

# INDIVIDUALISM

## CRUCIBLE OF FUTURE WORLDS

by Ixigrec

*This human intervention with regard to an individual comes only from another individual replacing their own determinism and attributing to themselves the extraordinary power to dispose of their own person.*



I could simplify and summarize this study on my conception of individualism by specifying that, for me, it is the possibility for the individual to belong to themselves entirely and to dispose, at all times and in all places, and in an absolute manner, from the moment they become aware of their person until their death, of their life (but only their own) as they see fit.

This would be the declaration of the “Rights of the Individual,” which would be just as worthy of the "Rights of Man" and would justify the fact that its progenitors, having — consciously or not — seated themselves at the banquet of life, could do no better than recognize this minimum right: that of belonging entirely to oneself.

This clarification indicates quite clearly that individualism, as I understand it, is not a given economic system but a philosophical attitude of man toward the realities of existence. This in no way precludes the examination of the difficulties he must overcome in trying to realize his meaning in life and, in particular, his economic life.

This simplification of my study would seem rather simplistic because, in fact, no one lives absolutely alone, and the whole problem boils down to knowing how this individualist will realize his ethics among his fellow men.

Let's look at the facts.

What essentially differentiates man from other living organisms, what best characterizes his evolution beyond the merely animal stage, is his ability to abstract, from the immediate data of his contacts with reality, an imaginary conception of the various phenomena, which, since the most remote centuries of prehistory, has contributed to the present day, guiding and diversifying the multiple social organizations, which, as a result, have

no rational basis, since they stem from a past made up of material necessities, superstitions, fears, mysticism and struggles establishing the law of the strongest and the most cunning.

Contrary to popular belief, the State, a social product, is not a cause but an effect. It is the consequence of violence and the right of the strongest, aggravated by high population densities.

The spirit of the jungle, the spirit of profit, that of the happy accident and of luck are of ancestral origin.

The notions of right, justice, and equality are abstract, rational and recent concepts.

They are products of civilization.

The measurement of productive effort, the equivalence of services rendered, tend to eliminate inequalities of fate, luck and good fortune, and to equalize the material conditions of producers.

The world is evolving slowly despite the burdens of mysticism and the idea of profit.

Let no one imagine, however, that I am naive enough to believe in the imminent realization of my "vision" of social evolution.

Do we really believe that our contemporaries, with their harmful differences, their antagonisms, their prejudices, their mystics, their poor education, their conflicting interests, their erroneous conception of the necessity and virtue of the struggle between human beings, do we believe that these social deformities will transform themselves into fair and fraternal comrades?

And are we ourselves capable of this beautiful and desirable fraternity?

Nor do I believe in the effectiveness of a violent revolution, sooner or later, to resolve the problem of harmony between men. Imposing a social system by force is to achieve exactly what we criticize authoritarians for; it is to repeat a disappointing experiment, ultimately resulting in the continuation of violence and coercion.

The famous slogan "Force is the midwife of societies" is not complete. It must be perfected and "authoritarian societies" added, because force will never give birth to a society "without Gods or Masters"...

Wanting to transform the world and create universal happiness, when it is so difficult to succeed in one's own life and to be consistent with one's dream of fraternity and sociability, gives me the impression of a lack of objectivity. To imagine that it is possible, during social upheavals, to peacefully reduce the differences and antagonisms of our human anthills

and to organize a real path toward fraternization and the creation of a social system without authority is an optimism detached from reality.

As long as we give primacy to systems — whatever they may be — over the individual, there will be tyranny, despite the color and shape of the chosen label or the flag camouflaging the merchandise.

It's up to each of us to ask ourselves.

So! one might object, should we sit back and abandon all efforts to transform our social jungle into fraternal, equitable and supportive organizations?

Not at all.

One need only compare the current state — economic and moral — of certain nations with their previous state in bygone centuries to observe an evolution of mores in a constructive and liberal direction.

Material and cultural exchanges, the interpenetration of social systems are currently working towards the unification of knowledge and, contradictorily, towards the diversification and affirmation of the human personality.

It is therefore rather a matter of taking stock of this evolution, identifying its possibilities, and working towards its acceleration.

Let there be no misunderstanding about my intentions. This is in no way a matter of opting for this or that social system, for I believe that the diversity of individuals and the necessities of evolution oppose — at least in my view — the conception of a single social system, even a fraternal one. I add, reinforcing this opinion, that to accelerate the evolution of our species, it is beneficial and necessary for there to be a multiplicity of attempts at association, if their basis — common to all — is respect for the individual, which necessarily implies the total disappearance of the exploitation of man by man.

It will be objected that behind possible social systems lie organizational, economic and moral necessities created by nature itself, and that they will always influence human groups.

There is much to discuss about these necessities, because we know that throughout history many ancient civilizations have focused on erroneous beliefs, such as the worship of deities, ancestor worship and other products of ignorance that owe nothing to biological necessities. It is therefore quite possible that the current belief in the necessity of strong social concentrations to resolve demographic difficulties is yet another error. In social gigantism, rigid laws, constraints, brainwashing and

stimulating slogans are necessarily required, and everyone, like social insects, can only clump together in a collective amorphousness, collective desires, collective amusements and, perhaps, collective dreams.

It seems that these human agglomerations represent the pinnacle of human evolution!

Yet, one might object, you have recognized a certain evolution of morals, greater tolerance, and greater diversification among humans! Isn't there an obvious contradiction here?

This evolution is undeniable, but it is not the product of fanatical doctrinaires — quite the contrary. It is the product of individualists who thought differently from those of their time, whether they were called Epicurus, Democritus, or Socrates, or, closer to us, Rabelais, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, Spinoza, Descartes, Stirner, and many others.

The mass mentality opposes adventure, the discovery of truth and beauty. If it preserves what has been acquired, even if harmful, it cannot create the future paths that will certainly free man from his physical and moral infirmities and propel him toward the conquests glimpsed by his imagination... And it is not truly loving one's fellow human beings to want to shape them according to a preconceived system.

In my book “Doctor Rob and His Essays,” I summarized some criticisms of this despotism, which aims only to distort human beings in order to shape them according to standards devised by other humans. And I've also outlined some visions of a possible and harmonious world.

Perhaps some readers might find this interesting.

All this is well and good, some might say, but we would like to know how you intend to resolve moral and economic difficulties according to your individualistic guidelines.

Above all, I believe that the pivot of true social evolution lies in youth, hence the need to raise children for themselves, free from all morality and political or social teaching, free from the influence of their environment, with only objective, even historical, knowledge of the evolution of their species to better adapt them to their planet and know how to defend themselves against the authoritarian environment they will encounter. With their personality and judgment firmly established — at least, I hope so — they will be able to orient themselves according to their own views and temperament and react in order to preserve their personality.

And now, how can we practically resolve the difficult economic question, given the unequal distribution of natural resources, given the

differences among human beings and the inviolability of the human person, accepted as the social basis and starting point, and above all, given the differences in the functioning of each group?

The reader will easily understand that there is no question of isolating the individual and that Ibsen's affirmation of the strength of Man alone is only an allusion to moral strength. One can isolate oneself if one is strong.

In reality, the strong man is the associated man.

But association has produced monstrosities, smoky, blackish factories, man-killing mines, unhealthy suburbs, and deadly machines of every kind, without forgetting the gigantic stores where thousands of useless objects are nibbling away at their producers' possible leisure time.

Humanity has given itself a new idol: Machinery!

Its stupidity oscillates between Hindu fanaticism, creator of misery, overpopulation, and famine, and industrial super-production, mechanical gigantism, plunging man back into another devilry: that of metallurgy.

The civilized man is not the man who loses himself in the charms of nature, cultivating his garden like Candide, or composing a gallant quatrain for his Sweetheart! No, none of that, although his enormous productive power would easily allow him this idyllic forgetfulness of his impending end.

Civilized people are organized: so much for work, so much for meals, so much for sleep, so much for entertainment, so much for vacations, and, thus, the well-oiled machinery must be able to hold up and last until it is scrapped. All gigantic civilizations are robot factories.

We must therefore focus the economic question on the liberation of man and not on his domestication.

How can this be achieved?

First of all, by allowing individuals to group themselves according to their particular economic conceptions, ranging from "abundance" to the "Spartan" conception of life. This implies that the young human being, educated as mentioned above, will find themselves faced with a choice of varied groupings allowing them to experiment according to their nature. But we must also consider their desire to create, in turn, an original and as yet untested way of life. Having raised them from nothingness, society owes them not only the intellectual enrichment already mentioned, but also their share of the material heritage enabling them to carry out various vital collective or individual endeavors.

Perhaps they will succeed in something original or superior; perhaps they will return to proven groups, but it is necessary for young people to seek, innovate, move forward, and always be encouraged in this direction.

But the pivot of an individualistic society will inevitably be the contract, a contract limited in time, variable according to individuals and circumstances, freely discussed, and binding its participants only for the circumstances provided for.

Lovers of gigantism will see this as an insurmountable obstacle to the creation of pharaonic constructions, to those of vertical or sprawling cities, to the flourishing of super-power plants, super-atomic aircraft and other manifestations of their constructive genius. But nothing will prevent, in individualist ethics, the formation of strong communities working on the aforementioned projects, for planned and discussed durations, provided that those “enthusiasts” of the colossal respect the tranquility and contemplation of poets and dreamers.

Moreover, it is likely that, in practice, the size of these groups will oscillate between too low human densities, vegetating due to industrial insufficiency, and too high demographic concentrations, unchanging and crystallizing through fossilization, like the monsters of the Mesozoic. The most difficult thing, moreover, is not the design of a productive and distributive economic system; it is, fundamentally, the intellectual training of the younger generations in the sense I have indicated.

I will be criticized for dodging the problems of machinery, transportation, public services, construction, etc.; in a word, all large-scale production requiring strong organization. Being an enemy of gigantism, I have no interest in industrial slavery, assuming that the wise men of the future will reduce it to the scale of strict necessity. Comrades who love this all-consuming industrialism have never participated in it. I myself have brushed against it very closely, and I know the other side of the coin.

Besides, why make a plan for the future, to dispose in advance of the time and activity of our successors? The most urgent thing is first of all to rid men of their aggressiveness, their intolerance, their prejudices, their ignorance, and to give them a glimpse of the creative possibilities of the free man, the sole master of his destiny.

The most urgent thing is to create individualities, beginning with the child, and not to create future societies they will not want.

As it is said in the Scriptures: The rest will come as an addition.

This will not satisfy revolutionaries in a hurry “to get it over with.” Everyone, alas! follows their own path according to their personal vision of reality, and future events will alone demonstrate the positive aspects of these diverse interpretations of human evolution, unless we disappear in an atomic geyser.

All the same, I don't believe in such a calamitous end, and it would be regrettable if so many promises inscribed in the evolution of our species were to end so stupidly. And what somewhat strengthens my optimism is that, taken as a whole, humanity — thanks to strong evolutionary individualities — is slowly progressing towards tolerance and intellectual enrichment.

Finally, one last objection: opponents of this education will not fail to observe that the young individualist launched into our social jungle will inevitably be its victim. This is reversing the roles. The victim is the human being, robotized, exploited, mechanized, indoctrinated, denatured, and, very often, killing or killed by a society of semi-civilized people.

If we want to influence the course of social events and create new directions towards harmonious coordination, it is not by embarking on the spectacular and gregarious achievements of the great crowd leaders. We know the results.

And it is not truly loving one's brothers to impose on them a social system that kneads them in order to adapt them to our own conception of their happiness: it is by separating the child from our errors, by going back to the very source of creative thought, that is to say, to the genius that perhaps lies dormant in every newborn, which our authoritarian education stifles from its earliest stammers.

The various modes of grouping and exchange? The community or individual forms that our successors will imagine? They will be the ones to take care of them. Let us make their task easier by trying, according to our means, to develop in them a lucid, peaceful, fraternal, and independent spirit.

Raised outside constraints and distorting systems, giving free rein to their adventurous genius, to their creative spirit, to this explosive force which propels man ever further towards the conquest of life and duration, the strong individualities which we will have been able to favor by our efforts will perhaps justify, — for our sense of causalities and responsibilities — the appearance of intelligence, conscience and goodness in a universe which we know to be without purpose and without gods.

Originally published as "L'Individualisme, creuset des mondes futurs," *Le Monde Libertaire* 133 (Juin 1967): 8-9.

Working translation by Shawn P. Wilbur, last revised March 28, 2025

**A CORVUS EDITION – [libertarian-labyrinth.org](http://libertarian-labyrinth.org)**