

# Ted Kaczynski on 911 politics and policy

Ted Kaczynski

~2000–2013

# Contents

1. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) . . . . .	4
2. Full Letter (August 26, 2000) . . . . .	4
3. Letter Snippet (2001) [Page 3] . . . . .	4
4. Full Letter (October 31, 2000) . . . . .	4
5. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) [Pages 16–17] — On his past support for the US war in Vietnam, etc. . . . .	5
6. Full Letter (October 3, 2001) . . . . .	7
7. Correspondence with UK Professor — On his thoughts about Osama Bin Laden, etc. . . . .	7
<b>7A. Professor to Ted (October 3, 2001)</b> . . . . .	7
<b>7B. Ted to Professor (November 1, 2001)</b> . . . . .	8
<b>7C. Professor to Ted (December 4 2001)</b> . . . . .	8
<b>7D. Ted to Professor (January 14, 2002)</b> . . . . .	10
<b>7E. Professor to Ted (March 12, 2002)</b> . . . . .	10
<b>7F. Ted to Professor (December 4, 2002)</b> . . . . .	12
<b>7G. Professor to Ted (December 12, 2002)</b> . . . . .	12
<b>7H. Ted to Professor (December 18, 2002)</b> — On his support for the US invading Iraq, etc. . . . .	12
<b>7I. Professor to Ted (March 3, 2003)</b> . . . . .	14
<b>7J. Professor to Ted (April 8, 2003)</b> . . . . .	14
<b>7K. Ted to Professor (May 1, 2003)</b> . . . . .	14
8. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) . . . . .	14
9. Full Letter (December 8, 2001) . . . . .	14
10. Letter Snippet (April 26, 2002) [Pages 3–4] . . . . .	14
11. Full Letter (August 6, 2002) . . . . .	15
12. Letter Snippet (August 11, 2002) [Page 2] . . . . .	15
13. Letter Snippet (August 29, 2002) [Pages 1–2] . . . . .	15
14. Letter Snippet from Ted to J. Nitzberg (April 8, 2003) [Pages 9–10] . . .	15
15. Full Letter (April 8, 2003) . . . . .	15
16. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) . . . . .	15
17. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) [Pages 3–4] . . . . .	16
18. Full Letter (May 17, 2003) . . . . .	16
19. Full Letter (July 24, 2003) . . . . .	16
20. Full Letter (August 30, 2003) . . . . .	16
21. Full Letter (September 21, 2003) . . . . .	17

22. Full Letter (October 23, 2003) . . . . .	17
23. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) . . . . .	17
24. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) . . . . .	17
25. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) . . . . .	17
26. Full Letter (September 13[?], 2004) . . . . .	18
27. Letter Snippet from Ted to C.J. McNulty (April 11, 2005) [Pages 5–6] . .	18
28. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) . . . . .	18
29. Letter Snippet #25 from Ted to Dr. Patrick Barriot (June 30, 2007) [Pages 1–2] . . . . .	18
30. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) . . . . .	18
31. Ted to Lydia Eccles — 4/16/09 . . . . .	19
32. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) [Pages 2–3] . . . . .	19
33. Letter Snippet from Ted to Lydia Eccles (September 5, 2011) [Parts of pages 1–4] . . . . .	19
34. Happy Halloween card from wingnutrva.org (November 2, 2011) . . . . .	19
35. Correspondence with John Jacobi . . . . .	20
<b>35A. Ted to Jacobi (July 18, 2012)</b> . . . . .	20
<b>35B. Ted to Jacobi (November 9, 2012)</b> . . . . .	23
36. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) [Parts of pages 1–2] . . . . .	23
37. Full Letter from Ted to Lydia Eccles (April 13, 2013) . . . . .	23
38. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) . . . . .	24
39. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) [Parts of pages 1–2] . . . . .	24

From his jail cell, Kaczynski has kept a close watch on current events, offering his reaction to 9/11, the motivation of Osama bin Laden and other Islamic extremists, the Iraq war, presidential politics and even so-called Tiger Moms.

The selection was curated by Yahoo News.

---

## 1. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date)

If Bill Clinton should be convicted and imprisoned, I would guess that – contrary to what you suggested – they will not put him here. Instead, they will build a special prison just for him. It will be a more-or-less exact replica of a luxury hotel, complete with golf course, swimming pool, etc. ... and, of course, girlfriends.

## 2. Full Letter (August 26, 2000)

Dear [REDACTED]

I apologize for taking so long to reply to your letter of June 20, ...

## 3. Letter Snippet (2001) [Page 3]

... Third, you seem to assume that if a person uses *some* technology, he must consider *that* technology to be good. You might as well say that because the U.S. made war against Hitler in 1941–45, the U.S. must have considered war to be good. If I didn't use any modern technology, I wouldn't even be able to send you this letter, since it will presumably be carried by airplane. I would be completely isolated and therefore unable to fight technology; just as the U.S. would have been powerless to fight the warlike Hitler if it had refused to make war itself.

Sincerely yours,  
Ted Kaczynski

## 4. Full Letter (October 31, 2000)

Dear [REDACTED]

For the first couple of years after I was put in this prison ...

## 5. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) [Pages 16–17] — On his past support for the US war in Vietnam, etc.

Question 7. I've never had anything but contempt for the so-called "60s kids", the radicals of the Vietnam-War era. (The Black Panthers and other black activists are possible exceptions, since black people had then, and still have today, more genuine grievances on the score of discrimination than anyone else does.) I was a supporter of the Vietnam War. I've changed my mind about that, but not for the reasons you might expect.

I knew all along that our political and military leaders were fighting the war for despicable reasons—for their own political advantage and for the so-called "national interest." I supported the war because I thought it was necessary to stop the spread of communism, which I believed was even more dangerous to freedom, and even more committed to technology, than the system we have in this country is.

I've changed my mind about the war because I've concluded that I vastly overestimated the danger of communism. I overestimated its danger partly as a result of my own naivety and partly because I was influenced by media propaganda. (At the time, I was under the mistaken impression that most journalists were reasonably honest and conscientious.)

As it turned out, communism broke down because of its own inefficiency, hence no war was needed to prevent its spread. Despite its ideological commitment to technology, communism showed itself to be less effective than capitalism in bringing about technological progress. Finally—again because of its own inefficiency—communism was far less successful than it would have liked to be in strangling individual freedom. Thirty years ago I accepted the image of communist countries that the media projected. I believed that they were tightly regulated societies in which virtually the individual's every move was supervised by the Party or the State. Undoubtedly this was the way the communist leaders would have liked to run their countries. But it now seems that because of corruption and inefficiency in communist systems the average man in those countries had a great deal more wiggle-room than was commonly assumed in the West. Very instructive is Robert W. Thurston's study, *Lift and Terror in Stalin's Russia, 1934–1941* ...

On the basis of Thurston's information, one could plausibly argue that the average Russian worker under Stalin actually had more personal freedom than the average American worker has had at most times during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This certainly was not because the communist leaders wanted the workers to have any freedom, but because there wasn't much they could do to prevent it...

08460

Question 7. I've never had anything but contempt for the so-called "60's kids," the radicals of the Vietnam-War era. (The Black Panthers and other black activists are possible exceptions, since black people had then, and still have today, more genuine grievances [on the score of discrimination than anyone else does.] I was a supporter of the Vietnam War. I've changed my mind about that, but not for the reasons you might expect. I knew all along that our political and military leaders were fighting the war for despicable reasons — for their own political advantage and for the so-called "national interest." I supported the war because I thought it was necessary to stop the spread of communism, which I believed was even more dangerous to freedom, and even more committed to technology, than the system we have in this country is. I've changed my mind about the war because I've concluded that I vastly overestimated the danger of communism. I overestimated its danger partly as a result of my own naivety and partly because I was influenced by media

## 6. Full Letter (October 3, 2001)

Dear [REDACTED]

Thanks for your letter of September 15. Yes, I did enjoy the book that you sent, and found it very interesting. I don't know why the book was slow to arrive. ...

## 7. Correspondence with UK Professor — On his thoughts about Osama Bin Laden, etc.

### 7A. Professor to Ted (October 3, 2001)

3.10.01

Dear Mr Kaczynski,

It is with some trepidation that I embark on this letter. I don't know how you feel about word-processed letters. On the other hand if I were to write in my own fair handwriting you would not be able to read it at all. This way you have a choice.

I am writing because I was struck by your letter to Louis Michel which I read in his book on MacVeigh. I was actually reading this while doing research at the University of Chicago last month and actually read your letter on the very day of the events of 11<sup>th</sup> September. My interest was because of what you said about convergence between right and left in certain respects. Also because for some reason I found MacVeigh to be a sympathetic figure while I would have supposed his politics and mine were as different as night and day.

I have always considered myself to be on the "left". I came of age with a vengeance in the sixties. I was bom in 1944. In the early seventies I lived in Cuba and after coming back to England I worked for twenty years with Irish Republicans running a support group for IRA prisoners. I have been in every top security jail in Britain and Ireland (as a visitor!) but have no idea what conditions are like where you are — or very little. I have somehow managed to go on earning a living as a university professor and I teach US literature and research in Islamic studies.

In late middle age I am reluctant to let go of my ideals but now have real doubts about my rather gung -ho attitude to the loss of human life which thirty years ago seemed to me a sine qua non of progress — and all this before 11 September. My email is cluttered with memos from Chomsky, Said, Sontag et al pointing out the injustice of bemoaning those deaths when deaths of innocents occur every day in hundreds of thousand through the depredations of imperialism etc etc etc. I have been in Palestine and know what Israeli colonialism looks like. I have Iraqi friends... And yet, and yet ... those deaths in New York, if I am honest, have more deeply affected me. Does that make me a racist? Am I growing conservative? Or is it right to feel affected by such a deeply deliberate and cruel act?

There is more of course. There always is. But you may not choose to pick up the conversation. If you do, I shall write back.

Best wishes,

## **7B. Ted to Professor (November 1, 2001)**

...

Dear Professor [REDACTED]

Thanks for your letter (even though it bears the inauspicious date of October 3 – my brother's birthday). I don't object to word-processed letters.

I'm not sure what you're looking for from me ...

## **7C. Professor to Ted (December 4 2001)**

4 December 2001

Dear Mr Kaczynski,

Thank you for your letter of 1 November. I have taken some time to reply for a variety of reasons, partly to do with work, but also partly because I seemed to be constantly being overtaken by events as it were, and felt unable to respond in a balanced way to your many queries about Islam.

Your take on Islam seems to me accurate in many respects but I am a bit bemused to find that you thought that Bin Laden might not be politically motivated — if you see what I mean. I have read a series of articles in *Time* over the past few weeks. Like you I should be inclined to think what was behind such pieces, however they seem fair enough as far as they go. Prior to 11<sup>th</sup> September I would have made a distinction between Islamism and fundamentalism. I should have said that the former represented an attempt to create a version of Islam for the modern world, that it was highly in the sense of being an ideology which bound its adherents together in a belief system which was subject to revision by a leadership who were open to influences from outside. Fundamentalism I should have defined as a closed system of belief which rejected the modern; whose adherents were bound together by ritual and repetition and which rejected all outside influences in favour of an atavism based on a mythological version of the past. Of course, both of these versions can be seen to be "political" in a larger sense and may have collaborated at some points — Iran is the obvious example. I think Bin Laden's link to the Taliban has mixed my categories.

Before I pursue this train of thought, just let me say that really what we are talking about here has nothing to do with piety, which is an inward and indiscernible dialogue between the individual and their concept of the divine or transcendent and which can not be assessed by anyone else. Bin Laden may appear pious: we have no way of



knowing. However, his representation of himself as pious is highly political — if you see what I mean..

On one level, what has happened is that an extremely wealthy Saudi businessman has bought himself a country — apparently you don't get much of a country for \$10m. This is a purely capitalist transaction. This purchase has been dressed up in the garb of shared religious belief. To be facetious for a moment, one might have expected that the US would have applauded this evidence of the spirit of free enterprise. Yes, I think someone (not necessarily BL) thinks that Islam can be a player in a world power game -I'm guessing the Saudis because of their penetration into Central Asia and Africa. They backed the Taliban and the mullahs who give BL spiritual credibility. I think BL himself is not important. Let's look at the bigger picture: as I write it seems as though the Israelis will declare war on Palestine. This is right up the Saudis street: it will swing all Muslims in the world behind the Saudi backed Hamas. Looking at Saudi Arabia (SA) we can see a perfect example of what you call the resistance to social change accompanied by the use of modern technology. In this scenario Afghanistan is irrelevant except in so far as it allows the US to demonstrate its military superiority and drum up orders e.g. today the Israelis have been showing how good the F16s are.

There is a difference between militant Islam and military Islam. I think that there are many that would believe that Islam could be a great power without industrialisation. They do not see modern technology as being industrial- believing that with sufficient wealth they can purchase what they need and even produce it themselves in a way, which obviates social upheaval. Yes they want Islam to be a world player, but this "Islam" is an external signifier, it has nothing to do with religious belief but is a code for submission to certain authorities different from those of the west — but the power game is the same. The states with small elites such as you describe existed in Iraq before the Gulf War, exists in Iran, Morocco and most of the Gulf States. They are built upon "traditional" societies, which are corrupt, but they "work" because of oil wealth, oppression and family/tribal connections.

I don't agree that cultures possess essential characteristicsrthink what you call recklessness can be attributed to the corruption and power structures but also to resentment on the part of those who feel they belong to the "have nots" while being told what to do by the "haves". I think disasters could well occur in these countries (and Israel, what are they doing to safeguard their "non-existent" atomic program?) But I don't think it's inevitable or part of some innate quality. I think its because people in the Middle East (where I have travelled quite a lot) are intelligent and informed and that they know, e.g., that "their" oil funds the life style they see in American films and TV and they are reasonably angry about it when they look at their crappy governments kept in power by western bought oil or whatever riches their countries possess.

I don't agree with your remark about violence in the Middle East — and find it a bit odd coming from a citizen of the US where recourse to guns seems to be a national affliction.

I think you are probably right about the use of the term racist. I can't remember exactly what I said but I think I was trying to pick up on something that you said in your letter about McVeigh which was in the Michel book. I agree about the deaths and also the lives saved by technology. Having said that, I suppose I have a kind of rage that the image of the plane flying into the building has embedded itself in my memory in a way I can't control. Of course what is happening now on the ground in Afghanistan is invisible. But this is another story.

As for Ireland, certainly when I got involved what was going on was a Civil Rights movement similar to that in the US. An attempt by Catholics to secure the right to self-determination. I could talk at some length about this because I think what has happened is that several different struggles or wars were waged one behind the other. It's too soon to say which one has won out. My purpose was to help those imprisoned for their political beliefs and in the course of my doing that, they became my friends.

I hope I have been able to give a partial response to some of your questions  
Sincerely,

## **7D. Ted to Professor (January 14, 2002)**

Dear Professor [REDACTED]:

Thanks for your letter of December 4. You don't need to be concerned about the fact that it took you some time to reply to my letter ...

## **7E. Professor to Ted (March 12, 2002)**

12 March 2002

Dear Mr Kaczynski,

Now I have to apologize as I realize it is two months since I got your last letter. The reason for my delay in replying is simply to do with pressure of work at this point in the academic year. I hope that by now you have received the book I sent you by John Esposito, which is generally regarded as a good introduction to the some of the main concepts of Islam.

First of all, you criticize Lewis for naivety, which I agree with, but for Muslims there is another problem with his analysis, which is always seen as being pro-Israel. He regards Israel as a modern democracy. I write this the day after 17 Palestinians were killed in Gaza and after the deaths of hundreds of others by modern weaponry supplied by the USA. One Muslim leader interviewed about suicide bombers argued that they would not be necessary if they had the arms available to the Israelis.

In the countries of the Middle East there is a huge gap, cultural and social, between the elites and the majority of the people. The westernization of the elites does not impact on the people at all.

For example, in Saudi Arabia, the royal family live lives which are in defiance of the “wahabism” which it theoretically espouses and which is imposed on the rest of the population. In such countries there can never be representative government. I am not even going to use the word “democracy” but prefer some concept of a government responsive to the wishes of the people which could actually be populist and even centralised control like Cuba, because there is no shared language of identity. Some of my research has been in this area. In some countries the rulers do not even speak the same language e.g. North Africa, Pakistan. In some cases, the ruling elite are different by religion e.g. Iraq, Syria, or by tribe or clan affiliations, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf, Iraq again, Algeria, India.

It is difficult to know what would make people give up these long tried methods of promoting special interests in favor of a common national identity. I think Iran has gone a long way down this path since 1979 and that is why I am most unhappy about the threats being made against Iran by Bush. It seems to me that the last lot of Iranian elections was fairer and more “democratic” than those, which gave you your latest President. At least Iran does not seem to be ruled by big business.

I agree that it is impossible to see any rationale strategy behind the Al Qaeda attacks on 9/11. At the time I was affected for two reasons: I was in Chicago when they happened and I was researching Islamic ideas of jihad and martyrdom that day in the library. I suppose I had a solipsistic moment when I felt I had caused the attacks! For that matter, I had also just read *The Turner Diaries* so when I heard of the attack on the Pentagon I assumed it was a militia attack. I was affected also because I saw it on TV. Although I have been involved with the aftermath of “terrorist” attacks in the past it has always been after the event. To see such a thing as if you were seeing it actually happening was a strange and disturbing experience. My feeling now, is that there was no long term thinking behind the attacks: they were done simply to show that they could do it. After all, no demands were made. My fear is that the US has no long term strategy either and does not at all appreciate that others’ responses will mirror theirs i.e. just as the people in the US appear to have united behind Bush, so Muslims have swung behind Bin Laden, the Palestinians and now Saddam Hussein as they come under attack. I think Bush and Bin Laden would have a lot in common — apart from the fact that their fathers are friends. Both are bigoted fundamentalists who know very little about the world outside a tight knit circle of people who reinforce their egos. If I see anything behind Al Qaeda, it would have to be what it appeared to be, i.e. the Saudis who think that their riches and religious righteousness make them players on the world stage. After all, most of the suicide attackers were Saudi, Bin Laden is Saudi, the money was Saudi... and as they say, “If it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it is a duck”. The Saudis are heavily involved in Central Asia and sub-Saharan Africa. For them Islam is just a weapon in a bid for influence and control. Just as the West uses the empty ideas of “freedom” and “democracy”. All of these are cloaks for power, which is always what it at issue. The trouble is that most social

ideologies involve the individual abandoning autonomy and ceding authority to others. This is the main obstacle in the way of human progress — she said sweepingly!

I'll have to stop there, as my working day is about to recommence. I hope to hear from you soon and let me know if you would like me to send you any more books. Maybe you have thought of writing one yourself.

With Best Wishes,

## **7F. Ted to Professor (December 4, 2002)**

Dear [REDACTED]:

I wish you a Merry Christmas ...

## **7G. Professor to Ted (December 12, 2002)**

Dear Ted:

First I would like to wish you a merry Christmas ...

Ted what do you think that the U.S. should do about Osama Bin Laden? Do you believe that President Bush is too war minded as to Saddam Hussein or is it warranted?  
...

## **7H. Ted to Professor (December 18, 2002) — On his support for the US invading Iraq, etc.**

Dear [REDACTED]

Thanks for your letter and Christmas card. Thank you very much also for ordering the book for me. I appreciate it.

Yes, Colorado can get cold. But compared to Montana, where I used to live, it seems fairly mild.

To answer your questions, I don't know what the U.S. should do about Osama Bin Laden. To tell the truth, I don't read too much in the newspapers and news magazines, so I don't know very much about the situation. But as far as I can make out, nobody knows what to do about Bin Laden.

As for Saddam Hussein, yes, I would guess that President Bush is serious about making war on him. I would guess that it probably is warranted. I don't think all these petty little dictators around the world should be allowed to develop nuclear weapons.

Merry Christmas and Happy New Year,  
Ted Kaczynski

TED KACZYNSKI  
to

December 18, 2002

Dear

Thanks for your letter and Christmas card. Thank you very much also for ordering the book for me. I appreciate it.

Yes, Colorado can get cold. But compared to Montana, where I used to live, it seems fairly mild.

To answer your questions, I don't know what the U.S. should do about Osama Bin Laden. To tell the truth, I don't read too much in the newspapers and news magazines, so I don't know very much about that situation. But as far as I can make out, nobody knows what to do about Bin Laden.

As for Saddam Hussein, yes, I would guess that President Bush is serious about making war on him. I would guess that it probably is warranted. I don't think all these petty little dictators around the world should be allowed to develop nuclear weapons.

Merry Christmas and Happy New Year,

Ted Kaczynski

## **7I. Professor to Ted (March 3, 2003)**

[Not included in this Yahoo selection of letters.]

## **7J. Professor to Ted (April 8, 2003)**

Dear Ted:

How are you doing good I hope. I want to thank you for writing to me before and I really value your opinion. Ted do you think they will ever catch Osama Bin Laden? And are Saddam Hussein days numbered or will he escape? How do you think George W is doing? Ted I'm enclosing \$10.00 money order for your commissary for you to buy a little something. Hope to hear from you and may God Bless you.

Sincerely,

## **7K. Ted to Professor (May 1, 2003)**

Dear [REDACTED]

Thanks for your letters of March 3 and April 8. Thanks also for the ten dollars that you enclosed with your letter of April 8.

I've been excessively busy lately ...

## **8. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date)**

The World Trade Center and the conflict between the West and the Islamic World? I don't think it is only an economic and political matter, ...

## **9. Full Letter (December 8, 2001)**

Dear [REDACTED],

Thanks for your letter postmarked November 30. I very much appreciate the trouble you've gone through in trying to find books for me. ...

## **10. Letter Snippet (April 26, 2002) [Pages 3–4]**

... For the effect of the Industrial Revolution on personal freedom in the U.S., see Hugh Davis Graham ...

## **11. Full Letter (August 6, 2002)**

Dear [REDACTED],

Thanks for the birthday card you sent me. I must admit I've been very slow to acknowledge it. I'm happy to report that I'm doing fine. ...

## **12. Letter Snippet (August 11, 2002) [Page 2]**

... by the intrusion of modern civilization.

By the way, to answer a question that you asked in a recent letter ...

## **13. Letter Snippet (August 29, 2002) [Pages 1–2]**

Dear [REDACTED]:

I apologize for taking so long to answer your letter of June 26. I've had so many problems and pressing matters to deal with that the part of my correspondence that is not time-sensitive has tended to get put on the back burner. ...

## **14. Letter Snippet from Ted to J. Nitzberg (April 8, 2003) [Pages 9–10]**

... basis. I won't waste my time with that. Much more interesting would be a discussion of the psychology of morality, i.e., of why people make the moral decisions that they do. But this is a subject that is rarely discussed in depth, because such discussion would lead to conclusions that most well-socialized people would find unacceptable. ...

## **15. Full Letter (April 8, 2003)**

Dear Ted:

How are you doing, good I hope. I want to thank

## **16. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date)**

In answer to your question, I have no respect for George W. Bush ...

## **17. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) [Pages 3–4]**

... Let me go back to your letter of 3/25/03 and mention something there that I disagree with. On page 3 you wrote, “I usually hang my head in shame when saying I’m a citizen of this country.” You wrote this in connection with your comments about the war in Iraq. I’ll say first that if it’s true that Saddam Hussein was developing nuclear or biological weapons, then one could make a good argument for invading Iraq to disarm him. Of course, the U.S. still hasn’t been able (as far as I know) to turn up any solid evidence ...

But how many countries are better than the U.S.? The U.S., as it happens, is top dog in the world today. If Russia, or China, or some other country were top dog, would they behave any better than the U.S.? Not likely! Given the present technological and economic situation of the world, a ruthless struggle for power among nations is probably inevitable. If you single out the U.S. for blame simply because it is, for the time being, the most successful contestant in the international power struggle, you only distract attention from the real root of the problem, which is the set of technological and economic conditions that make the power-struggle inevitable. I’ve argued with [REDACTED], too, by the way.

\* \* \*

## **18. Full Letter (May 17, 2003)**

Dear [REDACTED]

On the back of these sheets you’ll find an article by McNamara, ...

## **19. Full Letter (July 24, 2003)**

Dear [REDACTED],

I trust you received my letter of June 10. ...

## **20. Full Letter (August 30, 2003)**

Dear [REDACTED],

Yesterday I received your letters postmarked August 21 and August 22. ...



## 21. Full Letter (September 21, 2003)

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for the ten dollars ...

## 22. Full Letter (October 23, 2003)

Dear [REDACTED]

Thanks for your letter postmarked October 15,

## 23. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date)

... What can be done to stop the killing of our soldiers in Iraq? I don't know!

Why do the Iraqis hate us? Probably one of the main reasons is that it hurts their national pride to have their country occupied by a foreign army. I would guess that most Iraqis do not have a clear idea of what they want for the future of their country, and would be dissatisfied with anything that foreigners could do for them or impose on them. And they probably perceive, correctly, that whatever the U.S. does in Iraq it does for its own national interest and not for the sake of Iraqis.

I hope that you and your family will enjoy yourselves over the holidays.

Best regards,

Ted Kaczynski

## 24. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date)

You ask who I would vote for, for president. I actually wouldn't want to vote for anyone for president, because I don't respect any of the politicians. If I had to choose, I suppose I would pick one of the democrats, simply as a lesser evil in comparison to Bush. I'm not sure which democrat.

## 25. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date)

... able to get along without the pain pills.

As for Ronald Reagan, I thought he was pretty much of a jerk. But then, I have an equally low opinion of the rest of our presidents over the last forty years. It seems as if the quality of our politicians just keeps going downhill.

As for the budget deficit, I think it is foolish for our government to spend more than it can afford. You're right about Ray Charles. He was a great musical genius. ...

## **26. Full Letter (September 13[?], 2004)**

Dear Mr. [REDACTED]:

Thanks for your letter of last April 22, ...

## **27. Letter Snippet from Ted to C.J. McNulty (April 11, 2005) [Pages 5–6]**

... I receive Time and Newsweek, and the prison provides a daily copy of the Denver Post for inmates to read. You say that the current U.S. Government is “comical”. I agree that President Bush ...

## **28. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date)**

... these problems. Why can't they correlate modern living conditions with their psychological problems? Actually I would guess that some of them do ...

## **29. Letter Snippet #25 from Ted to Dr. Patrick Barriot (June 30, 2007) [Pages 1–2]**

Dear Dr. Barriot,

Thank you for your beautiful owl card ...

## **30. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date)**

... As for your “morally conservative” classmates who are opposed to stem-cell research – I'm not sure what stem-cell research is. It has something to do with embryos, doesn't it? In any case, I'm opposed to it too, though not necessarily for the same reasons as your classmates. I'm opposed to nearly all scientific research, especially biotechnological stuff. ...

## 31. Ted to Lydia Eccles — 4/16/09

... About Obama ... it's interesting that you worked on his campaign. I at first favored Hillary Clinton for president, but after she was out of the picture I favored Obama. I mean, I don't think any of our politicians are worth a damn, so when I say I "favor" a politician for an office, I just mean that I think he or she is the least of the available evils. I favored Clinton and later Obama mainly because I figured a Democratic president would be much more likely than a Republican to appoint judges and Supreme Court Justices who have some respect for constitutional rights. (From my own experiences with the judicial system I know how important that is!) But now I'm afraid Obama is going to be a big disappointment in that respect. The people he has appointed as Attorney General and Solicitor General both say they think the government should be able to hold alleged terrorists indefinitely without trial. Of course, the government can *claim* that anyone is a terrorist, and if there is no trial that claim is never tested. So in effect the government would be able to lock up *anyone* indefinitely.

Thus, on the basis of Obama's choices for Attorney General and Solicitor General, I don't think there is any reason to hope that he will appoint good judges...

## 32. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) [Pages 2–3]

Thanks for the articles on the oil spill. The prison does subscribe to USA today, and copies of it circulate among the prisoners. Also, there's a slightly daffy person in California who buys me subscription to Time and The Week. So I'm adequately informed about the oil spill. ...

## 33. Letter Snippet from Ted to Lydia Eccles (September 5, 2011) [Parts of pages 1–4]

... First let me comment on the NY Times clippings that you sent me ...

## 34. Happy Halloween card from wingnutrva.org (November 2, 2011)

Hope You Have A Blast  
[Anarchist heart] the  
Wingnuts

[Note by Ted: From {Redacted} with letter dated 11/2/11  
Grossly unfair to Obama!  
—TJK]

## 35. Correspondence with John Jacobi

### 35A. Ted to Jacobi (July 18, 2012)

TED KACZYNKI  
to  
[REDACTED]  
c/o INTERBOOKS  
405 W. FRANKLIN STREET  
CHAPEL HILL NC 27516

July 18, 2012

[Corrected First draft, SAVE. There is no carbon copy.]

Dear [REDACTED]

Thanks for your postcards, which I received on May 22 and July 17, 2012, and for your letter of June 26, 2012, which I received on July 9.

1. In your letter you sent me some fragments of information about terroristic actions. After this, please do not send me any information about illegal actions of any kind. If there is any type of politically motivated illegal activity going on out there, I don't even want to know about it. I'm surprised your letter was even allowed to reach me. Recently someone else tried to send me information about such activities and it was rejected by the prison authorities.

I have to be concerned about the risk that my communications with the outside world might be cut off. See Technological Slavery, page 12. For some time I've been seriously worried that my communications may be cut off if Obama loses the next election. Not that Obama administration is good ...

I wasn't overly concerned about the information that you sent me in a letter a year or more ago, because the attempts at terrorism that you mentioned seemed amateurish and not very successful, so I saw no immediate reason to fear that they would receive any more than minimal attention in the U.S. media. But if anti-tech terrorist activities ever become serious enough so that they get a lot of attention in the U.S. media then the fact that I'm allowed to communicate will have obvious political implications. The prison authorities here know that I've been extremely careful to avoid anything that could conceivably be interpreted as an attempt to incite illegal action of any kind. But the higher-ups in the Department of Justice won't be concerned primarily about whether I'm actually doing anything that encourages illegal activity; their main concern will be the possible political consequences of allowing me to communicate. SO now I

have to worry about the danger that even the Obama administration may cut off my communications at any time if there's more anti-tech terrorism.

The only thing I can do to reduce the risk myself is to keep generally a low profile and especially, avoid even the faintest whiff of any connection with or interest in terrorism. This means if you ever send me any further information about terrorism, or about any other politically motivated illegal actions, I'll have to break off my correspondence with you completely and permanently. For my own protection. The same applies to everyone else I correspond with. As I've said I don't even want to know anything about any illegal anti-tech activities.

Also, for their own protection, I advise everyone involved in legal advocacy of anti-tech ideas to avoid all discussion – even the most innocent discussion – of terrorism or sabotage. At least in the U.S., conspiracy laws make it a crime to “conspire” to do an illegal act, even if the illegal act is never carried out. For example, ...

In line with this, no, I have not been receiving the Earth First! Journal (page 4 of your letter), and I consider it safest not to receive it. So please cancel the subscription you got for me.

2. I'm desperately short of time. Because of my concern that my communications might be cut off at any time after Jan. 2013 if Obama loses, or even a lot sooner if there's more terrorist activity, I'm struggling to get all my main ideas written down, and to arrange for their publication, at the earliest possible moment. So I'm not going to be able to answer everything in your letter. For the present I can only say what follows.

3. Propaganda against “green” technology is good so far as it goes. A point to remember: Energy conservation is useless, because no matter how much energy is provided the system will always expand rapidly until it is using all available energy, and then it will demand more. Same for “green” technology generally. The nature of the system is such that it will always expand rapidly until it comes up against some obstacle to its expansion (shortage of energy, water, food, or something else, environmental pollution, problems of waste disposal; etc., etc.) Then it will push hard and recklessly against the obstacle, with destructive consequences. The only thing green tech accomplishes is to delay, slightly, the destructive collision of system against obstacle. There is no solution except to dump the whole system.

4. The answers to much of what you say can be found in Tech Slavery if you study it closely enough. The propaganda work you are doing, by itself, will never bring victory. As noted in Tech Slavery, p. 269, you can't defeat the system in a head-on propaganda contest. What is needed is to build a (legal) revolutionary organization that will be disciplined, deeply committed, and prepared for decisive action so that when the system gets itself into sufficiently serious trouble (as it will probably do) the revolutionaries will be well prepared to use that opportunity to eliminate the system altogether. Such an organization need not be numerically large. The quality of its personnel will be far more important than their numbers. See Tech Slavery ... the problem is to organize them.

5. Even though the kind of organizing and propaganda work that you are now doing can never by themselves defeat the system, they can nevertheless be highly important in preparing the ground for the real revolutionary organization that I've been referring to. In the Russian Revolution the Bolsheviks were by far the most effective group, and it was they who took control of the revolution. But they couldn't have accomplished much if numerically larger groups, such as the Social Revolutionaries, hadn't created the general revolutionary atmosphere that was a precondition for the Bolsheviks' victory.

6. You say that I have no practical experience in organizing, and you're quite right. Nor am I in contact with anyone but you who is an experienced organizer. So we would love to have your input on the problems of organizing. I've written a critique of Saul Alinsky's book on organizing, *Rules for Radicals*, and I would be extremely pleased if you could find time to write a critique of both of Alinsky's methods and of my critique of them.

I know a young man in Spain named Gonzalo who, as far as I can judge from a brief correspondence, is very promising. He is trying to get people together for serious discussions, and I think that exchanges between you and Gonzalo would be profitable to both of you. I also know some other people with whom you could probably have productive discussions. If you will send me an email address at which you can be reached, I will pass it on to Gonzalo and others. In addition, an email address will enable me to send you my critique of Alinsky, and other materials. Photocopying and ordinary mail are too expensive.

Of course, if you want to have useful discussions with us, you'll have to make time for them. If you take months to answer communications from us, we'll be forced to move ahead as best we can without the benefit of your potentially valuable input on organizing.

7. You ask (page 4 of your letter of 6/26/12): "Why not let people have their utopian visions...?" People whose vision of utopia is focused on issues like gender equality, racism, homophobia, etc., have strong leftist affinities; if their vision of utopia also focuses on not having to work, then they are lazy to boot. These are the kind of people who will ruin an anti-tech movement. You'll see why I wrote "The Truth About Primitive Life" if you will reread "How to Transform a Society", part IV, fourth paragraph from the end, and the corresponding endnotes. I also suggest you reread everything in *Tech Slavery* that talks about leftism – and reread it carefully enough so that you will actually understand my arguments on that subject. You might end up disagreeing with my arguments anyway, but you can't disagree intelligently unless you read carefully enough to understand what my arguments are (which most people don't do).

Yours,

Ted Kaczynski

### **35B. Ted to Jacobi (November 9, 2012)**

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for the beautiful card you sent. It's good to hear from you again. I hope your sister's children are doing OK, and needless to say I hope you're doing OK too.

Any delay in the research that your loss may have caused is of no consequence. Of course, we can make up for lost time; but what is more important is the fact that Obama won the election. The main reason why I was in such a hurry to finish the book was my fear that if the Republicans had won, my communications might be cut off at any time after they took office next January. I don't want to give the impression that the Obama administration is good on basic civil liberties such as the prisoner's right to communicate. It isn't. But in that respect the Republicans are a lot worse.

Of course, it's still possible that my communications could be cut off — I always have that hanging over my head — but since the Obama administration hasn't restricted my communications during the last four years, the chances are that it won't do so during the next four years either. So now I don't need to be in such a rush to finish the book.

If you ever feel able and willing to rejoin the research project, you will be most welcome. If not, I will still remain

Always your friend,

Ted

### **36. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) [Parts of pages 1–2]**

... Obama's victory relieves me of the most intense time-pressure, because now at least I don't have to worry that my communications will be restricted ...

### **37. Full Letter from Ted to Lydia Eccles (April 13, 2013)**

Dear Lydia,

Did you ever receive the \$35.99 I sent you for the book on Chinese history? ...

I hope you were not a spectator at the Boston Marathon.

Love,

Ted

### **38. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date)**

... Thanks for the clipping you sent me ...

### **39. Letter Snippet (Unknown Date) [Parts of pages 1–2]**

Just yesterday, 7/19/13, I received a letter dated 7/6/13 from Valerie in which she briefly explained her Immigration problems ...



# The Ted K Archive

Ted Kaczynski  
Ted Kaczynski on 911 politics and policy  
~2000–2013

[documentcloud.org](http://documentcloud.org)

Feel free to help with typing these letters onto the website, so that it's easier for people to find and refer to sections of letters. For example, it's amusing to note Ted's past support for the US wars in Vietnam and Iraq in letters #5 & #7H.

**[www.thetedkarchive.com](http://www.thetedkarchive.com)**