkets and finery, starkly and simply dressed, whose haunted eyes could be seen as summing up the plight of the world's poor and starving.

Henry VIII is given a corner to himself. In the most noticeable picture he is portrayed as a "queen" wearing pink tights - resembling a ballet dancer who is about to sway into a swoon and call for the smelling salts!

Perhaps the last word from the children is the portrait in the corner near the exit of Elvis Presley entitled "The King"!

My own favourite is not that of a monarch, but of a fishing boat, one half of a painting done by two youngsters. The king, in grey armour, is stuck in the foreground, looking pretty dull, dead and dreary, but behind him is the most alive and happy fishing boat I can ever remember having seen. It seems to be mostly yellow, blue, and red, and it moves, almost bounces, off the wall. If I had to choose, I would prefer the company of that boat to any of the monarchs on the walls surrounding it - except, perhaps, the one that will be most appreciated by egoists: a resplendent self-portrait resembling the boy-king Tutenkamen.

B.W.

The next issue of Minus One will contain the first complete English version of Max Stirner's seminal essay of 1842 "Art and Religion", translated and introduced by Lawrence S. Stepelevich.

Also coming: "Renzo Novatore: Anarchist Iconoclast" by Mario Verдини. Translated from the Italian by Stephen Marletta. Edited by S.E. Parker.

MINUS ONE - founded 1963 - is edited and published by S.E.Parker,
186 Gloucester Terrace, London W.2., England. £1.00 (U.S.A. 3
dollars) for six issues.

Marathon Encounter

Getogether

and

Relate	concentrate
Vibrate	meditate
Cogitate	fecundate
Masticate	marinate
Ruminate	fascinate
Illustrate	fornicate
Vacillate	scintillate
Assimilate	recreate
Rusticate	rehabilitate
COMMUNICATE!	

A weekend in the country
Or a trip to Southern Spain
Blue denims are essential
If you are a soul in pain

Collaborate	discriminate
Masturbate	fulminate
Culminate	integrate
Lubricate	perpetuate
Illuminate	vegetate
Satiate	separate
Celebrate	isolate
Originate	expatriate
Propitiate	pontificate
Procreate	co-operate
PARTICIPATE!	

O where is the old-time preacher
Who threatened heaven or hell
We got him for nothing
And security as well!

S.G.H.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

A Little Story From Poland

The scene - A Communist Party Political Class.

Instructor: "Can any student tell us the essential difference between
a capitalist society and a socialist in two sentences?"

Student: "Yes, comrade. In a capitalist society one part of the
community lives by exploiting the other part of the
community".

Instructor: "Very good! And how does a socialist society differ?"

Student: "In a socialist society it is the other way round!"

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

(A week in Majorca with a
psychologist thrown in to help
people "find themselves" is
being introduced by a leading
package tour firm. "We call, it
finding a friend with a
psychologist's help, and we
expect a big response because
there are a lot of unhappy
people about" a spokesman for
Blue Sky holidays said today.
Lond. Evening Standard
5.6.78.)

(Homosexual students were
asked to wear blue jeans in a
demo to make the public aware
of the problems they face. And
normal students were also asked
to wear blue jeans to show
support and sympathy for their
fellows' cause.
Lond. Evening News
1.6.78.)