

The Anti-Tech Perspective On Politics

(A modern analysis based on the philosophies of former
literary references)

Ford Cadman

11/24/21

Contents

The founding principles of American democracy	4
What do we gain from politics	6
How do politics function in terms of technique	8
Modern journalistic portrayal of politics	11
Politics in terms of social environments	13
Analysis of societal interactions between parties	15
The Anti-Tech Apolitical Fundamentals	18
List of Cited Literature	20

I would like to preface this essay with a quote from Jacques Elull's foreword to the American Revised Version of his book *Technological Society*, which I feel best represents the core value of independent journalism.

"I ask only that the reader place himself on the factual level and address himself to these questions: Are the facts analyzed here false? Is the analysis inaccurate? Are the conclusions unwarranted? Are there substantial gaps and omissions? It will not do for him to challenge factual analysis on the basis of his own ethical or metaphysical presuppositions."¹

The American political climate is becoming a caustic environment, an ecosystem centered around hate and opposition. The prospect of unity has been bastardized to a degree never before seen. A situation ultimately made possible by oversocialization through the means of social media and other advanced technologies of the 21st century, bearing close resemblance to issues predicted by many of the Anti-Industrialist scholars whose works helped to standardize the fundamentals of the modern Anti-Tech movement. This essay will predominantly focus on the literary minds of Orwell, Huxley, and Kaczynski; assuming the formality of their philosophies portray an adequate example in modernized terms, we will discuss the political dynamics of their propositions through comparisons with modern social structures. Furthermore, we will format the collaboration of their ideas interchangeably rather than in a chronological manner, solely on the fact that they compare a full spectrum of ideas towards one justifiable conclusion.

¹ This excerpt is one of the greatest representations of Jacques Elull's influence on the birth of Anti-Tech ideas within modern literature. Elull's form of objective interpretation is exactly what is missing in the age of technology, this utter lack of objective analysis has become the heartbeat of mass-media "journalism". I felt that this particular statement in Elull's dialectic tone, is a crucial opening for an essay centered around such sensitive topics. This essay is composed of objective observations, none of which correlate to any political bias save for the blanket assessment of political dysfunction and the relative uselessness of political systems within democratic society. When addressed with such brutish, skeletal topics, those who would be inclined to challenge the substance of such texts through politically driven "moral obligations", are forced by Elull's proclamation to contemplate their own grounding prior to the understandings of the philosophical contexts contained within.

The founding principles of American democracy

First we will discuss the founding principles and purposes of American democratic politics in a minimalistic perspective, concluding the bare essentials of what politics are supposed to represent. As well as the state of politics today

The realm of politics is a fundamental system designed to connect the separate entities of the individual, and the government, as a means of allowing opportunity for representation of public perspectives within legislative and judicial systems. The American political system is designed to function as a tool of debate and rational deliberation, for the purpose of combining opinions amidst merging demographics of a particular social climate, as to assert the best possible solution to be developed along whatever criteria decided upon by the congression of legislative and public opinions.

Initially, American Democracy was intended to be a flowing, open party system, this would by default, hinder the destabilization of political unity. George Washington stated in his farewell address, “The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge, natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated

the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism”. Washington’s statement was issued as a warning to future generations, that if the open party system were to collapse, so would the democratic values of the country they were to be determining the fate of. Washington’s thought was that a binary party system would immediately dissolve any sense of unity amongst the American people, today we know this to be true considering the offensive boundaries of disagreement within the political spheres of American society.

What was once determined as rational debate grounded in social cohesion, has devolved into a state of hatefulness and disagreement concerning *any* opinion asserted by either party. The opposition an idea is to be met with is no longer defined by its effects on social or economic climates, rather it is out of a state of vengeance and retaliation towards whichever faction initially decided to propose said ideas, just as Washington had predicted. Opinions are now refuted by the exaggerated expression of disenfranchising accusations, as well as the overall illogical disagreement of certain identifications aligning with an opposing party.¹

¹ The intention of this statement is to display the concept of biased perception. Individuals are often immediately categorized with a corresponding political denomination when expressing certain

The political factions of modern democracy prefer to develop ideas beneficial only to those in favor of the totality of its agendas. Those who are displaced from the determining factors of a political party's affiliation are misrepresented by the opinions proposed, no matter their range of overlapping agreements. Likewise, if you refuse to self identify with the goals of either party, you are not eligible to fit into their social circles. This is the rift of disagreement that has destroyed modern political systems, between outrageous feats of groundless "activism" (which in effect create further dispositions), and the overall lack of capacity for reasonable discussion, American politics have been tainted by the vengeance and hatred of our own unifying values. We will analyse the efforts of both parties momentarily, to show the contributions they have made to the devolution of democratic function.

opinions that may align with identifying narratives, no matter the true justifications for such opinions. For example, when expressing a positive view on topics such as marijuana legalization, an automatic assumption is made that the holder of such opinions is most likely a Leftist, even though the opinion may have derived from determining factors other than political associations. The idea of an opinion "belonging" to a political group is ludicrous and will only allow for the pronouncement of further opposing ideas based solely on this fact.

What do we gain from politics

In modern times, it becomes difficult to express the benefits individuals receive from political associations. The entire premise of political association has reverted to a state of sociological war, a propagandic battle of psychology rather than a tool to be used for the betterment of all attributed to its reach. In reality, to assume the benefits of political function, we would have to consider the data as a psychological analysis rather than a conglomeration of economic or legislative deliberation. This tactic of understanding is the predominant tool used by the aforementioned authors, in efforts to evaluate the effects of politics from the perspective of the individual. Thus we have based some segments in this essay proportionately on their understandings of socio-political dynamics within the modern industrial world; rather than rewriting the original texts we will use excerpts and quotes to correlate specific analyses.

First we must assume the hierarchy of political function, from the individual to the governing body. The main *economic* beneficiary of politics is ultimately those in charge. Individuals who hold stakes in large manufacturing and distribution corporations receive the most economic benefit, due to their immense contributions to the capitalist system which allows for democratic politics in general. Economic politics of today are no longer determined by the votes of the majority, rather that of the governing body and corporate organizations making such contributions to the system. The succession of monetary power drives us further into a technocratic world, therefore the terms of economic politics have left the spheres of individual deliberation, where technocratic control is no longer in the hands of the working party. Those who hold political opinions on economic function are relatively few, the main focus being on regional economics and mostly for the sake of a hobby rather than making actual contributions to benefitting majority demographics. Although this is a well known subject. There is a scarcity in trying to obscure economic politics from the public due to the public having no control over it in the first place. Considering the majority of people can be categorized into individual roles concerning the aspect of political benefit, we feel it is important to put our focus on the psychological effects of individuals rather than the monetary gain of technocratic super-systems we have no collective affiliations with. The function of corporate power is well documented and better expressed as an independent subject, they have little significance to this essay other than the understanding of how an industrial system functions.

We refer to Kaczynski to better understand individuality, particularly the beginning segments of ISAIF which contain an analysis of the leftist mentality within an

industrialized environment, as well as a general consensus of psychological dilemmas portrayed by oversocialization and the power process.¹

Kaczynski concludes that affiliation with political groups allows minor fulfillment of the power process; by in-vitro association people attain psychological satisfaction through the efforts of the overall group they identify themselves with, no matter the scale of an individual's contribution they attribute the success to their affiliation alone. Thus individuals are psychologically inclined to accept their participation as a gratifying feat even though they, themselves may have played little-to-no active role in the attainment of whatever goal was proposed. Kaczynski also concludes that affiliation with political and activist groups functions as a surrogate activity, an action used to displace the natural gratification of survival instincts lost during the expansion of technological society. Therefore, people are provided an outlet through political activism, to resume their natural habits of acquiring psychological benefit from association and attainment, as a technical means of sociological distraction from the unnatural environment we reside in.

This coincides with certain psychological studies on the functions of group mentality², politics provide stimulation of both attainment processes as well as socialization amidst groups whom we choose to fit in with. An individual's benefit from politics is determined by his susceptibility to social aggregation, and the relief of psychological ailments imposed by the industrial system. An example of this, as Kaczynski explains, is the prominence of inferiority and the need for control over cultural evolution amongst leftists; an assimilation of synonymous factors exhibit a psychological force pushing people towards political activism because it provides a "pseudo-redemption" of missing attainment processes. This subject is discussed in further detail later.

¹ Kaczynski's writings are crucial to the understanding of individual psychology related to the Technological system. *ISAIF* and *TS* are magnificent representations of psychological studies, the objectivity contained within show similarities to the early works of Freud or Skinner. By analysing basic associations with previous psychological standards and the effects of which displayed through collective functions, Kaczynski categorized and described an amazingly dense psychological system that had barely been touched before.

² A great example of group mentality studies that heavily correlate to politics would be the Stanford prison experiment (1971). Adversity between "guard" subjects and "prisoner" subjects quickly developed over a short period of time, eventually resulting in radicalised opposition towards minor infractions, and ultimately physical violence. The similarities to political climates post-election are undeniable, especially when considering tensions resulting from media based antagonism.

How do politics function in terms of technique

This segment is centered around the function of politics in terms of technique, specifically Jacques Elull's definition of the word. Elull defines technique as the "precursor" to technology, a way of integrating technology into a world unfit to do so. Technology always follows a path of efficacy through the use of technique, the predetermining value to its indoctrination into society. We see politics as multiple forms of technique, though we will only discuss those we feel are important to the current expression we wish to make.

When analysing group thinking as a political subject, Orwell tends to provide the best representation. The presence of Goldstein comes to mind, one of the main antagonists to the political structure of *Oceania* in the novel "1984". Goldstein is a character used to exemplify universal hatred as fuel to the fires of tyrannical nationalism, a great source of control for Big Brother, the central political figure in Orwells fictional world. Though this doesn't quite translate well to American politics, we see these same tactics used amongst media, the provision of hatred ultimately *does* fuel the offense of political factions, but that is only a minor technique in the full scale of the situation. This example does represent the body of technique rather, in a manner of idealistic germination, bringing forth the end-goals crucial to attainment of the most efficient foreseeable ends, solutions to problems previously created in the same manner. The hatred of Goldstein is not the only technique influential to this situation, the true Technique surpassing all of the minor subdivisions is in reality the effects of social dilemma, and the consequential interactions between those exposed to the propagandic exhibition of the "most hated figure in Oceania". The social climate born from the spread of such ideas is much more potent than any individual grievances based on the subject's character. The goal of hating Goldstein is simply a technique of minor propaganda, but the Technique of pitting friends and neighbors against one another, obliging them to perceive anyone whose opinions differ from that of Big Brother as a traitor. That is the form of Technique in which systems are truly dependent, one which will bring forth the end goal of cooperation within the system's strict guidelines for social behavior. Few seem to understand how our socializations affect the trajectory of the world around us. When we allow such denunciations to fester, we degrade our individual potential to make any considerable change. In our world this seems to be one of the farthest reaching techniques, enhanced by crucial aspects of politics and media, we allow for our own social engineering through the routes provided by the technical system.

"1984" in its entirety proves many aspects of Elull's Technique, particularly striking are those of socio-political engineering. Orwells overarching technique is clearly stated as "Control via redirection and distraction", further exemplifying the techniques of politics are the slogans of Big Brother. The mantratic sequence, "War Is Peace, Freedom Is Slavery, Ignorance Is Strength" display the fundamentals of political technique as a whole. When attentive only to that of politics, one is distracted from the downfalls of the system, an intoxication of the mind breeds hyperfixation towards what is effectively useless information. The proprietary fulfillment of this useless information acts to decentralize the mind, pushing it towards uncontrolled reformation rather than viable revolutionary action against the Techno-industrial system. Orwell is accredited to be the most realistic 'Fairy-Tale' author of his time, the accuracies of his fictitious worlds parallel only to that of our own, especially when the nuance of reality merges to complete the deeper personifications of his writings. Orwell also held the masterful tendencies of over representation, portraying his ideas and the concepts within them as minimalistic proclamations, most of which developed the trajectory of his intended statement entirely. Thus when expressing Elullian Technique, one may easily gravitate towards Orwell's politically saturated fables, as a means of observing the dynamics of technique in its totality.

As for the modern role of politics, it is difficult to accurately depict in one essay, in fact it would take many compounding essays to provide a full determining value to its influence.

Therefore it is best to generalize a mild comprehension, shallowing a broad social thesis for the sake of brevity. In the most applicable terms, politics function as the technique of obscurity; between futile attempts at reforming disorders birthed by the hands of technology (with said practitioners of reform being oblivious to their beginnings), as well as the redaction of justifiable means to a proper solution, politics prove ineffective at performing the sole function of its existence. Politics became the path of least resistance for technique to pursue, as to artificially enhance the retention of an individual's faith in the larger super-systems which provide the foundations of technological expansion through social engineering. By personifying the good and the bad, technique itself is relieved of burdensome deliberation, allowing the erosion of barriers technology has yet to overtake. When a means becomes inefficient within a governing system, the blame is of those who partook in its original development, leaving room for improvement by those who have yet to take their place, perpetuating a vengeful cycle that functions to fix the wrongdoings of past representative figures and the social climates from which the gestation of their actions became possible.

Orwell often focused on the mentality of "Political Enemies", whether enemies of the state, or enemies of warring nations, the depiction was of a stable representation. Based heavily on communist politics, "1984" proclaims the need for opposition amongst political entities, an ever growing commonality in American Politics. The aforementioned techniques, brought forth a new generation of social battery, through the means and consequential ends of social media, as well as the ever growing presence

of oversocialized “journalism”. Political bias has developed into the driving force of media publication, the agendas of political techniques have taken hold of organizational media allowing it to be used as a tool for the benefit of Industry as a whole.

Modern journalistic portrayal of politics

Within the last decade, American News Media has diverged onto a path of social manipulation; the focus of journalism has turned towards an aversive climate, idolising disagreements between political groups, and blaming one another for the exponential increase of said dispositions. The rise of social media has only aided in the perpetuation of these issues. By giving formidable exposure to the individual through social media, the progressive rate of political unrest has exceeded that of previously wide-spread technologies. The overall heightened awareness of this disparity pushes the relatively dated format of journalistic media to favor defensive representation of biased subjects. Domestic media organizations are now more economically favored when promoting politically controversial topics, predominantly directed towards a specific demographic for the sake of audience inclusion standards. This is the direct cause for political bias amongst previously centristic news publications, one can presume the effects of technique on the industry of media to be decisive in this outcome. Former segments of this essay express the ‘setting of the stage’, as well as the explicable conditions modern political climates thrive, therefore it is understandable in these terms the role of media to an Industrial system, which is none other than to function as a source of propagandic infusion, driving technological ideas further into relevance within our daily lives.

Aside from the physical functions of politics, the environments structured around them act in the form of psychological theatre, especially new media. By entertaining the thoughts and minds of opposition, political groups self-propagate developmental tendencies amongst themselves. Truthfully, today’s idea of journalism is simply stirring the metaphorical pot of social tensions. The bias of media outlets is not only a benefit to their economic success, it also tends to create further issues solely based on the variety of coverage certain topics receive. This is becoming increasingly evident concerning the past decade, when news media has made drastic changes to the presentation of specific topics in hopes of altering public perceptions and assisting the decided trajectory of activism. This is representative of technological solutions evolving into later unforeseen technological problems. Take For example, the coverage of a right leaning protest by a leftist organization. A report such as this is to be expressed in a strategically determined tone, with a specific vocabulary, so as to influence a provocative mindset in the left leaning audience of said organization for the sake of maintaining

a correlating demographic to that of their chosen promoted opinions.¹ This coverage will most likely, (not always but it is becoming ever more typical today), indirectly influence the formation of a counter protest directed against the original interpretation of said opinions based on a directive issued by the news organization in question. These are rarely conscious decisions, there are no men in suits deciding exactly what to say. Like any other modern industry, corporate journalism is designed to exceed profit margins. Therefore when an economic advantage is found in the form of a trendy story to report on, such as a developing protest situation, most news organizations will proceed in using it for as long as possible, which forces the need to influence provocative behaviors in responding parties.

We can observe the provocative dynamics of media in comparison to that of Aldous Huxley's observations on the subject in his essay "*Brave New World: Revisited*". Huxley states, concerning political propaganda that, "Propaganda in favor of action dictated by the impulses below self-interest offers false, garbled, or incomplete evidence, avoids logical argument and seeks to influence its victims by the mere repetition of catchwords, by the furious denunciation of [scapegoats], and by cunningly associating the lowest passions with the highest ideals, so that atrocities come to be perpetrated in the name of god and the most cynical kind of *Realpolitik* is treated as a matter of religious principle and patriotic duty". We can conclude from this excerpt that over 60 years ago, Aldous Huxley had perfectly described the propagandic function of political media in the modern day. Later in the same segment of his essay, Huxley expresses the psychological reasoning behind human susceptibility to propaganda, to quote his findings, "The power to respond to reason and truth exists in all of us. But so, unfortunately, does the tendency to respond to unreason and falsehood - particularly in those cases where the falsehood evokes some enjoyable emotion". With this statement we can presume a correlation to Kaczynski's thinking on the subjects of attainment and gratification of the power process relative to political or social activism.

This segment of the essay has been heavily influenced by Aldous Huxley's "*Brave New World Revisited*", respectfully there is little more to expand upon concerning the conclusion of this segment that hasn't been previously acknowledged by Huxley himself. It is suggested for further exhibition of this particular feature the reader inquires upon Huxley's Perspective in his own words, though a proper resolution can be found within a final excerpt which is seen to be a key point in discerning the state of media as a whole. "The early advocates of universal literacy and free press envisaged only two possibilities: the propaganda might be true, or it might be false. They did not foresee what in fact has happened, above all in our western capitalist democracies - the development of a vast mass communications industry, concerned in the main neither with the true nor the false, but with the unreal, the more or less totally irrelevant. In a word, they failed to take into account man's almost infinite appetite for distractions."

¹ This tactic is one of the staple factors in providing effective propaganda. When trying to direct an individual's thinking, the subject must be expressed in an extensively purposeful manner.

Politics in terms of social environments

Interactions between individuals (including marginal groups, in comparison to larger organizations) have become limited to criteria of political alignments. In the natural world, human psychology, much like that of any other rational animal, sets the basis of risk assessment as a superior prioritative response to the environments we find ourselves in. When reduced to the terms of a technocized world, the social and physical requirements for risk assessment must be supplemented towards more technically involved means, so as to dominate the presence of ignorance, preserving a protective boundary around that of technological society. This supplementation factor has been redirected into the functions of social tensions for the modern man, a thin veil used to obscure the true risks of industrialization.¹ As previously stated, when man becomes enveloped in minor, more attractive issues, he tends to be distracted from the presence of greater evils, those who so often are the relative cause for the minute discrepancies in which we choose to direct our attention.

The steady development of social climates follows a near Darwinian evolutionary path, at the forefront of which is the interactions between groups of differing social acclimations. Political factions tend to feed off of one another, it is logical to assume that the presence of two or more organizations symbiotic in nature, will seek to derive benefits from their opposites for the sake of attaining a degree of mutual equilibrium. In the case of politics, the structural systems founded upon their connectivity cannot thrive in an unbalanced environment. Though we can concur, the technical functions of political ecosystems are exponentially more beneficial to industrial society when hostility and adversity are proportionately incorporated as factors of perpetual development. The pressures and strains of social tensions are the only force strong enough to match the exponential progression of a technocratic world.

Concerning the dynamics of social interactions on the level of individuals or small groups, we can observe differing accumulative factors as catalysts for political associations. The psychological need to “fit in” is present in most if not all of us, though unlike that of our primordial counterparts who relied on socialization as a factor of survival,

¹ The supplementation of primordial needs with technicized mechanisms is not a new concept in terms of behavioral psychology, in fact the majority of early to mid 20th century psychological studies contain some acknowledgment of this process. Although this section of the essay was predominantly inspired by Terrence McKenna’s “Archaic Revival” hypotheses (*Food of The Gods-Bantam ©1992* & *The Archaic Revival ©1991*).

modern man seeks the attainment of social cliques due to the mental benefits we receive from affiliation itself. A competitive nature is embedded in the act of political association, a seemingly masochistic longing to harbor the hatred of an enemy. The domesticated lifestyles we live have stripped the world of its natural risks, ecological factors that we have become genetically inclined to resent for the sake of prolonging our species, thus the representation we are provided through political association allows us to turn our own species against itself, to replace the beasts that once lurked in the darkness just beyond the light of our tribal fires.

Due to the influence of politics creeping further into our daily lives, we are forced to de-rationalize ideas and philosophies, forcing them to fit into the ideation of political prerogatives. The average person only allows themselves to perceive opinions through an overcasting filter, one which applies politically justifying alterations to the subject matter as a means of fitting it into a designated agenda. This harsh climate forces those who identify with specified political doctrines to take offense from any objection to their beliefs, no matter how logical they may be; the assumptions made by objection tend to “justify” political beliefs on the grounds of moral identity alone. The act of opposition only solidifies irrational beliefs, most see objection as proof of success due to the need for something to fight against. Consequently, when a politically based idea receives no opposition, or a previously opposed goal is attained, it will be pushed further until an immoral proclamation is formed, to then obtain the objections needed to keep the cycle in motion. Today we see liberalism as the force of objectionable activism, driving developmentally irrational ideologies further into the spheres of social normality, leaving the goal of opposition to that of conservatism, the push-back force that perpetuates the moral devolution of liberal ideas. This supplements the missing equilibrium in which societal infrastructure is grounded. By replacing the rational, slowly balancing progression of political structures with that of the excessively vengeful cycle we see today, technique can catch up to the exponentially steadfast development of technology.

Analysis of societal interactions between parties

Leftist activism has become a leading factor in promoting societal docility within the Technological System. The ‘social justice movement’ has influenced nearly every facet of public life, between political correctness and the further developing trends characteristic of its prominence such as censorship and the promotion of provocative ideologies, there remains little democratic value to the functions of political structures.¹ On a large scale, leftism acts as an enforcing power to the benefit of the technological system. Obscured by the illusion of rebellion, leftist tendencies portrayed by activists and social justice enthusiasts allow for societal compliance within the regulations of systematic efficiency. When met with the enveloping frustrations of daily living, imposed upon us by the indignities of an industrialized world, many follow the inclinations of rebellion, leading them down a path of a greater inescapable servitude, taking the face of social justice activism.

This perspective is derived from the particular influence of Ted Kaczynski’s essay “*The Systems Neatest Trick*”, in which he concludes that the trajectory of liberal politics is lead solely by justifications beneficial to the technological system, redirecting the possibilities of revolutionary rebellion away from the system itself, and further towards the stagnant debilitating force of social activism. In expression of this process, Kaczynski explains, “Many people do not understand the roots of their frustration, hence their rebellion is directionless. They know they want to rebel, but they don’t know what they want to rebel against. Luckily, the system is able to fill their need by providing a list of standard and stereotyped grievances... racism, homophobia, women’s issues, poverty... In fighting [such issues], they are only doing the systems work for it.” Thus, we see that the social aspects of these minor problems have taken the place of more severe issues in which our attention would be directed. Though these issues are relatively detestable problems within our society, the prospect of reformation eliminates interest in the major problems caused by industrialization. Being blinded by the aspirations of useless revolt, leftist ideologies tend to obscure the fact that many modern issues in which they choose to direct their attention, have been artificially fab-

¹ The use of the word “trend” here is deliberate. As stated, the perpetuation of false identities and void individuality is one of the largest issues present among the concepts of the political left. The overall prominence of social justice issues they intend on pursuing follow a direct path of trendy behavior, and would not be so widespread if they were not advertised as suitable options for coping with industrial stress.

ricated by themselves alone. Kaczynski explains this predicament by stating, “In order to bring themselves into conflict even with that majority of the system’s leaders who fully accept the social changes that the system demands, the would-be rebels insist on solutions that go farther than what the systems leaders consider prudent.”

This technique can be easily observed in organizations such as the LGBT movement, a small fraction of the ever evolving philosophies designed to fill the gaps created when a goal of previous political relevance has been attained. When writing his essay in 2002, Kaczynski only had mild exposure to the vast decree of social justice activism, which began to gain heavy traction in the early 2000’s shortly after his incarceration. During this time for example, the transgender movement, was a minimal effort comprised of few members, though today it has grown to be a commonplace trend proceeding that of the expended gay rights movement present in the late 1980’s-1990’s. We have seen over the last decade that the LGBT movement is based in the leading factors of leftist psychology exhibited in Kaczynski’s ISAIF, such as encompassing feelings of inferiority, which develop through the means of the LGBT movement into the solidified surrogate identities of homosexuality, transexuality, and many other self identified sexual or gender orientations.² Though leftist activists fail to see these self exhibiting issues as no more than the mere creation of a trend, something in which they gave birth to for the sake of creating political unrest and “rebellious” goals to attain later.

By influencing the development of a victimized demographic, activists continue to immerse themselves in the suitable environment they use to escape the world their synthetic issues created in the first place. In continuing the productivity of their activism through this technique, leftists also promote the elimination of lingering ideas harmful to the system’s functionality. Kaczynski states on the subject of this topic, “In this way the activists are able to maintain the illusion that they are rebelling against the system... Those who work against racism, sexism, and homophobia are acting as the systems enforcers: They help the system to suppress the deviant racist, sexist, and homophobic attitudes that cause problems for the system.” The majority of such trends take hold in the youth, who are notably more susceptible to social acclimation. The LGBT movement in particular has become more relevant with younger generations, due to the fact that it allows presence of social identity through sexual orientation, two issues suitable to the fragility of teenage mentalities during puberty. Youth more commonly pursue “trendy” behavior, which allows them to fit in with the harsh social climates of school life and early public socialization, thus the combination of these factors allow younger generations to perceive the LGBT movement as a more attractive identifying issue which gives credible association to peers of their chosen demographic. In expressing the imitations of social justice behavior amongst youth, Kaczynski states,

² Truthfully, the sexual orientation issue is the best modern exmple of exaggruated consequences stemming from oversocialization. The intention of focusing on it as an example in this essay is due to its chronological progression, one can clearly see how over the last few generations its prominence has been artificially prolonged through the provision of additional interconnected categories for new leftists to identify with.

“A youth culture develops in which there is a stereotyped mode of rebellion that spreads through imitation of peers just as - hairstyles, clothing styles, and other fads spread through imitation”

Leftism also functions as a means of absorbing any opposition towards the system, creating a personified target to express one’s disapproval of technocratic function, which has become a symbiotic factor to leftist ideology. By promoting philosophies offensive to the norms of past generations, criticisms that could be directed towards the diseases of technological society, will instead fall onto the provocateurs of reformerist activism. As stated earlier in this essay, it is evident that opposition to leftist ideals only influences further development no matter how irrational or immoral such philosophies may be. Though consequently, resistance creates targets for activists to proclaim enemies as to exemplify their ideologies of oppression and victimization. Take for example, the topic of gender transitions amongst youth, particularly pre-teens and toddlers. This topic has received a proportionate amount of opposition from conservative idealists due to the harmful consequences that may later effect such children, though it seems that the leftist representation of transgender youth has exceeded that of previous eras directly in response to such criticisms. In Kaczynski’s words, “Seeing that they have made someone angry fosters the activists’ illusion that they are rebelling.” Ultimately solidifying the relevance of conservative activism within political function.

Conservatism represents the human nature of *gradual* progression, an evolutionary function negated by the rapid progress imposed upon society by industrial forces. Conservative activism works to refute the propositions of leftism, which also functions as an act of rebelling against the new progressive mentality of a liberalised world for those involved. The two parties exist within a whirlpool of rebuttal, a seemingly infinite skirmish against self propagated issues for the sake of occupying one’s conflicted mind. By allowing oneself to succumb to the entrapment of such irrational behavior, we subdue any possibility of revolutionary potential, backing ourselves into an inescapable pit.

The Anti-Tech Apolitical Fundamentals

Any successful, long lasting resolution to the issues we find embedded in society today, will never be achieved through political associations. They can not be reformed, as the unrealistic fixations of the left imagine, and neither will the clinging grasp of conservatives ever be able to restore the days of old. By indulging in such fantasies we doom ourselves to the frankensteinian fate foretold by the revolutionary minds of our earlier precedents. Politics may work for the sake of bread and circuses', to entertain us by making way for the chase of our own tails, but the degradation of political philosophy has resulted in the bastardization of social cohesion and destroyed any lingering aspect of rational deliberation. We are a divided people, a world of mindless beacons who bestow our trust to the loudest roars of the herd so that we aren't chastised or criticized by our peers. The Industrial system in which our societal grounds are founded has turned us against ourselves for its own benefit, and we accept these terms on the delusional basis that our pointless efforts will somehow result in considerable change. As a society we have little understanding of the harm we are causing to ourselves by feeding into such idiocy.

By compounding relevant, unbiased philosophies, a small group of people can present an objective exponentially more potent than any political agenda in the modern age. A true function of change will be distilled from similar techniques, disparaging any essence of political ideology is a definitive factor in a successful outcome. When politics get involved, tensions soar, and any remnant of hope for an outcome suitable to the initial intentions of such operations will be extinguished. In Kaczynski's "*Anti Tech Revolution*", he explains many of the ideas present in this essay with a more academic persuasion, referring to large historical movements and the factors that directly influenced their success or downfalls. Of the many noted attributions to success, Kaczynski implies heavy emphasis upon the rationalization of an apolitical movement, a simple trait which will ensure such organizations deterrence of corruption, and limit it to one goal in which it must reach above all others. By disabling political influence, the paths a movement must follow and the obstacles it must avoid become limited to a quaint few, ultimately enhancing its chances of successful operation. The social climate of an apolitical organization will become increasingly dedicated to its success as compared to the tensions of differing opinions and goals within political movements, thus there will be no separation of ideas from the social body they were derived from. With this principle, apolitical organizations

will not be subject to the fate of trendy ideologies, keeping the gestation of functional probability within the realms of the few involved rather than spreading at the rate of a social trend, which could dilute its original purpose and representation. A description of the advantages attributed to an apolitical organization are seemingly endless, greatly outweighing the few positives of a politically based movement.

We wish to end this essay with one final address: Those who find themselves delving into politics, for whatever reason, be it primeval gratifications, social conditioning, or personal entertainment, are limiting themselves only to the options handed to them. No considerable movement in history has succeeded in its end goal through the sole use of resources provided by the system they oppose, advantages must be taken, for they are never gained through obedience. In a world consumed by politics, those who wish to make a true difference must think outside the box, they must develop rational ideas, rather than piecing together the trending scraps of “ticky-tacky”¹ activist regimes displayed on silver platters. As a race, we are failing, something that has become increasingly more evident by the nonsensical obsessions with political grievances and the devolution of social structures resulting from them. You will remain helpless, until you learn to help yourselves.

~Ford C.

¹ This is a direct reference to the lyrics of Malvina Reynolds’ and Pete Seeger’s song “*Little Boxes*”, a satirical ballad directed towards the conformist attitudes of the middle class in suburban america. This song is a fair representation of the tone this essay is meant to represent.

List of Cited Literature

1. Elull; *Technological Society*-(*American Revised Edition*)
2. Washington; *Farewell Address*-(*cop.senate.gov*)
3. Kaczynski; *Technological Slavery*-(*Volume One: Revised And Expanded Edition including ISAIF*)
4. Kaczynski; *Anti Tech Revolution*-(*Second Edition*)
5. Orwell; *1984*-(*Penguin, Afterword by Erich Fromm*)
6. Huxley; *Brave New World Revisited*-(*Harper & Row ©1965*)

A critique of his ideas & actions.



Ford Cadman

The Anti-Tech Perspective On Politics

(A modern analysis based on the philosophies of former literary references)

11/24/21

Anti-Technology Collective Library

www.thetedkarchive.com