A text dump on Ultimo Reducto

Contents

Important note of Último Reducto about the texts by Ted Kaczynski

In this *blog* appear several texts by Ted Kaczynski. These texts are published here Because they express important ideas worthy of being taken into account. No however, while Last Redoubt agrees with Kaczynski on the basic points (rejection of civilization in general and of industrial civilization in In particular, the need to eliminate techno-industrial society and the need for a organized movement that is fully and exclusively dedicated to that end and takes the necessary precautions to exclude from their ranks and keep distances with respect to undesirable elements – leftists, hippies, crackpots, etc.) and In many other secondary aspects of his ideas, there are also many others. details, more or less important, on which Último Reducto disagrees. Point them out one by one in each text of Kaczynski published in this blog, It would be excessively complicated to read with notes and digressions, so that which normally will not be done.[1]

To see some of the theoretical differences between Last Redoubt and Kaczynski you can read, for example, "Critique of *Anti-Tech Revolution* by Ted Kaczynski", in this same *blog.*

---

[1] The same should be noted for Kaczynski's texts published in Untamed Nature.

Presentation and clarifications

This "blog" aims to be a means for the dissemination of *non-leftist ideas against the techno-industrial* system. The fundamental values on which they are based are the autonomy of wild nature and, consequently, the hatred of everything that inevitably threatens it. Último Reducto is aware that "out there", in the midst of the masses, there are some people who share the *non-leftist* attitude and these fundamental values. This "blog" aims to be a way to contact them, show them that there are other people who share their attitude, values and ideas and encourage and inspire them to act, so that perhaps, in this way, one day a *non-leftist* movement against techno-industrial society will emerge.

It is also necessary to make some clarifications for all those who know the previous publications of Último Reducto.

First, some may find it at least surprising that Último Reducto is publishing texts on the Internet, given that in the past it has always shown a resounding refusal to do so. Last Redoubt's opinion about computing and the Internet remains basically the same: like other modern technologies, computing has worsened the world and is *an inseparable* part of the techno-industrial system. That is, it is bad. However, the refusal to use computer science to express and disseminate ideas contrary to modern technology is totally ineffective and counterproductive. If it is a question of obtaining practical results, trying to maintain consistency when it comes to acting can often be a hindrance, however honestly it is pursued.

Secondly, Último Reducto has been publishing sporadically texts with this name since 1996. In all these years it has been An evolution in their ideas was produced, carrying out in the process a ideological purification in their positions.

The initial ideas of Último Reducto (as can be seen, for example, in No. 0 of the publication *Último Reducto*, 1996), despite already pointing out Some of its current core values were heavily contaminated by leftist ideological influences; especially for certain versions of anarchism and so-called "animal liberation".

After putting in question the validity of animalist positions (based, in general, on sacredness of individual life and/or in the absolute rejection of pain), discover its profound incompatibility with the defense of freedom and the wild and begin to develop an explicit and general rejection of leftism[1], Last Redoubt entered the stage that we

---

[1] Which is to be greatly appreciated measured, respectively, to theoretical delusions and exaggerations and/or logical incompetence and irrationality of animal activists, as well as inestimable intellectual lucidity of Ted Kaczynski, in addition to the discomfort and natural suspicions that Último Reducto has always felt in front of much of it of leftist and countercultural ideas and attitudes.

could call "antidominator" (a example of it would be the number 1 of *Last Redoubt*, 2002). This transitional phase was characterized by the continuation of being heavily influenced by leftist and humanist ideas and attitudes coming from an anarchism for which Último Reducto still showed a certain affinity and respect; for continuing to have the freedom of nonhuman animals a excessive presence in his speech; to be presented in a clear way and explicit a frontal and complete rejection of the techno-industrial system; to give to practical coherence is of strategic importance that it does not really have; and because it is considered that reason and will exercise or could exercise a much greater weight than they actually can and usually exert on behavior of human beings (both individually and collectively). A typical trait of this stage is the practical omnipresence in the discourse of Last Redoubt of the notion of "Domination"[2], that gives its name to this stage. The concept of "Domination" of Last Redoubt came Negatively defined in terms of the fundamental value of the autonomy of the savage: "Domination" was the way to call everything that attacked against such autonomy. At this stage, Último Reducto already expressed clearly its core values: autonomy of wild nature, rejection of techno-industrial society (and civilization, in general) and rejection of leftism. Throughout this stage, Último Reducto was developing its basic ideas in more detail and abandoning positions, uses and values alien to the same and coming from humanist ideological contaminations in general and leftists in particular.

All this until reaching a stage (of which *Leftism: function of pseudocriticism and the pseudo-revolution in techno-industrial society* and *Con Amigos Como Estos ...* -2007 and 2009 respectively-, are the first examples), which continues to the present, in which the speech of Last Redoubt already reflects a greater theoretical maturity, coherence and solidity.

The reason for doing the previous review to the ideological evolution of Last Redoubt is serve as a clarification of possible contradictions and theoretical incompatibilities that readers of the work of Last Redoubt They can find by comparing their own contents from different stages. In such In cases, readers should always remember the following rule: appreciate incompatibilities between what was said by Último Reducto in its different works, most likely the position expressed in the work dated more is the one that Último Reducto currently defends (or at least the one that the closer it is).

Último Reducto is only fully identified with his works belonging to the last stage. However, since it is impossible to prevent to follow the independent dissemination of his works prior to that stage, by less would it be desirable for readers to know and take into account everything that previous.

---

[2] This term perhaps not very Fortunate to be conventionally loaded with connotations of Leftist currents that really had nothing to do with positions of Último Reducto; this is the main reason that today Ultimo Redoubt just uses that term to refer to any attack against the autonomy of the non-artificial.

Basic Requirements for Creating an Efficient Movement Against Technoindustrial Society[1]

In order to be efficient and to have any chance of success, a serious movement against technoindustrial society has to meet the following necessary requirements:

1. *Quality*: Those who start and/or later lead the movement must be high quality people. By "quality" I mean that they have to fulfil at least these three requirements:

   1. *Intelligence and cultural level*: Those who start and/or lead the movement must be able to understand well how the technoindustrial system works, why it is bad, why it cannot be reformed, what are the dangers and traps in which they shouldn't fall when struggling against it and why; among other things. That is, they have to adequately understand the theory and ideology of the movement. This will require that they have a minimum intellectual capacity and cultural level (and well above the average of the population).

   2. *Values and ends:* They have to have as "ideal" or basic positive value (that is, what must exist and should be preserved) the autonomy of wild Nature[2] and as negative value (what is bad, evil; that is, that what must be fought and must disappear) everything that is contrary to the autonomy of the wild; above all, civilization generally and the technoindustrial system particularly. And, for practical reasons, they must have as their ultimate and main goal the elimination of the technoindustrial system. At a "political" level they

---

[1] Adaptation and translation of an excerpt of the letter (in Spanish) written by Último Reducto to Ted Kaczynski (9-26-2017). © Copyright 2018, Último Reducto.

[2] The value of wild Nature is fundamental and irreplaceable. No member of the movement should lack it. Every member should show a sincere and intense natural interest in knowing and respecting the natural world (i.e, the non-human: faun, vegetation, ecosystems, etc.) and in being in direct contact with Nature. And every member should feel that to protect the autonomy of the wild is the main or, even better, the only important reason to wipe out the technoindustrial system. People who say they are against the technoindustrial system, but don't actually feel enough the value of the autonomy of the wild and propose mainly or exclusively, other (social or human) reasons to be against the technoindustrial system, are not reliable. Even though they seem serious and capable individuals, they will pervert the movement diverting it from the goal of destroying the technoindustrial system when the time comes.

have to reject any other end that interferes with the achievement of the main end.

3. *Attitude:* They must show a correct attitude, be willing to devote themselves to work for the cause and to fulfil such commitment with seriousness and formality.

2. *Availability*: In addition to quality, those who are involved in the movement, especially in its beginnings and among those who later lead it, must have availability, that is, they have to be able to devote much time and effort exclusively to the cause. This requires that they have enough resources (economic means, spare time, etc.) and an appropriate situation (independence from other obligations) on a personal level in order to allow them such an investment of time and energy.

3. *Capacity*: The movement, once constituted and in operation, has to obtain enough power (understood as technical, economic and human capacity and resources) to efficiently and sufficiently destroy the *material bases* of the technoindustrial system.

If 1 is met, but 2 is not, the movement will be inefficient and incompetent. If 1 and 2 are fulfilled but 3 is not, the movement will fail. And if 1 or/and 2 are not fulfilled, talking about how to attain 3 is useless or even counterproductive.[3]

For the moment, it is not clear at all, at least from my point of view (from Spain) and basing on my own experience and information (what I know about the people with whom you and I have contacted throughout all these years), that not even a minimum of people who meet 1 has been got together. Most of those who I have contacted, either didn't fulfil *a* directly or/and didn't fulfil *b*, or if they fulfilled *a* and *b*, they ended up failing at *c*. The exceptions are very rare. Much less it has been possible to get together people who fulfil 1 and 2 simultaneously. In this respect, as far as I know, you may be alone (or maybe not even this, as I have said in footnote 3), for now, because the rest of those who I know that, in principle, meet 1, have to devote too much time and effort to some other matters alien to the cause.[4]

---

[3] This is very important, because when we talk about how achieve 3 (strategy, organization, etc.) without having attained 1 and 2 we are, in practical terms, building castles in the air and rambling. Or building the house starting with the roof. Or even worse, building it on rotten foundations: encouraging the creation of a weak and "corrupted" movement from its inception, by promoting that people who don't actually meet 1 or 2 get together and act to achieve 3 (which means that the movement they create will be incompetent, will give a negative image of the cause and of its sympathizers, and/or sooner or later will deviate from the end of destroying technoindustrial society). The priority now isn't organizing ourselves, let alone trying to attain power. Before trying all this, we should find valid and capable people, if they exist, through developing, if possible, a good method to detect people who meet 1 and 2 and to discard, at least, those who don't fulfil 1 (if we also discard those who don't fulfil 2 it is possible that you end up alone, or not even this, taking into account your limitations as a prisoner).

[4] In more than one ocassion you have talked about the creation of a "'professional' revolutionary movement". How can the "revolutionaries"be "professionals" (a "professional" is the person who makes a

After years of contacting and trying to get together individuals who were adequate and seeing the few positive results and the many negative ones, I am now appropriate quality and with the adequate availability to form an efficient and serious movement which has some chance of success in eliminating the technoindustrial system. It is necessary; it is technically and theoretically possible; but is it actually possible in practice? Are there enough people who meet these conditions? If there aren't enough capable, available and committed people (requirements 1 and 2), everything else (requirement 3) is impossible. I am not meaning that there can't be such people somewhere and sometime, but now I certainly have little hope of finding them. I do not refuse to remain open to this possibility, but I am no longer as willing as before to contact and to try to join or to collaborate with more people.

I recognize that I lack enough information about all your contacts and that, thus, I don't know if any of them fulfils 1 and 2 (or even 3). So the above is a mere subjective judgement (but I think that is not completely irrational).

---

living doing a job) if they have to devote themselves to other things in order to survive and if they can only devote part of their limited spare time to the cause after working for a living and fulfiling their other personal obligations?

Note by Último Reducto about his ideological evolution and the present-day validity of his texts

Último Reducto has been sporadically publishing texts with this name since 1996. In all these years an evolution on his ideas has taken place, an ideological refinement of his stances being carried out in the process.

The initial ideas of Último Reducto (like those that expressed, for example, in the publication *Último Reducto* n° 0, 1996), despite already targeting some of its current fundamental values, were highly contaminated by left-leaning ideological influences; especially by some versions of anarchism and by the so-called "animal liberation" movement. After questioning the validity of animal liberationist stances (based, generally, on the sacredness of individual life and/or on the absolute rejection of pain), discovering its deep incompatibility with the defence of freedom and the wild, and

starting to develop an explicit and general rejection of leftism,[1] Último Reducto entered into a stage thatwe could call "anti-domination" (an example of this would be *Último Reducto* n° 1, 2002). This transition stage was marked by: remaining heavily influenced by leftist and humanist ideas and attitudes coming from an anarchism to which Último Reducto still showed a certain affinity and respect; by the idea of freedom of nonhuman animals keeping an excessive presence in his discourse; by presenting already in a clear and explicit way an outright and complete rejection of the techno-industrial system; by giving practical coherence a strategic importance that it actually lacks; and by thinking that reason and will can exert or could come to exert an influence much larger than what they actually can or use to exercise on human behaviour (both individually and collectively). A typical feature of this stage is the practical

omnipresence of the notion of "Domination" in Último Reducto's rhetoric,[2] which gives name to this stage. Último Reducto'sconcept of "Domination" was defined nega-

---

[1] This happened, to a great extent, because of the theoretical nonsense and exaggerations and/or the logical incompetence and irrationality of animal defenders, and thanks to the inestimable intellectual lucidity of Ted Kaczynski, respectively, plus the annoyance and suspicion that Último Reducto has always felt naturally towards many of the leftist and counter-cultural ideas and attitudes.

[2] Maybe this term was not very appropriate, because it is conventionally loaded with connotations typical of leftism currents which actually had nothing to do with the stances of Último Reducto; this is the main reason why currently Último Reducto virtually never uses this term to refer to any outrage against the autonomy of the non-artificial.

tively in relation to the fundamental value of the autonomy of the wild: "Domination" was a name for all that that outraged this autonomy. In this stage, Último Reducto already expressed in a clear way his fundamental values: autonomy of wild Nature, rejection of technoindustrial society (and of civilization in general) and rejection of leftism. During this stage, Último Reducto was developing his basic ideas in more detail and leaving aside stances, ways of doing and values alien to them that came from humanist ideological contaminations in general and leftist ones in particular. All that until reaching a stage (of which *Izquierdismo: función de la pseudocrítica y la pseudorrevolución en la socieda tecnoindustrial* and *Con Amigos Como Éstos... -2007*

and 2009 respectively- are the first examples), which extends until the present, in which Último Reducto's discourse reflects already more theoretical maturity, coherence and strength.

The reason for this notice about Último Reducto's ideological evolution is to serve as a clarification of the possible theoretical contradictions and incompatibilities that the readers of Último Reducto's work could find when comparing contents from different stages. In such cases, the readers should always remember the following rule: in case of incompatibilities between what is said by Último Reducto in his various works, it is most likely that the stance expressed in the most recent work is the one that Último Reducto currently defends (or at least the one that's closest to it).

Último Reducto now identifies fully only with his works from the last stage. Nevertheless, given that it's impossible to prevent independent diffusion of his previous works from happening, it would at least be desirable for the readers to know and take into account all that has been said above.

Some Comments on the communiques from Individualists Tending toward the Wild

After reading the five communiques that the Individualists Tending toward the Wild[1] (ITS) have published on http://liberaciontotal.lahaine.org, Último Reducto (UR) wish to make some comments about these texts:[2]

We are not going to go into the worn and generally sterile debate here about whether or not the use of violence as a means for combating the techno-industrial system is appropriate. Our critiques will go in other directions:

1. It is unfortunate what an overwhelming number of spelling mistakes, syntax errors, failures of grammatical concordance, stylistic defects, punctuation mistakes, etc., appear in ITS' first four communiques, since it makes reading them much more difficult and less attractive for those who might want to do so.

Some probably think this critique is rather superficial, that the content of the communiques is what matters, not their form. And, in a certain way, they are partly right. But, without denying that what they say is what is fundamental, and how they say it is secondary, we must point out that it is also important to take care of form, even though it may only be for purely practical reasons. Terrible grammar and poor style in expressing oneself makes it difficult not only because fewer readers correctly interpret the text, but also because fewer even go through the annoyance of reading it to the end. If almost every line makes you have to stop, forcing you to go back and/or mentally correct the spelling mistakes or reread the sentences over and over trying to imagine the true meaning of what you're reading because of the stylistic and syntax failures, the function of the text as a means of expression and diffusion becomes greatly reduced. Moreover, the fact that ITS uses Spanish so badly in these communiques could make it easier for certain technophiles (and other people who are scandalized by the attacks, verbal or non-verbal, against modern technology, leftist values and civilization) to pass the buck, making superficial critiques of the form and avoiding going deeper into the content of the communiques. For many it will be easier to dismiss ITS as a gang of uneducated people because of their bad grammar and preemptively reject the validity

---

[1] From 27 April 2011, 22 May 2011, 9 August 2011, 21 September 2011, and 19 December 2011, respectively.

[2] What we say in most of these commentaries generally also goes for the communique from the Terrorist Cells for the Direct Attack – Anti-civilization Faction (CTPAD-FA).

of everything ITS says than to force themselves to understand it and work on a serious response to their ideas. If those who position themselves against the techno-industrial system and civilization want their ideas and/or actions to be taken seriously, by their possible allies as well as by their enemies (and this supposes they therefore make their ideas public through texts), they should make clear that they are not a bunch of irrational, ignorant and/or negligent nobodies, forcing themselves to carry out their work in the most competent way possible (even though this implies going to the trouble of learning or exercising certain linguistic skills and adequately revising and correcting their texts before making them public; as well as forming, documenting, etc., in other non-linguistic aspects).

It must be pointed out, in any case, that in their fifth communique (from December 19, 2011, which claimed the attack on Greenpeace), a notable improvement could be noted in this aspect.

2. Also in relation to the use of language, it is worth pointing out that the excessively insulting and contemptuous tone that ITS use not only to refer to technophiles but also to leftists, to the defenders of other versions of anti-civilization theory, and to people in general, is overboard. It is overboard, not because many of them do not deserve contempt, but because expressing it such an exaggerated way does not contribute anything to the rational comprehension of the text and can give the impression (true or not, the practical effects are the same), that the members of ITS suffer a lack of self-control over their emotions and that the hidden aim of their communiques is, after all, to vent.[3] And this could also subtract respectability from their communiques.

3. And, continuing with the practical critique of form, it must be pointed out that ITS' communiques tend to be excessively long and contain redundancies, digressions and unnecessary fragments (for example, Último Reducto are still asking ourselves what the supposed mathematical formula on the principle of causality in their fourth communique was all about). One could say the fundamentals in many fewer words, and that would improve the reading and the readers' comprehension of it.

In fact, mere common sense should have dictated to ITS the convenience of measuring their words and being brief and concise when claiming their actions, even if only so as not to unnecessarily leave a trail.

That is all regarding the practical importance of taking care of form. Below UR will make some critiques about the content of ITS' communiques.

4. It is obvious that ITS have drawn upon on the work of Ted Kaczynski (alias Unabomber or Freedom Club–FC for short) and UR, among others, in expressing

_____

[3] There is certainly reason, in looking at ITS' communiques, to doubt the deep motivation of ITS' actions (or to put it differently: is love of the wild, and the discourse developed based on that value, the real cause of ITS' actions, or only their justification?). But, lacking conclusive facts, drawing conclusions would mean entering into the realm of speculation, so at least for the moment UR will leave this important question open.

themselves.[4] But it must be pointed out that, in UR's opinion[5], ITS have misinterpreted some aspects of Kaczynski's ideas, despite it being obvious that ITS have understood them for the most part (something that cannot be said for most of those who believe themselves in affinity with him, nor for the majority of his critics).

So, in the 2nd communique, ITS lead one to believe that Ted Kaczynksi defends the position of "educating people about the technology that will carry us to our destruction," when Kaczynski has defended no such thing. In fact, he has instead expressed that those who try to combat the techno-industrial system should not waste time or energy trying to convince the majority of people that they are right or to join their side (see, for example, Industrial Society and Its Future, paragraph 189[6]).

Also in the 2nd communique, ITS say that "[Kaczynski] also says that a change of values must come from an education taught from now on; [and that] Kaczynski has based his ideas on the French "Revolution" in order to make the example of that during the Renaissance many values began to flourish in Europe in many people's minds and just then the uprising in France arose," and again they are wrong. In the first place, when Kaczynski speaks of a change of values as the prelude of a revolution, he is not referring to educating the masses so that they accept the new values, but rather that a prerequisite for revolutions to happen is that some new values and ideas arise which defy the old ones. He does not in any way speak of "educating" the people, nor that such values should be extended to all of society first or simultaneously through education.[7] And secondly, Kaczynski is educated enough to know that between the Renaissance and the French Revolution several centuries passed ("just then"??). The Enlightenment

---

[4] Much of the discourse and terminology used in their communiques is taken from the writings of Kaczynski and/or UR (although in the cases in which they take UR as a reference, ITS do not say it explicitly). For example, expressions like "surrogate activity" or "power process" are taken from Industrial Society and Its Future (The Unabomber Manifesto) and expression like "System of Domination" or "psychocultural" are characteristic of much of UR's written work.

[5] UR want to clarify that we will draw upon on our own interpretation of Kaczynski's ideas here in order to critique ITS' misinterpretations. The ideal would be for Ted Kaczynski himself to address these points directly, but given the restrictions imposed by his confinement, it is unlikely this will happen. Nevertheless, it is also unlikely that our interpretation of Kaczynski's ideas deviates greatly from the author's original ideas. After more than eight years of exchanging correspondence with Kaczynski and numerous translations of his original texts to Spanish (approved by Ted Kaczynksi himself–see Technological Slavery, Feral House, 2010, page 13), UR believe we are capable enough to be able to point out and critique ITS' misinterpretations. In any case, UR are the only ones responsible for any error or deviation there might be in our interpretations with respect to the original meaning of Kaczynski's ideas.

[6] Due to the poor quality of the great majority of the Spanish editions of this work that circulate around here, UR recommend the following edition: La Sociedad Industrial y Su Futuro, Editorial Isumatag, Valladolid, 2011. Specifically paragraph 189 is on page 131 of this edition.

[7] See, for example, "The Road to Revolution," in Technological Slavery, pg. 222-231, and "The Coming Revolution," in Textos de Ted Kaczynski, Último Reducto (Ed.), Reedición Corregida, 2005, pg. 70-80. Idem.

(which is what Kaczynski spoke of[8]) is one thing, and the Renaissance is another. If one does not know the difference, how do they expect to be taken seriously?

In the same communique, ITS, err in saying that Kaczynski has said that "now many people is [sic] questioning the use of technology, that they are thinking seriously about abandoning it." What Kaczynski has said is that there are ever more intelligent people who seriously question technological progress[9], which is not at all the same. The individuals who are sufficiently intelligent to be able to seriously question technological progress are and will always be a small minority. It is just that, within that minority, there are more and more doing it.

ITS, in their communiques, critique Kaczynksi for defending the concept of revolution. UR will leave until later the discussion of what is correct about this critique and here will only focus on pointing out that ITS appear to not be very clear on what the concept of revolution[10] that Ted Kaczynski defends is, since, for example, they explain that all revolutions seek not only to destroy the preexisting society, but also to build a new one. But in Industrial Society and Its Future, paragraphs 104 (Fourth Principle of History)[11] and 182[12], without going further, FC makes clear that one should not try to create a new society, but only to destroy the preexisting one.[13]

---

[8] Idem.

[9] Idem.

[10] Or however one wants to refer to the hypothetical process by which the collapse of the techno-industrial system would be hastened thanks at least in part to the work of a movement against that system.

[11] Page 76 of the edition mentioned in footnote 6 of this text.

[12] Page 127 of the edition mentioned in footnote 6 of this text.

[13] In reaching some of these false conclusions, ITS have probably based themselves at least in part on the critical commentaries published by UR in "Writings of Ted Kaczynski". Nevertheless, it must be pointed out that the interpretation and critique that UR made of some of Kaczynski's ideas in certain parts of that work (especially in the "critical commentaries") were in some cases not totally correct. Time and deeper knowledge of Kaczynski's ideas have made our understanding of them rather more exact at the present than six months ago. It also seems that ITS has probably taken Writings of Ted Kaczynski and some other old texts by UR (for example, Último Reducto issue 1, spring 2002) as a reference for their critiques of the individuals and groups that are against the techno-industrial system and defend the concept of revolution. But we must point out that, even though we still think the fundamental values and ideas (dealing with the autonomy of the wild, rejection of the techno-industrial society and civilization and disdain for leftism and hippie-ism) expressed in our texts prior to Leftism: A Function of Pseudo-critique and Pseudo-revolution in Techno-industrial Society (2007) are correct, we no longer identify with many of the other ideas expressed in those texts, so it could be that ITS are, at least in reference to UR, criticizing obsolete positions. For example, today UR continue to believe that it is necessary to construct a serious movement that can aspire to effectively oppose the techno-industrial system when the time comes (a point that, as we have said, will be discussed later on), but we no longer believe that movement should refer to itself "revolutionary" (nor that it should call that fight a "revolution"), for purely practical reasons: the term "revolutionary", due to the use it has been given across history and by those who have used it, inevitably carries a semantic cargo that will always bear more problems than benefits for a movement contrary to techno-industrial society that really intends to be effective. The world and history are full of self-denominated "revolutionaries" and of "revolutions" of every kind, and practically none of them is really compatible with a serious and effective opposition

ITS also say, in the 2nd communique, that "... Kaczynski is in a maximum security prison, isolated from the world that surrounds him since 1996; surely

if he left the prison in this very moment, he would realize the error he has made in writing such a vague declaration..." It seems that some of those who speak publicly about Kaczynski without having tried beforehand to even really have contact with him, believe and try to make others believe that Kaczynski is completely incommunicado, totally isolated from the outside. It is necessary to explain that Ted Kaczynksi has not only kept correspondence with people from different countries from the beginning of his incarceration, he also has access to various publications from the written press and the prison's library. And, at least for several years, he has had contact with other prisoners and received visitors. If he was misinformed it would not be primarily due to his seclusion. In fact, in his writing and correspondence he has frequently shown himself to be much better informed of how industrial society functions than many of those who erroneously believe that he is isolated from the world.

5. The scientific rigor of ITS' arguments often leaves much to be desired.

The most obvious, though not the only, example of this is that ITS leads one to understand in their 2nd communique that earthquakes are the product of disequilibrium produced in the Earth by the techno-industrial system, without supporting this idea with empirical data, nor even citing references to research that can point in that direction.

In fact, on many occasions, references to serious works and studies are left lacking in ITS' communiques.

6. Even though going deeply into philosophical discussions is not usually very useful or practical in effectively combating the techno-industrial system, it is necessary to develop and have a minimally solid philosophical basis on which to construct an ideology and an appropriate discourse. And logical contradictions in one's discourse are not exactly a sign of solidity.

For example, ITS should make clear what their real position is toward "absolute truth" (or, what is the same, their position toward relativism) rather than expound on it in such an obviously sloppy and contradictory way as they did in their second and forth communiques. In their second communique (22 May 2011), ITS wield the extremely worn-out relativist cliche that consists of accusing others of believing they "have the absolute truth" in order to criticize the "anti-civilizationists" and "primitivists" who defend the concept of revolution, while in their fourth communique (21 September 2011) ITS try to criticize relativism and admit that they consider "Wild Nature and Individual Autonomy as an absolute and objective truth." That is, ITS, in their second communique, brazenly fall into what they criticize in the fourth. And vice-versa: in the second communique they criticize what they defend in the fourth. This inconsistency

---

to the techno-industrial system. Calling the struggle against the techo-industrial system a "revolution" means favoring the principles and ends of those who seriously oppose the techno-industrial system being misinterpreted and many undesirable self-proclaimed revolutionaries feeling affinity with them when in reality they should be kept at a distance.

does not reflect well on ITS' capacity for logical reasoning, or at least their capacity for correctly and logically expressing their ideas.

But there is something more to say about this whole matter of the defense or denial of the existence of absolute truths. It is a useless and impractical debate when it comes to effectively combating the techno-industrial system. All the time and energy invested in this debate are a waste. Obviously, those who are really against techno-industrial society and civilization and who really love wild Nature do not believe that everything is relative (and, however they call it and whether or not they recognize it, they always take certain things as absolute truths). But not being relativist and knowing that relativism is a sign of pseudo-intelligence, pseudo-rebellion and/or lack of honesty are one thing, and it is another to go around explicitly and spontaneously declaring that absolute truths exist. The first is indispensable, the second superfluous (it only leads us to unproductive digressions and debates). The aim is not to combat relativism. It is enough to not fall into it.

7. Even though one cannot rule out that nanotechnology may manage to pose a serious threat (because of the risk of the so-called "grey goo" or something similar), the distance that exists between the nanotubes and similar nanostructures of the present and those invasive, intelligent nanomachines that are completely autonomous and capable of self-replicating directly by means of the materials of their surroundings–the ones presented to us in science fiction novels or the futuristic speculations of some technophiles–is enormous and will probably be much delayed in being traveled, if it ever manages to be. There are much more imminent threats such as the progressive hybridization of artificial systems with non-artificial systems (for example, the gradual hybridization between human beings and informatic and robotic systems which, in a certain way and degree, is already happening at present: cerebral implants, the implantation of limbs with artificial intelligence, growing psychological and physical dependence on the Internet and mobile phone, etc.), or the mere substitution or elimination of the latter by the former (something that has been increasingly happening over thousands of years and is extending and worsening with every new technological advance. It could be that to a certain point some branches of nanotechnology (those applied to genetic engineering, for example) form an active part in these imminent threats along with many other modern technologies, but they do not constitute the principal core of the threats, and perhaps they are not essential for those threats to be made reality. If one takes all of this into account, perhaps ITS should have better chosen the immediate target for some of their attacks.

8. In their communiques, ITS say they are not defeatist. If by "defeatist" we understand the attitude of abandoning struggle because one considers it already lost, ITS are not defeatist, since they have not abandoned their struggle. But if we understand "defeatist" to mean the attitude that denies in advance all possibility of victory when in reality it isn't clear that no possibility exists, ITS are defeatist, as indicated by their way of understanding the concept of anti-technology revolution (or whatever one wants to call the hypothetical process of demolishing the techno-industrial system,

assisted at least in part by a movement). Let us analyze ITS' way of understanding the anti-technology struggle. It would seem that for ITS there are only two general possibilities of thinking about the struggle against the techno-industrial system: the illusory, or "revolutionary," consists, according to ITS, of believing that a movement against techno-industrial society must be created that is capable of destroying that society through its mere activity (also, according to ITS, of constructing a utopian new society that isn't industrial or civilized) and the realist one, also according to them, consists of attacking the techno-industrial system with the available means without hoping or pursuing its destruction and without organizing any movement. The second strategy, to call it something, would be the one that ITS follows; the first, according to ITS, is the one followed by all those individuals and groups that are against the techno-industrial system and are the target of ITS' critiques in their communiques. UR will not deny that many of those who declare themselves against the techno-industrial system defend[14] proposals that are extremely naive, inefficient and unrealistic about how to carry out the struggle against that system and about what is worth hoping for and pursuing and what isn't as regards that struggle. Even so, ITS seem not to realize the extreme simplicity of the dichotomy they propose. Between fighting without hope, only to never give an inch and to die with our feet planted (launching attacks like ITS'), and fighting for a chimera, overestimating our own abilities (believing in the future arrival of non-industrial or even uncivilized utopias and/or believing that the mere activity of a movement against the techno-industrial society will result in its demolition), there is room for other possibilities that ITS completely passes over.

To begin with, the techno-industrial system at present is certainly too strong to be destroyed solely or principally through the activity of those who fight against it. But in other circumstances, the situation could be different. In the future, the techno-industrial system could suffer a serious crisis, a great enough weakening to cause its own collapse, or at least as to make it susceptible to being successfully destroyed by a movement that was strong and well-organized enough at that time. It is probable that this crisis will happen sooner or later, since the system is presently faced with various serious threats to its survival (from global ecological problems to problems of maintaining its internal functioning and structure) and it is not clear that it will be able to overcome them all easily and without weakening itself. But a movement against the techno-industrial system that is organized and capable enough will not fall from the sky the day this crisis happens (if it does happen), instead it is something that needs to be created beforehand by means of a patient and laborious process of recruitment and organization. This movement, if it manages to constitute and fortify itself enough, could even assist in the arrival of the crisis. In fact, it must try to do this, since the later this crisis arrives, the less likely it will be for something wild to survive the demolition.

---

[14] Here it is worth saying, "we have defended." See footnote 8.

Of course, all of this is only a possibility. It could be that a serious crisis will never happen. It could be that, although this crisis happens, the collapse of the techno-industrial society does not arrive and this society overcomes. It could be that a movement is never created that is organized and strong enough to annihilate the techno-industrial system when the opportunity arrives... But also, there also exists the possibility for these things to happen and for the techno-industrial system to be destroyed in time. And this possibility should not be discarded lightly. Not only because it could be the only opportunity to manage to end with the techno-industrial system, but because it is not absurd. It could happen. And whether this possibility happens depends in part on the attitude toward it (defeatism or hope) adopted by those who today declare themselves against the techno-industrial system.

On the other hand, between fighting without hope of victory, just to not surrender, and fighting with the hope of achieving victory (as small as the possibility of this happening may be), there is a great difference. Human beings normally try much harder, and with greater tenacity, when they hope to be victorious than when they fight without hope. And as we have seen, there is hope even, though it is remote.

As for non-industrial and/or uncivilized utopia, it must be pointed out that utopia and the design or creation of a new society (or world) prior to the destruction of the pre-existing society (or world) is completely naive. It never goes as expected. To dream that after the fall of techno-industrial society a new world without civilization or domination will arise is to not absolutely understand how the world, societies and human nature work. It is not likely that techno-industrial society will at some point collapse (in a way that leaves a habitable environment for the human beings who would probably survive), but it is possible. It is completely impossible that civilization and domination would disappear if human beings survived after that collapse. Wherever ecosystems permit, great and complex new societies would again arise over time (if they did disappear completely in the collapse), and human beings would continue to be human and behave as such in any kind of society, level of technological development, or ecological environment. To a greater or lesser extent, while the world is the world and human beings are human, there will continue to be injustices and abuses, there will continue to be hierarchies, there will continue to be at least certain kinds of imposition and submission, etc. Forever. And even so, that is not a reason to not take as a reference certain forms of society, certain forms of life and certain levels of technological development that have been the least harmful to the autonomy of wild Nature (including human nature). We know that human nature is the product of the evolutionary adaptation produced over hundreds of millennia of hunter-gatherer nomadic existence. That is the form of life we are biologically programmed for. It is not a matter of dreaming that the world will go back to being populated solely by hunter-gatherer nomads again. But we have to keep in mind that, if techno-industrial society collapses at some point, some human beings would be able to return to living in that way (at least for some centuries).

9. ITS end their 3rd communique with the phrase: "Nature is good, civilization is bad," and in their 4th communique they try to explain what they mean. This, like the matter of relativism, is another example of the philosophical tangles that theory and discussions really against techno-industrial society should avoid falling into. Discussing whether Nature is good, whether the techno-industrial system is bad, what is good and what is bad, whether there are absolute or intrinsic values, etc., is completely futile in effectively combating the techno-industrial system. Of course those who really love wild Nature and reject the techno-industrial system and civilization have a morality or ethic, that is, they have some values. They think–consciously or not–that some things are more important or valuable than everything else,[15] and that some other things are incompatible with the important ones–that is, they are bad. And they think that at least some of the bad things are bad in themselves, always and independently from everything else (that is, they are intrinsically and absolutely bad). And their ideological positions arise, obviously, from this moral basis. But it is one thing to have a moral and non-relativist opposition to civilization and it is another to go from there to unnecessarily provoke discussions about morality and get tangled up in them. The first is indispensable and inevitable, the second is superfluous and hardly effective in advancing the struggle against the techno-industrial system.

10. From what one can infer from their communiques, ITS have demonstrated a fairly good understanding of what leftism consists of in broad strokes (which is much more than can be said of the majority of radicals who believe themselves to be non-leftists), but one detail or another makes one suspect that in some concrete aspects related to this topic (as well as in other matters like the rejection of relativism, grammar and the use of language, the

understanding of some of Kaczynksi's ideas, the understanding of the concept of revolution, etc.), ITS are, in any case, still too green.

Perhaps the most significant detail of their incomplete rejection of leftism is their "wager on insurrectionalist immediatism" (2nd communique). ITS seem to not be aware that insurrectionalism, like almost any other kind of anarchism, is leftism, however much many insurrectionalists may rant against the "leftists." Insurrectionalism has not absolutely broken with its historical origins. The insurrectional theoretical basis, terminology and methods are the inheritance of certain branches of anarchism from past ages (and anarchism has almost always been leftism[16]). This, which is obvious

---

[15] UR does not believe in the concept of good, and we prefer not to use the term "good" and its derivatives. To look somewhat deeper into the reasons for this rejection of the concept of good and UR's moral basis, see "El mito de la superioridad e inferioridad absolutas como justificación de la dominación," Último Reducto issue 1 B, note 21, page 103.

[16] And even in the rare cases in which it hasn't been, as may be in the case of Stirner and perhaps some of his followers (and only some), the fact of referring to these ideas with the term "anarchism" has not exactly favored their being recognized as something apart from and completely alien to the majoritarian anarchist currents always based on different libertarian versions of socialism. Normally one puts one (individualists) and the other (collectivists) into the same bag, and takes as given that a minimal affinity exists between any two currents that refer to themselves as anarchists.

in "pure" insurrectionalism, continues to be evident also in green or anti-industrial insurrectionalism.[17] And going into terminological and conceptual subtleties such as differentiating between "anarchy" and "anarchism" (something very proper to insurrectionalist discourse, to be sure) does not invalidate it. The discussion over the two terms/concepts doesn't interest anyone except anarchists or libertarians, and they, almost without exception, are what they are: leftists and/or brainless.

Another detail, although much less important (if ITS' leftist contamination were reduced to just this it would hardly be a problem), is the use of "x" to try to avoid the masculine gender in certain words. Putting aside that this ridiculous custom comes from certain ludicrous feminist (and therefore leftist) theories about the macho nature of language and that it is typical of much of leftism, one must note that attempting to eliminate the masculine gender from words denotes a concern with machismo (and therefore inequality, oppression and injustice in general), which is not typical of those who have really broken with leftism and have realized what is really important, what is it worth fighting for (and/or against) and what is only a decoy for keeping rebellion in good hands. Someone who really cares about wild Nature and really rejects techno-industrial society shouldn't give a damn about combating supposed social ills like machismo (especially imaginary "linguistic machismo"). That is not to mention that ITS, consistent with their deficient use of the rules of traditional Spanish grammar, aren't even able to use the "x" adequately (often they do not place it where one supposedly should place it according to this "anti-sexist grammar", and other times they place it where it shouldn't be placed–for example, "lxs individuos").

11. In relation to the topic of leftism, in their 5th communique ITS say that "the war against academics and technologists is declared (that is more than clear and we have shown it) but also the war against leftism". UR is very much in agreement that leftism is a serious threat for those who want to really damage the techno-industrial system, since the true function of leftism is serving that system as a mechanism of self-defense, self-repair and self-perpetuation. Nevertheless, declaring war on leftism, that is, taking combating leftism as an aim, is a tactical error. And it is an error not because leftism does not deserve to be exposed and rejected. In fact, those who really want to seriously and effectively combat the techno-industrial system should firstly be very clear about what leftism is and learn to identify it (in all of its facets and versions, including the forms of leftism that present themselves as critiques of leftism); and, secondly should very clearly mark their distance from leftism and keep away from it and, vice versa, should keep leftism away from their ideas, discourse, close circle and ranks. Declaring war on leftism is a tactical error because leftism is not worth capturing the attention of those who intend to fight the techno-industrial system beyond the mere critique necessary to keep away from it. The objective that those who really love

---

[17] The CTPAD-FA show that they are more realistic and honest in this sense by also rejecting insurrectionalism and recognizing that they are making their communique public on an insurrectionalist web page only because there isn't a really non-leftist infrastructure of affinity that they can turn to to do this.

wild Nature and hate the techno-industrial system and civilization have to focus their limited energies, time and resource on is fighting against the techno-industrial system, not against leftism. All serious opposition to the techno-industrial system has to have the rejection of leftism as a prerequisite and has to keep separated from it if it wants to stay healthy, well-directed and effective, in the same way that it is necessary to also keep away from individuals who are vague, irrational, pusilanimous, lacking in self-control, etc.. But it would be a mistake and a waste to declare war on them. As in the case of relativism, it is one thing to take care not to fall into it and another to dedicate yourself to combating it.

Here this critique ends for now.

Much less do we now believe that the struggle against techno-industrial society could or should be carried out through the education of the people, the rational, generalized spreading and argumentation of ideas against techno-industrial society or civilization, the development of ways of life and social models consistent with those ideas, etc.

Therefore, whenever readers find contradictions between what is said in different works by UR, they should consider that the position expressed in the most recent writing is the one that UR presently defends (or at least the closest to this).

On the other hand, the majority of the classical supposed anarcho-individualists, like the contemporary individualists who take them as a reference point, are very contaminated by positions that come from socialism (for example, identification with and defense of groups of supposed victims–the oppressed, the working class, the excluded, the marginal, etc.). Even the most recalcitrant anarcho-individualists, like Stirner, who could not be so easily categorized as leftists, leave much to be desired as ideological references, since much of their work is infested with pseudo-rebellious attitudes like relativism or irrationalism.

In light of the situation, referring to oneself as anarchist not only doesn't contribute anything practical to the fight against the techno-industrial system, it suggests the existence of a series of awful ideological references and affinities. And this is something that it is better to avoid.

Critical comments on Ted Kaczynski's "In Defense of Violence"

The article "In defense of violence"[1] is important in order to clarify certain aspects of Theodore John Kaczynski's position on the use of violence. However, there are certain details in this text that are worth commenting on.

First of all, it should be made clear that, as far as Ultimo Reducto (UR) knows, the original article in English was not actually submitted by Kaczynski for publication in any media and was originally only part of Kaczynski's collection of writings, letters and notes in the archives of the Labadie Collection at the University of Michigan. Therefore, it may well be that it was only something of an unfinished draft that Kaczynski considered unsuitable for publication. Somehow, however, it ended up being uploaded to the Internet by someone, and thus turning out being published in practice. If the text was never more than an unfinished draft which Kaczynski never wished to be published in that state, then most of the criticisms below would be worthless and unfair. In such case, UR would appreciate being informed of it in order to remove them and publicly retract. In the meantime, they remain.

That said, let's move on to the criticisms:

- Any regular reader of the blog should already know that UR avoids using certain words typical of Kaczynski's vocabulary, considering them inadequate to denote what they are intended to refer to. Specifically, as far as this case is concerned, UR considers Kaczynski's, certainly rather abundant, use of the word "revolution" to refer to the activity aimed at the destruction of the technoindustrial system by a nonleftist movement contrary to modern technology, whose main value is wild Nature, to be inappropriate and inadvisable, *merely for strategic and practical reasons*.

  In principle, it is not that *technically* the term cannot be applied to such activity nor (in its derived form: "revolutionary") to those who promote and carry it out, but *in practice* to do so is counterproductive, mainly for two reasons.

  First, many terms are conventionally semantically loaded. People tend to interpret them in the way they are most frequently interpreted, not in other, less

---

[1] See: https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/ted-kaczynski-in-defense-of-violence.

common ways, even though sometimes these other meanings may also be technically correct. Thus, most people, when they hear or read the word "revolution" (or for that matter, "revolutionary") tend to think of historical revolutions, such as the American and French revolutions of the 18th century, and especially the multiple communist revolutions of the 20th century (Russian, Chinese, Cuban, etc.). However, none of the historical revolutions have anything to do with what Kaczynski is referring to when he calls the process of intentionally destroying the technoindustrial system a "revolution". So by using this term he is encouraging the public misunderstanding of his ideas and his goal.

And second, in the eyes of many radical leftists who consider themselves "revolutionaries, the term "revolution" carries with it a kind of mystical aura", and therefore they are attracted like flies to any activity or group that bears such a label. Using this term to denote the ideas, activity and movement Kaczynski advocates is not only unnecessary and confusing, but appealing to such leftists. So, for all the emphasis Kaczynski often makes in his texts on keeping leftists away from the movement against the technoindustrial society, he may in practice be attracting them with such things as the use of the term "revolution".

Note that, in general, UR does not disagree about the concept to which Kaczynski refers when he uses the term "revolution", but about the use of that term to denote that concept. Like Kaczynski, UR defends the intentional destruction of the technoindustrial society by a movement for the sake of the autonomy of the wild, but, as stated above, he considers that it is a mistake to use the term "revolution" to denominate this process.

- Now focusing more specifically on the issue of violence, Kaczynski says that "it is true there have been a few primitive cultures that were strictly nonviolent", but is this really *certain*? Actually, at most, it could be stated that there have been a few primitive cultures for which (so far?) no data have been found to prove that they engaged in *warfare*, as perhaps is the case mentioned of the Okanagan. But from there to saying that there *certainly* were *strictly non-violent* primitive societies there is a gulf that reason cannot cross.

  To begin with, Kaczynski should know well that absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. The fact that there is no evidence that they practiced violence does not mean that they *certainly* did not practice violence, it only means that we simply do not know. And, of course, much less do we know it *for sure*.

  Moreover, knowing human nature -of which Kaczynski himself acknowledges that violence is to some extent an integral part-, that a human culture, primitive or otherwise, were completely non-violent would be rather implausible. So, in case of having to bet for one of both possibilities, we should rather lean towards the *inexistence* of past human non-violent societies.

And to continue, it is one thing for a culture to be strictly non-violent and another for it not to engage in war. Violence is something much broader than merely war. That a society is peaceful (i.e., it does not engage in war) does not necessarily imply that it is non-violent. A culture may not carry out war and yet be violent in many other ways. Its members may, for example, murder each other, fight and beat each other, beat up spouses, physically punish children or those who transgress social norms, and so on. And all this is somehing much more difficult to prove from the archaeological record or from anecdotal and unsystematic ethnographic observations of certain witnesses than mere warfare.

- The claims Kaczynski makes about modern warfare are more than questionable in some cases.

First of all, we should wonder what exactly he means by the expression "modern warfare" (supposedly as opposed to "primitive warfare"). Were the Roman invasions, the Crusades or the Napoleonic wars, to give just three examples, "modern wars", were they "primitive wars" or what the hell were they? Because, compared to the 20th or 21st centuries' wars, they were not exactly "modern", nor technologically very advanced, but they were not exactly "primitive" either. Do Kaczynski's claims of "modern warfare" hold true in all cases? A 21st century war, conducted largely from long distances, by relatively small contingents, with technologically very advanced weapons and quite precisely selected targets, can in certain cases have battles with very few casualties compared to many other less modern wars, such as World War I or the wars of the 19th century. So perhaps not every modern battlefield is a "slaughterhouse"... And what about "primitive warfare"? Were all "primitive" wars fought by a few warriors? Did the Amerindian warriors who fought in wars always do so on a small scale and only for self-defense or of their own free will? And the Aztecs, for example, who fought in battles of hundreds or thousands of warriors by order of their emperor to obtain prisoners to sacrifice in the temples of their cities? Were they not also American Indians? Were they not "primitive" (at least at the technological level)? If it cannot be said that they were "cannon fodder" it is only because they did not know firearms.

And secondly, to assert that "today soldiers fight to satisfy the ambition of politicians or dictators" is to fall into a grossly simplistic interpretation of the real and deep causes of today's wars in particular, and of the functioning of the technoindustrial system in general. Kaczynski is well aware that the will of individuals, even the most powerful individuals, has very little influence on the overall dynamics of the development of large-scale and long-term social systems. Soldiers, especially today, actually fight to favor the prevalence and self-perpetuation of those social systems they represent over rival social systems in the competition for access to resources, space and geostrategic control over them. The will of their leaders is, at best, a pseudo-cause, a superficial "cause" to justify the war

in the eyes of the public, if not a mere smokescreen to hide the real root causes and processes.

This case and the previous one (the absence of evidence of violence in certain primitive societies) are just examples of the kinds of simpleness and inaccuracies to which Kaczynski is very prone to use in expressing his message, especially in short articles like this one. However, if Kaczynski falls into such simple-mindedness it is not because he himself is simple-minded, but because he is trying to address a simple- minded audience. The question is: Why does Kaczynski want to get his message across to intellectually mediocre people? And what would be the result if he succeeded in doing so? This imprecision and simplicity in expressing his ideas is not good at the strategic level: it generates repulsion in the most rational, intelligent, rigorous and informed readers (and therefore, those who would be potentially the most valuable as members of a movement against the technoindustrial society) and attracts only the dumbest, intellectually undemanding and ignorant (and therefore, the least valuable and most dangerous for such a movement).

- As for his assertion that "in [many past societies] there was much less stress, frustration, anxiety or other forms of psychological suffering [than in today's technoindustrial society]," there would be a lot to qualify.

First, in *many* cases of past societies, both primitive and not so primitive, the only thing that can be stated categorically is that there is no reliable evidence that their members suffered from *some* psychological disorders or, if they did, of the exact extent and intensity of such disorders, but, as we have seen for violence, this does not necessarily mean that they did not suffer from them at all or that, if they did suffer from them, they always suffered from them to a lesser degree. All it means is that there is insufficient evidence to know it for sure. It actually seems possible and even probable, from certain indirect logical inferences,[2] that Kaczynski is right in certain cases, but it is actually empirically indemonstrable.

Second, it is not the same thing to point out that in today's technoindustrial society certain types of psychological problems are enormously widespread due to the unnatural living conditions imposed by this very form of society, as it is to say that in other societies, primitive or otherwise, such psychological problems were scarcer. More importantly, in order to affirm the former (that in technoindustrial society certain psychological problems are enormously widespread), it is

---

[2] For example, given that our nature (i.e., the psychological traits of our species that are, completely or partly, genetically determined) is the product of a process of evolutionary adaptation to the living conditions of the nomadic hunter-gatherer bands of the Pleistocene, nomadic hunter-gatherer societies would offer the most appropriate conditions for the adequate expression of our nature, from which it could be inferred that in such conditions there would be fewer disturbances in the expression of our nature (our natural behaviour) and consequently those psychological disorders derived from them would most probably be less frequent.

not necessary to discuss the latter (whether psychological problems existed in the past in other societies, and to what degree). It is the former what is important to be pointed out in order to show the incompatibility between the technoindustrial system and human nature. Moreover, the latter can easily be interpreted as idealization of the past and be wielded back against those who, like Kaczynski, use it (more so when, as it is often the case with Kaczynski, it is documented by references to the works of certain anthropologists of dubious reliability).[3]

- Finally, Kaczynski says, "I would prefer to see people living together without causing each other physical, economic, psychological or other harm" and that "the elimination of violence should not be at the top of our list of priorities". At first glance this may seem sensible, but a closer look shows that it is actually not so sensible.

  On the one hand, if "aggression is a normal part of the behavioral repertoire of humans and most other mammals," and therefore violence is an inherent part of both non-human Nature and human nature, then its total absence in a society would be completely unnatural. So Kaczynski, in expressing such a preference for the absence of violence, is taking for granted (probably inadvertently) the prevailing morality in modern society regarding violence and aggressiveness. Namely: violence/aggressiveness is always bad and undesirable, the absence of violence/ aggressiveness is always good and desirable. But is violence/aggressiveness really always bad, and is peace or the absence of aggressiveness always desirable? Even if a completely non-violent world were possible (and it is not), why would one prefer it to a world with some degree of violence and aggressiveness? For example, what is wrong with causing harm to an enemy, or to someone who insults or disrespects you? What is wrong with trying to strike back at someone who has hurt you (or those/that who/which you love)? Or threatening someone who threatens you (or your loved ones)? Or simply spanking or slapping a child who misbehaves? In reality, none of this is *necessarily* (i.e., applied in a measured way) wrong. Indeed, whether one admits it or not, it is part of human nature. When Kaczynski says things like that he would prefer people to live in peace and without aggression he is contradicting himself and shooting himself in the foot, suggesting in reality (surely without even realizing it) that he would prefer artificially unnatural human societies at peace (because in order to achieve the total absence of violence natural human behavior should utterly controlled and manipulated) to a wild world in which the expression of human nature were free (and therefore *necessarily* entailed at least some degree of violence).

---

[3] Although, in this article, Kaczynski does not provide anthropological references to support his claims, in other more elaborate articles he usually does (further evidence that "In Defense of Violence" is probably an article written "for dummies"). Two such unreliable authors who often appear in the bibliographical references of Kaczynski's writings are Colin Turnbull and Elizabeth M. Thomas.

And as for saying that the elimination of violence should not be among the top priorities of the movement against technoindustrial society, more of the same. By expressing himself so clumsily, Kaczynski is actually suggesting that the elimination of violence could in fact be a goal for the movement against the technoindustrial society, although it should be secondary. However, it is not only that the elimination of violence should not be one of such movement's top priorities, it should not be a goal of it at all; neither a priority nor a secondary one!

And the most unfortunate thing is that Kaczynski deep down knows and shares all what UR has said above. To deny or obviate these facts about natural human violence is ignorance and/or hypocrisy. So it is almost incomprehensible that he has fallen into such nonsense. Either he suffers from some confusion about this issue and is irrationally contradicting himself or, more probably, he is simply saying what he thinks readers want to hear (i.e., he is not being honest). And if the latter is the case, who is he trying to cajole and for what purpose? Perhaps those useful "saints" he refers to in the text (in the dubious event that they actually exist)? Useful for what?

Despite all these criticisms, UR agrees with the fundamental idea of the article: violence will be necessary when the time comes as a means to achieve the end of destroying the technoindustrial society.

Critical Comments on Ted Kaczynski's "Ecofascism: An Aberrant Branch of Leftism"

Once again Ultimo Reducto is forced, very reluctantly, to criticize another text by Theodore John Kaczynski: "Ecofascism: an aberrant branch of leftism".[1]

First of all, it is necessary to make clear that Kaczynski is right to repudiate certain authoritarian and racist currents that are presenting themselves as supposedly akin to his ideas (he calls these currents "ecofascism"), yet, given the way he does so in this paper, he errs in certain important respects:

1. To begin with, his notion of "ecofascism" seems to be rather peculiar. In fact, the term "ecofascism" is almost exclusively used (if not coined) by humanists (mostly, but not only, by those of a socialist bent) as an insult to refer to certain ideologies that clash with their anthropocentric and philanthropic prejudices: the ecocentric currents, whether or not they really advocate fascism or any other type of authoritarianism. In fact, in most cases, those to whom the "ecofascist" label is usually applied are not really more authoritarian than those who label them as such. And often they are far less so.

So regarding the term "ecofascism", it happens something quite similar to what happens with the term "fascism": nowadays some individuals (especially some sly and/or intellectually lazy leftists) call "fascism" everything that they do not like or that does not fit into their narrow ideological schemes and intellectual boundaries, whether it is really fascism or not. And likewise, deep ecology, radical conservationists (preservationists), anarcho-primitivists, Kaczynski and even Charles Darwin himself, are all Nazis, ecofascists and the like, according to some humanists.

And secondly, even in the minority of cases where this label is applied to really authoritarian environmentalists, many of them do not actually advocate fascism (i.e., a strongly racist and nationalistic authoritarianism, among other things), but merely other kinds of authoritarian solutions (i.e., strong state measures that try to tightly regulate society to keep environmental impacts at bay).

It is true, too, that there may be certain *very minority* groups and individuals who are calling themselves "ecofascists", and Kaczynski seems to be referring primarily or exclusively to them in his text, but in doing so he is overlooking all of the above

---

[1] Available on line here:https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/ted-kaczynski-ecofascism-an-aberrant-branch-of-leftism.

(which actually represents the most common and mainstream way in which the term "ecofascist" has been used for decades). So, when Kaczynski assumes as valid the term "ecofascist" to refer to these types of individuals or groups, he is not only making an unconventional use of the term "ecofascism", but somehow, in using such term, he is regarding as correct the inaccuracies and abuses committed by the humanists who created and mostly use it.

2. Kaczynski states that "ecofascists", according to him, share at least two traits:

I. They want to create a strictly regulated society in which technology is kept under control, for ecological reasons.

II. They are racists (more specifically, white supremacists).

Let us first comment on (I). Kaczynski says the following in this regard: "ecofascists want a planned society, which simply means that they are socialists, since the fundamental idea of socialism is that of the planned society". As expressed here, Kaczynski is falling into a textbook logical fallacy. That the fundamental idea of socialism is social planning does not necessarily imply that all forms of social planning are socialism, just as the fact that having warm blood is a fundamental trait of mammals does not mean that only mammals are warm-blooded. Moreover, the conclusion "ecofascists are socialists" cannot be logically drawn from the premises "socialists want a planned society" and "ecofascists want a planned society", because neither of them implies that *all* those who want a planned society are socialists (or in other words, that *only* socialists want a planned society). The nonsense/falsehood is equivalent to saying that if a dog is a mammal and a human being is also a mammal, then human beings are dogs (or, for that matter, that dogs are humans[2]).

But even leaving this aside and assuming that, with the phrase "the fundamental idea of socialism is that of the planned society," Kaczynski meant rather that every form of social planning is ultimately a kind of socialism, the argument would still be flawed. As he has done with the term "ecofascism", here Kaczynski is using a very unconventional notion of "socialism" (it seems that, according to him, socialism equals social planning, and vice versa). When most people hear, read or use the word "socialism", they do not think primarily or exclusively of social planning, but of an ideology or social current based *also and especially* on some other fundamental features such as the explicit defense of equality (at least in theory; in practice equality is never achieved); progressivism (i.e., the assumption, in one way or another, of the notion of progress); collectivism and anti-individualism (understood as the exaltation of that what is social, public, communitarian and collective on a large scale - civilization- and putting it above the individual, private initiatives and small-scale groups; for socialists these latter aspects of the humanity must be eliminated as far as possible or, if it is not possible, at least they must always be subordinated to the former); and, derived from these, a negative attitude towards private property and the defense of collective

---

[2] Or translated to the case at hand, that "socialists are ecofascists". This conclusion is as illogical as "ecofascists are socialists".

(mainly state) property and administration.[34] And yes, in order to uphold these ideals and to achieve these goals, socialists usually advocate social planning by some kind of large organization (usually a state or something similar). So Kaczynski is overlooking other defining features of socialism as important as social planning or more, which are nevertheless part of the conventional meaning of the term (the notion that almost everyone has about the term "socialism"). And this, assigning unconventional meanings to terms, is the best recipe for generating confusion, being misunderstood and making it difficult to correctly understand what is meant.

Similarly, to suggest that all forms of social planning are socialism is inaccurate, unless the meaning of the term "socialism" is forced and stretched far beyond what it conventionally means. Attempts at social planning and regulation are a feature of every large society (civilization). All forms of complex societies to date have needed to be managed in order to remain cohesive. Such large and complex forms of society need to plan and regulate their structure and functioning, in some way and to some extent, through the establishment of an administration (usually a state or equivalent). They need to control, alter and restrain the natural behavior of their members and subsets and to coordinate the activity of their members and subsets in order to channel it for the sake of the social system and to prevent certain tendencies of human nature - and even of physical reality- from interfering negatively with the proper functioning of society. So that all civilized societies, no matter their social ideology or their socioeconomic tendency (be they fascist, socialist, capitalist, feudal, absolutist monarchic, parliamentary democratic, theocratic, or whatever), always try to regulate and plan, in one way or another and to a greater or lesser extent, their structure and functioning. It is another thing whether they succeed or to what extent they succeed in each case. However, no one with half brain would say that, given that any form of large and complex society always involves some degree of planning and social regulation, civilization is always a socialism. So not only socialists (or for that matter, fascists) try to plan society, and therefore not every form of social planning implies socialism (or for that matter, fascism).

In the case at hand, if we were to stick to Kaczynski's *sui generis* notion of "socialism" as social planning and nothing else (and, vice versa, of social planning as socialism and nothing else), those supposed "ecofascists" he refers to would logically be a type of "socialists." However, no matter how much Kaczynski explicitly redefines the term

---

[3] Note that footnote 2 of Kaczynski's paper in which he states that the most sophisticated forms of socialism do not *completely* reject private enterprise but only seek to limit it, control it and submit it to the needs of society, does not contradict the fact that socialism always shows a negative attitude towards private initiative and considers that the latter must always occupy a subordinate place with respect to state or collective initiative.

[4] Unfortunately, this is not the first time that Kaczynski chooses and misuses labels and uses unconventional, nebulous, erroneous or inaccurate definitions or notions to refer to some movements, currents or social phenomena. "Anti-tech", "revolution" and sometimes (like in this very article) even "leftism" are some other examples typical of his.

"socialism," many (perhaps most) readers will still identify the term "socialism" with other things with which socialism is conventionally associated, in addition to, and even above, social planning. And in such cases, more alert and rational readers will find too uncanny his insinuations that socialism is *only* social planning and that social planning is *always* socialism, as well as the consequent conclusion that ecofascists are socialists. However much one can find certain parallels between both currents,[5] there are also notorious differences[6] that make most people, in most cases, consider that, on the one hand, socialism and fascism are completely different and even opposite currents and, on the other hand, social planning is not only for socialists. And to suggest the contrary (that socialism and fascism are the same thing and that social planning is only a for socialists), as Kaczynski does, only generates perplexity, diverting attention and thus hindering the understanding of the fundamental idea that Kaczynski intends to give: that ecofascists like socialists want a society, with modern technology, planned and strictly regulated, which makes them enemies of those of us who, above all, wish to destroy the technoindustrial society in order to preserve the autonomy of the wild. When terms are twisted and stretched excessively and unnecessarily to cover things they do not really mean conventionally, they become corrupted and lose their usefulness and meaning. When a word (such as "socialism" in this case) is so carelessly defined that it can mean almost anything, it ends up meaning nothing, and using it does not serve to make oneself understood, but only to create further confusion and make oneself look foolish in the eyes of the public.

As for (II), again, simply many of those who are usually labeled "ecofascists" (i.e., mostly ecocentric radical environmentalists and/or critics of modern technology and civilization on ecological grounds, whether they are right-wingers, left-wingers, or neither), are not racists. They are not even ethnocentric. Some may be nationalists, yes, but some are not, and some are against immigration for ecological reasons, but not because of racism, nationalism or ethnocentrism. Somebody could say that some minority of them are indeed racist anyway. Well, again we basically face the same logical

---

[5] Incidentally, such similarities go beyond advocating planning and intense social regulation and also include such things as the defense of civilization as a social ideal (especially, in *most* cases of both fascism and socialism, some form of *industrial* civilization); the defense of some form of collectivism; or the assumption and defense of some kind of idea of progress. And even, at least in some cases, fascism seems to have borrowed some of these ideas from socialism (not for nothing do certain forms of fascism adopt names such as "National-Socialism" or "NationalBolshevism"). But "being influenced by" is not *necessarily* the same as "being the same as" or "being a type of." So, although their ideologies certainly borrowed certain notions from socialism, no one in their right mind considers Mussolini or Hitler to be paradigmatic examples of socialism, but rather the opposite: staunch enemies of it.

[6] Such differences also go beyond the mere explicit defense of racism by most of the fascist branches (see comments on II below in the text) but not by socialism, and would include, for example, the radical defense of some kind of nationalism by fascist currents, but not so much by socialist currents (the latter tend to be rather internationalist, globalist or universalist); the rejection of equality as a value by fascists but not by socialists (we have already seen that the latter, in theory at least, defend equality as one of their fundamental values); or the generally rather strict respect for private property and enterprise by fascists but not by socialists (see what has been said in this respect in footnote 3 of this text).

fallacy as before: a particular type of a phenomenon should not be confused with the general set of all possible types of that phenomenon. One subset (the racist alleged "ecofascists") is not the complete set (all so-called "ecofascists") and does not necessarily encompass other subsets (the non-racist alleged "ecofascists").

3. Another very serious error in the text related to the issue of racism is to openly defend the "blending of races and cultures". It is one thing to *reject* racism on strategic and practical grounds, since a movement against technoindustrial society that wants to be effective must choose its members basing only on their abilities and their efficiency in performing the necessary tasks within it, regardless of their race, sex, or any other inconsequential trait (for the efficiency of the movement), and quite another and wrong thing to openly and actively (and without any nuance)[7] *advocate and promote* "race and cultural blending". The reasons why the two are different should be obvious (especially to someone in principle as rational and pragmatic as Kaczynski), as well as that the latter is (practically or strategically) wrong and why, but unfortunately it seems that at least the most important ones need to be reminded:

- A movement against the technoindustrial society that claims to be effective must have *exclusively as its only goal the destruction of modern technology and the technoindustrial society* determined by it. The adoption by such a movement of any other goals, such as anti-racism and multiculturalism,[8] would imply that in practice such goals would compete with the goal of destroying modern technology, diverting to them the resources, time and effort of the movement, which in reality should be invested solely in destroying the technoindustrial system.

- Goals such as anti-racism or multiculturalism, and struggles for the so-called "social justice" generally, act as *decoys or distractions* that cajole people and keep their attention diverted away from the main problem involved in modern technology: the subjugation of wild Nature (including the free expression of human

---

[7] In his article Kaczynski does not even qualify that such "racial and cultural blending" should be promoted only within the movement against techno-industrial society or in certain circumstances (which anyway would be wrong, as is explained below in the text), but rather, by not qualifying, he implies that such a movement should promote "racial and cultural blending" also outside itself, all over the world, throughout techno-industrial society and in every context and circumstance.

[8] In his article, Kaczynski says that his rejection of racism or ethnocentrism has nothing to do with "tolerance, diversity, pluralism, multiculturalism, equality or social justice", but he also claims that it is necessary to "promote racial and cultural blending". One can't help wonder what is then *in practice* the difference between "multiculturalism" and "cultural blending" or how "racial and cultural blending" can be promoted and achieved *in practice* without applying and fostering tolerance, diversity or pluralism. Or what is *in practice* the difference between promoting such things and defending "social justice". Whatever Kaczynski says, in principle, and without further nuances or explanations on his part, what he is promoting is basically *militant* anti-racism and multiculturalism, both of them notable examples of "social justice" struggles. So in this text, Ultimo Reducto will call such defence of promoting "racial and cultural blending" by its real names: "(militant) anti-racism", "(militant) multiculturalism" and "social justice".

32

nature). Thus people engage in struggles for or against things that are unimportant (or even sometimes absolute bullshit) compared to the problem posed by modern technology and the social system it determines, and so this problem goes unchallenged.

- Struggles for social justice (such as anti-racism and multiculturalism, in this case) serve as an *escape valve to defuse the social and psychological tension* that the unnatural living conditions in technoindustrial society generate on people, offering them ways to vent their rebellious impulses and hostility that are harmless or even beneficial to the technoindustrial system (pseudo-rebellion). In this way, the system benefits twice: the system by diverting rebellious impulses into the pseudorebellion offered by social justice struggles prevents social and psychological tensions from damaging vital aspects of its functioning and, in turn, people by venting through pseudo-rebelliousness can continue to endure the unnatural living conditions, functioning efficiently and adequately playing their role in the maintenance and development of the system. Or even threefold: social justice is also beneficial to the maintenance and development of the technoindustrial system because it actually points out flaws and problems in the structure and functioning of that system and repairs them; a racism-free and culturally homogeneous world technoindustrial society would be more effective in developing socially and technologically because it would lack the ethnic conflicts that hinder its development today.

- Struggles for social justice (or, for that matter, against social injustice), such as, in this case, militant anti-racism and militant multiculturalism, are a characteristic feature of virtually all forms of *leftism*. Leftists are attracted like flies to any struggle that promotes social justice.

So, by arguing that a movement against the technoindustrial society should actively promote the blending of races and cultures, Kaczynski is favoring attitudes that are beneficial to the development of the technoindustrial system and, in practice, inviting leftists to come closer to him, his ideas and the movement he intends to create. And of course, he is repelling the more sensible and rational readers (who could become potentially valuable members of such a movement) who clearly see the absurdity and harmfulness of his proposal and refuse to buy into it.

Because the spectrum of possibilities around the issue of racism and ethnocentrism is not exhausted by the three options put forward by Kaczynski, in this case for a movement against technology (namely, either to be openly racist and ethnocentric, or not to claim the supremacy of any race or culture but to insist on the separation and preservation of the different races and cultures of the world, or to promote racial and cultural blending). Another, much more sensible and practical option for such a movement would be simply not to attach any importance to racial or cultural differences

when they do not have it (and in the case at hand -i.e., creating and running a movement against the technoindustrial society-, they do not!),[9] neither for combating them nor for promoting them. The fact that the movement must be global implies precisely only this, that what it must give importance to is only the quality and capacity of its members to adequately carry out the tasks necessary to advance towards the goal of destroying the technoindustrial system. And whether these members are white, black, yellow or orange with blue stripes, or whether they are Nubians, Tartars or Visigoths, in principle should be completely irrelevant to how effectively they function within such a movement. Unless we are so foolish as to give importance to that which has no importance and actively promote/combat it needlessly.

4. Another example of inadequate and confused use of terms and logic by Kaczynski in this text is to consider that what he calls "ecofascism" is a type of leftism (for example, in the very title). What are the reasons that Kaczynski gives to affirm this? From what he says in the text we can suppose that, according to him, those "ecofascists" he refers to are leftists because "[t]he ecofascists' fixation with race relates them to leftists, who also have a fixation with race" and because "[t]he ecofascists and ordinary leftists are just two sides of the same (false) coin" (presumably the "coin" he refers to is social planning). And presumably he also regards those "ecofascists" to be leftists because he regards them as socialists, being socialists one of the most common types of leftists. The latter (whether these "ecofascists" are really socialists) has already been disputed above, let us now discuss the other two alleged reasons.

- According to Kaczynski, "ecofascists" have a fixation on race and this "puts then in the same family" with leftists. Even supposing that the racists' fixation on race really is of the same kind and for the same reasons as that of leftists (which could be doubted at least in certain cases) and that this somehow links them to leftists, being related is not the same as being the same, and does not necessarily even imply being closely related. Two relatives are not one and the same person, nor are they the identical (or even necessarily alike). Nor are they necessarily part of the same family unit; they may be very distant relatives. Moreover, Kaczynski should know well that even between close relatives there can come to be great differences and separation and even opposition and enmity. So even in the debatable case that the fixation on race of the "ecofascists" and that of the leftists were really of the same type and involved some relationship between the two, this would not necessarily imply that the "ecofascists" *are* leftists.

---

[9] In reality, there would be much to discuss about the issue of racial and cultural differences and their importance *in general, in other contexts, from other approaches and based on other criteria*. But to discuss it in greater depth and rigor would take us away from the purpose of the present text. Suffice it to point out here that, for practical and strategic purposes, *as far as building a movement against the techno-industrial society and combating such a society is concerned*, racial and cultural differences can and should be considered virtually inconsequential in most cases.

- According to Kaczynski, "ecofascists" and leftists are two sides of the same coin. However, this metaphor of the coin is clearly inappropriate and even logically contradictory to his claim that "ecofascism" is leftism. To begin with, social planning would be more accurately represented by a polyhedron (an object with many faces), not by a flat object with only two sides like a coin. As we have seen, it is not only "ecofascists" and socialists who advocate social planning. And to continue, if "ecofascism" and socialism are two different sides, they are not the same side. Heads are not tails, nor, for that matter, tails heads, although both are part of the same coin. And finally, one side cannot be part of the other, but both are part of the coin. And the coin is not leftism, leftism is only one of the sides, so "ecofascism" is not a type of leftism, just another type of social planning.

So, while one could rightly say that "ecofascism" and leftism share some similar traits (among them the obsession with race), one cannot say without erring or lying that the one is a type of the other, nor suggest that they are the same simply because they share some similar characteristics.

5. As mentioned above, in this text Kaczynski is only reacting and responding to a fairly recent fashion (occurring in the last few years) that has occurred mostly in some online social media, consisting of some right-wingers (usually far-rightists), whatever this means, presenting themselves as Kaczynski's followers and at least some of them presumably as "ecofascists" too.[10] These people have taken only what they like from Ted Kaczynski's ideas (such as the value he puts on the autonomy of individuals and small communities, the positive sense in which he uses the term "power", his antileftist and politically incorrect stance, his critique of modernity, etc.) and perhaps they have some kind of environmental or ecological "awareness", but they are not really against all modern technology and technological development. They are part of the so-called "white trash", "alt-right", right libertarians, reactionaries, etc. They are usually racist and nationalist, though not always, and they are not even always in favor of a highly regimented society or a strong central state.

Kaczynski is absolutely right in trying to repel this kind of irrational riff-raff. Unfortunately the sloppy and not at all intellectually rigorous way in which he has attempted to do so in his article may prove more counterproductive than effective. To scare away authoritarians, racists and other right-wing (whatever you mean by "rightwing") undesirable people and keep them away from us and our ideas, it is not necessary to embrace leftish positions such as actively promoting "racial and cultural blending" or to express oneself in a confusing, simplistic and illogical way. It is enough to make clear and precise what we think, to remind those "rightists" clearly and openly that we are

---

[10] You can see, for example, an article that talks about this trend here: Kiernan Christ, "Why Right-Wing Extremists Love the Unabomber" en *Lawfare*, October 17, 2021 (https://www.lawfareblog.com/why-right-wing-extremists-love-unabomber). See also: Jake Hanrahan, "Inside the Unabomber's odd and furious online revival", *Wired*, 01-08-2018 (https://www.wired.co.uk/article/unabomber-netflix-tv-series-ted-kaczynski).

neither part of their crew nor their allies, that we are neither racist nor authoritarian and that we reject all forms of modern technology and social planning and regulation by large organizations, whether they are called "states", "confederations" or whatever. Basically, it is as easy as that.

The fact that in recent years in some of his texts,[11] Kaczynski seems to be persisting in this line of sloppy "reasoning" unworthy of his true intellectual level does not bode well for the future of the cause against technoindustrial society. There is a great risk that he himself and those who uncritically follow and emulate him, echoing his mistakes, will ruin the movement against the technoindustrial society they intend to create. Even before it emerges.

Let's hope that Ultimo Reducto is wrong, that its fears are exaggerated and that good sense prevails! Time will tell.

See: "Critica a *Anti-Tech Revolution* " (English https://drive.google.Com/file/ d/ 19keZrCRRj HETccM4rM6KYKbKDg49Qm3E/view) version: and "Comentarios criticos a 'En defensa de la violencia" (English https://drive.google.Com/file/d/ 1kwkNTfg8X7Sx27HRRptbbO5riRJnfUWJ/view)

A Brief Comment on Pleistocene "Rewilding"

In the last decades, in ecological restoration circles, certain propositions have been raised under the name of "Pleistocene rewilding". Among them the Zimovs'[1] "Pleistocene Park" stands out. However, in spite of its environmentalist and conservationist appearance, this particular project and Pleistocene "rewilding" generally, have some serious fundamental flaws and imply some serious threats. Some of them are:

1. Projects of Pleistocene "rewilding" are based on the assumption that "Pleistocene overkill" hypothesis is true, but this hypothesis is not utterly proven. What if Pleistocene-Holocene climate change was partially or totally the cause of late Pleistocene extinctions? Should we then get back species that actually could have gone naturally extinct?

2. It is "playing God". It implies further human tinkering with Nature. Much if not all the ecological mess in which we are trapped now is the result of humans increasingly monkeying around with Nature for thousands of years. And we seem not having learnt the lesson still. Fiddling with Nature and with evolution is the problem, not the solution. We are not gods or able masters or managers of Nature; and we can't be. We are not so skilful, wise, and powerful to actively manage, manipulate and control Nature and evolution and simultaneously to avoid the emergence of unexpected serious problems; and we never will. And, so we shouldn't even try.

3. Nature and evolution, to be actually themselves, should be "self-willed", autonomous, wild, not our creation or the product of our manipulations and control. And to adduce "green", environmentally friendly and seemingly conservationist motives and excuses[2] for further human interferences with ecological and evolutionary dynamics doesn't change the fact that these interferences will erase real wildness, not reinforce it. Thus, one can seriously ask what does actually mean the term "rewilding" (or "wild"), if it still means anything at all, when it is used in the theories and projects of the so-called "Pleistocene rewilding"

---

[1] Sergei Zimov and his son, Nikita Zimov.

[2] This refers to the justifications that usually are offered to carry out Pleistocene "rewilding". These range from carbon atmospheric flows and thus climate regulation to "preserving" or even enhancing biodiversity and "improving" ecosystems.

4. "Pleistocene Park" is based on a theoretical rhetoric which has some serious flaws, especially regarding ecology. For example, according to Sergei Zimov, the tundra and the taiga are but "low quality" ecosystems. In fact, he seems to think that the only terrestrial kind of ecosystems that are valuable, important and worth existing ecosystems are grasslands, and that the rest of ecosystems, and especially woodlands, are but the result of the degradation of Pleistocene grasslands. He has rewritten ecological science to adapt it to his particular project and goals.

5. The project is but another Anthropoceniac geo-engineering attempt, with similar anthropocentric ideological justifications and approaches and similar technical traits than other geo-engineering projects (artificially changing and controlling atmosphere and ecosystems in order to keep climate warming in check). And with similar risks (creating or increasing the dependence on artificial and technological control and maintenance of ecosystems for human and non-human survival; unexpected and unpredictable, but most likely certain, bad effects on wild ecosystems).

6. Ecosystems are constituted by many other living beings than megafauna, like invertebrates, microbes, small vertebrates, plants, fungi, etc. and all of them interact to create and maintain the whole ecosystem. Most of those beings aren"t even known (and many won"t ever) in any given extant ecosystem, much less in extinct ecosystems. So what would be recovered or de-extinct never would be a Pleistocene whole ecosystem, not even something remotely similar. The use of the term "Pleistocene" in expressions such as "Pleistocene Park" or "Pleistocene rewilding" is actually but a marketing bait for "selling" this kind of hubristic projects to the funders, states, local administrations, and the masses.

After watching the documentary "Mammoth" (https://vimeo.com/207624364) and other information about the Zimovs" project[3], one is left not only with the criticisms expressed above, but even also with the suspicion that the Zimovs (and especially the

---

[3] Some of those sources are:

- Sergei A. Zimov, "Pleistocene Park: Return of the Mammoth"s Ecosystem", *Science*, vol 308, 6 May 2005.

- Sergei A. Zimov, ""Wild Field" Manifest", 2014.

- https://pleistocenepark.org/science/

- "Siberia"s Pleistocene Park: Bringing Back pieces of the Ice Age to Combat Climate Change", *BBC News*, July 7, 2019: https://www.cbsnews.com/news/siberia-pleistocene-park-bringing-back-pieces- of-the-ice-age-to-combat-climate-change-60-minutes-2019-07-07/

- Martin W. Lewis, "Pleistocene Park: The Regeneration of the Mammoth Steppe?", *GeoCurrents*, April 12, 2012: http://www.geocurrents.info/place/russia-ukraine-and-caucasus/siberia/pleistocene- park-the-regeneration-of-the-mammoth-steppe

- Martin W. Lewis, "Pleistocene Re-Wilding: Environmental Restoration or Ecological Heresy?", *GeoCurrents*, April 14, 2012: http://www.geocurrents.info/place/russia-ukraine-and- caucasus/siberia/pleistocene-re-wilding-environmental-restoration-or-ecological-heresy

son, Nikita) are but a family of charlatans trying to maintain the family livelihood (their source of income) at any cost.

Many people seems to be naively and shallowly left enchanted by the grandeur and spectacularity of the fantastic images of de-extinct Pleistocene megafauna suggested by the project, so few notice the flaws, risks and problems of it and think deeply about them.

- "An Interview with Nikita Zimov, Director of Pleistocene Park", *Animal People Forum*, April 2, 2017: https://animalpeopleforum.org/2017/04/02/an-interview-with-nikita-zimov-director-of-pleistocene-park/

- Alan Wolf, "The Big Thaw", *Stanford Magazine*, September/October 2008: https://stanford-mag.org/contents/the-big-thaw

The Ted K Archive

A text dump on Ultimo Reducto

Ultimo Reducto's blog

www.thetedkarchive.com