

# Ted Kaczynski's flirtations with the supernatural

# Contents

Ted's Upbringing . . . . .	3
1979 . . . . .	3
1980 — Two Dreams . . . . .	9
Acting as if animism were true . . . . .	12
1999 — A Fantasy . . . . .	14
2001 . . . . .	17
2002 — The Aftermath of 9/11 . . . . .	17

## Ted's Upbringing

Quoting Ted's 2001 interview with his lady love:

**BVD:** ... I remember reading that your parents were atheists, that you were raised in an atheistic home.

**TJK:** True.

**BVD:** Do you remember your parents ever talking about God? Did they ever say anything like "This is what some people believe..."?

**TJK:** Oh, they did a little bit. For example, if my mother were reading a book to me and something about God were in there, she would explain "Well, some people believe so-and-so, but we don't believe it." That sort of thing.<sup>1</sup>

Quoting Ted's 1959 Autobiography:

My parents, though of Catholic backgrounds, are atheists, and, fortunately, never taught me to believe in God.<sup>2</sup>

## 1979

Ted was briefly being suckered in by some scientific sounding evidence for a spoon bending magician's paranormal beliefs.

Quoting Ted's 1979 Journal:

A couple of months ago I came across a book in the Library titled "The Gellar Papers". It is about certain people, notably one Geller, who can supposedly bend metal, read people's thoughts, and stuff like that, under conditions that would seem to preclude any obvious explanation in terms of the known laws of physics. Of course, there is always a lot of that junk in the popular press, but what is remarkable about this book is that the papers in it are written by people who are represented as having prior backgrounds and excellent credentials in *the hard sciences*. Moreover, the papers are written in very temperate terms, and the authors give no obvious evidence of having an emotional attachment to "far-out" beliefs. I had always assumed that all this telepathy stuff was a lot of crap, and the undisciplined character of most of the stuff that is printed about "psychic"

---

<sup>1</sup> Joy Richards Interview with Ted Kaczynski

<sup>2</sup> 1959 Autobiography

phenomena, flying saucers, astrology, Atlantis, etc., etc., certainly gives ample justification for the opinion that most of this is only believed by certain people because it satisfies their emotional needs.

However, since the physicists and other hard scientists responsible for the papers in this particular book seem to have no *prior* commitment to telepathy or other crackpot beliefs, I am forced to think again. Naturally, this is uncomfortable for me, since no one likes to change his habitual assumptions.

The book strongly suggests that, by application of will, certain individuals are able to mobilize some force not comprehended within the present knowledge of physics and chemistry. Such a suggestion must be viewed with great caution. Such a large part of human mental functioning can be explained in terms of physiology and neurology that there are strong grounds for the supposition that *all* human mental functioning is based on physics and chemistry. (See, for example, *The Nervous System* by Peter Nathan.) Thus, one thinks of the following explanations for the book, which would not require anything outside the realm of physics as we now conceive it: (1) The book is a very cunning hoax (I have not gotten around to checking up to see whether the scientists really exist.) (2) The scientists writing the book fabricated the whole thing for reasons of their own such as money. (Fanley Mowat, formerly Canadian Government biologist, wrote book called “Never cry Wolf”, which he represented as an account of his personal experiences in studying wolves, but according to wolf expert L. David Mech, Mowat’s book is largely a fabrication, and gives a false picture of the wolf.) (3) The scientists writing these papers were not consciously dishonest, but their emotional needs caused them to give a highly distorted presentation. (4) The observed phenomena resulted from known physical forces combining or operating unknown ways to produce very remarkable effects.

However, none of these explanations seem likely. Of course, there is always the possibility of some explanation I haven’t thought of. Still, this book has caused me to reluctantly accept the probability that there is some force operating of a kind that is not currently known to physics.

But experiments of the kind described in the book will probably lead some people to jump to unwarranted conclusions enough associations established by popular literature. It should be remembered that we know *only* what has been established by careful experiment, unverified reports being usually worthless. For instance,

(1) The careful experiments reported in the book provide no evidence for the existence of flying saucers, lost continents, precognition, re-incarnation, ghosts, or gods, or for the validity of the predictions of popular “psychics”

reported in the newspapers. (Twice I wrote down predictions of astrologers in physics for the coming year, as reported in the newspapers; then I checked them again a year later. The rate of success of the predictions was so poor that I probably could have done better myself on the basis of common sense. On the other hand, if these “Geller papers” are on the level, it ought to make us give closer attention to other putative “psychic”-type phenomena, so as to see which ones actually have something to them.)

(2) These Geller papers do not provide evidence for a life after death. According to Peter Nathan’s “The Nervous System” and other books on brain research, practically all the sensations, emotions, thoughts, memories, perceptions, etc. — in short, practically everything we experience, has been shown to be dependent on the functioning of certain parts of the brain. For instance, if one part of the brain is destroyed, certain memories are lost. If another part of the brain is destroyed, the patient permanently ceases to show any evidence of ever feeling angry. If still another part of the brain is destroyed, then the patient ceases to show any evidence of ever feeling any emotion whatever. And so forth.

The obvious conclusion is, that if my whole brain were destroyed, I would thereafter experience nothing whatever.

Still, it is true that, if the human mind is capable of mobilizing some force not currently known to physics, then this raises the possibility that some aspect or attribute of the mind might persist after destruction of the physical brain, since the physical brain (so far as we know) operates according to the laws of physics. However, the experiments reported in the “Geller papers” do not provide any evidence that such a thing actually happens.

The rather tenuous possibility raised by the Gellar papers that I might experience something after death makes me a little hopeful and a little uneasy. On the one hand, it would be nice if life in some form did not have to end, but on the other hand I am displeased by any possibility of being plunged into some experience that I can’t predict, control, or rationally prepare for. On the whole, I would prefer to be absolutely certain that I would experience nothing after death. Of course, this feeling is somewhat colored by religious propaganda about heaven and hell, since I’m amoral and impenitent and would surely go to hell according to Christianity. Of course, I don’t believe in that stuff, and “the Geller papers” gives no evidence or even suggestion in favor of it, but naturally (having read so much literature from earlier times which accepted traditional Christianity) I can’t help being slightly affected emotionally by the fable of hell.

Well, in regard to any possibility of experience after death, the word is... courage! I am attracted to William Henley's famous poem, "Invictus," though I consider it a little too vainglorious...<sup>3</sup>

(3) Probably one of the things that attracts many people to the belief in so-called "psychic" phenomena is this: They imagine that these things provide some kind of escape from the mechanistic view of the human mind that is indicated by scientific results, and they may also imagine that these phenomena promise some kind of free will, — ability to avoid control by "the system."

There is no reason to suppose that the "Geller papers" provide any evidence in favor of free will or a non-mechanistic view of human nature; nor do they indicate any limitations of the scientific method.

Science never claims to know everything. The business of science is, by useful, disciplined observation and experimentation, to construct formal, educative models of various aspects of human experience, that will enable human organization to predict and/or control certain aspects of human experiences.

Since past observation and experimentation is limited, scientific models must be continually revised and/or extended as our information comes to light. This does not mean older models are proven worthless. What it does mean is that older models are replaced by newer models that are either more accurate, or applicable over a wider range of conditions than the older models.

---

<sup>3</sup> Here is the Invictus Poem by William Ernest Henley:

Out of the night that covers me,  
Black as the pit from pole to pole,  
I thank whatever gods may be  
For my unconquerable soul.  
In the fell clutch of circumstance  
I have not winced nor cried aloud.  
Under the bludgeonings of chance  
My head is bloody, but unbowed.  
Beyond this place of wrath and tears  
Looms but the Horror of the shade,  
And yet the menace of the years  
Finds and shall find me unafraid.  
It matters not how strait the gate,  
How charged with punishments the scroll,  
I am the master of my fate,  
I am the captain of my soul.

Thus, scientific models continually provide wider, more detailed, and more accurate pictures of reality. The classic example is the replacement of Newtonian mechanics with relativistic mechanics.

If the “Geller Papers” are on the level, then they seem to indicate that science is about to come to grips with some new force or some new class of phenomena. The probable outcome I think is this: science will eventually bring under control these new phenomena, just as it has brought under control such formerly mysterious phenomena as electricity, radiation, etc. “Psychic” phenomena, if they exist, probably have their own laws, which science will come to understand. “Psychic” phenomena will then be “harnessed”, and turned into tools of “the system”, which tools will be used to control individuals, and also the physical world; just as science has turned other classes of phenomena into tools of the system.

Even if science is for any reason unable to analyse psychic phenomena, it still is probable that these phenomena will be turned tools of the system. Note that Geller is essentially a conformist and (apparently) uses his powers only for purposes approved by the system. If Geller-type powers turn out to have practical utility (as they probably will), then it is safe to assume that The System will organize programs for the following purposes: A. To determine the most efficient ways of utilizing psychic powers for the purposes of the system; B. To identify persons having psychic powers at the earliest possible age; C. To devise special programs for the training and socialization of persons having unusual psychic talents, so as to guaranty that they will use their powers “for the good of society” (i.e., for the purposes of the system) rather than for “irresponsible” (i.e., individualistic) purposes.

If the “Geller papers” are on the level, then it is quite possible that, thirty years from now, we may have government-employed psychics wandering around checking up on our thoughts to make sure we aren’t planning to do anything illegal.<sup>4</sup>

Quoting a letter from Ted to his brother David:

By the way, I remember a few years ago you spoke to me about some woman psychologist whom you saw on television who claimed to have impressive evidence in favor of re-incarnation. You said she cited all kinds of impressive-sounding (alleged) facts. Well, a few years ago when I was back in Lombard there I found a book called *The Geller Papers* edited by some guy named Parati or something like that.

---

<sup>4</sup> Ted Kaczynski’s 1978–79 Journal

It was difficult not to take the book seriously because the papers (those I read, anyway) were by people in the “hard” sciences who claimed to have done experiments under controlled conditions with this guy Uri Geller, and they found he exhibited powers not explainable on the basis of known scientific principles. What was impressive was the fact that there was nothing sensationalistic about the papers and the authors seemed to take a very conservative attitude and made no flat assertions that Geller had any supernatural powers. So I was forced to take the book seriously, though I didn’t like to do so. On the other hand, the thing just didn’t seem right to me — it all just didn’t seem to fit with things that are definitely known, are obvious and simple experiments that I thought ought to have been done. So I always meant to try to do some checking up to see if the book was on the level. But I didn’t get around to it.

However, a few months ago I learned of an organization that goes by the initials CSICOP and publishes a periodical called “the Skeptical Inquirer” (formerly *the Zelectic*) devoted to exposing fraudulent occult and psychic — type stuff. So I wrote them asking about this Geller book. They wrote back referring me to some articles in back issues of their journal. So I ordered the 3 back issues in question (\$2000 altogether, ugh!) It seems that, investigated carefully, these Geller claims look much less impressive. In fact, at one point it was flatly asserted that Geller was a fraud. A very clever trickster. Their investigation of Geller and other psychic-type stuff generally seemed to be very careful and reasonable. On the other hand that pro-Geller book (so far as I read it) had also seemed reasonably and moreover I have learned that people sometimes publish gross distortions if not outright lies, or sound quite reasonable while doing it. Furthermore, some (not all) of the Skeptical Inquirer writers seemed to have an emotional bias *against* this psychic stuff just as strong as the emotional bias that some people have *for* it.

Of course, in a case like this where it is impractical to do one’s own investigating, so that one has to take the word of one side or another as to the facts on which to base a judgement—how can one be sure who is distorting things and who is not? However, I opined that the antipsychic school is right. Naturally, my preferences may be influencing me here, but it does seem to me that all the psychic and occult stuff just doesn’t fit in with the general pattern of definitely established facts, so that, in the absence of very solid evidence for psychic phenomena one would have to reject this. And since the evidence produced by the anti’s is at any rate sufficient to deprive the evidence of the pros of a solidly convincing character, one would have to conclude that the antis are most likely right. Also, some of the statements about Geller, notably the statement that he has been “exposed



as a fraud,” would lay the writers open to a libel suit if Geller were on the level.

If you find all this occult bullshit disturbing and would like to read those 3 issues of the Skeptical Inquirer that I have, let me know and I will send them to you.<sup>5</sup>

## 1980 — Two Dreams

Quoting a letter from Ted to his brother David:

Now here is where I am going to open to you the window to my soul as I would not open it to anyone else, by telling you two dreams that I’ve had about you. The first dream is simple. It is one I had more than thirty years ago, when I was maybe 7 or 8 years old and you were still a baby in your crib. Some time before, I had seen pictures of starving children in Europe taken shortly after world war II—they were emaciated, with arms like sticks, ribs protruding, and guts hanging out. Well, I dreamed that there was a war in America and I saw you as one of these children, emaciated and starving. It affected me strongly and when I woke up I made up my mind that if there was ever a war in America I would do everything I possibly could to protect you. This illustrates the semi-maternal tenderness that I’ve often felt for you.

The other dream is more complex and requires a little preliminary explanation. First of all, I had this dream 2 years ago or so, at a time when I was contemplating making those comments on your psychology (some of which I made in the letter before last), and on your motives for what I consider your self-deception. I had strong hesitations and a certain sense of guilt about what I was planning to say to you because I knew it would hurt your feelings to have my real attitude toward you revealed and also because in attacking your self-deceptions I would be attacking that which, so to speak, gave you hope and preserved your life from being utterly empty. Of course, I figured you would probably retain your self-deceptions no matter what I might say, [CROSSED OUT; like still I felt a certain remorse about attacking you in that place] and moreover, I figure you are tough enough so that even if you were deprived of your illusions you wouldn’t be utterly crushed, even though badly hurt. But still I felt a certain remorse about attacking you in that place. This remorse is clearly mentioned in the dream I am about to recount.

---

<sup>5</sup> Ted Kaczynski’s Correspondence with his Brother David

Furthermore, you are trusting, imitative, and suggestible, so that you are easily influenced by persons who come into contact with you from the right psychological angle. At various times you have been heavily influenced by me, by Dale Edwards, and by Neil Dunlap, among others. One of the reasons why I was irritated by your talking against democracy and in favor of a “philosopher-king” on that occasion which you may remember was because you were so slavishly imitating Heidegger. Those ideas weren’t your own. You had borrowed them from Heidegger. And they weren’t ideas that you selected critically from his works while adding something of your own. You were just *aping* Heidegger — you had fallen under his influence. [CROSSED OUT: {TEXT OBSCURED}]

Also, I suspect that one or two of your friends may take advantage of you, in a sense. Linda Patrick, I suspect, has used you. She has no interest in you as a male, but she knows (knew?) that you were interested in her as a female and she used you as a shoulder to cry on when she had trouble. Has she ever sought you out when she didn’t have some kind of trouble or want a shoulder to cry on? Also, I suspect that Denis Dabbis does not feel anything like the warm and open — heated friendship for you that you feel for him. In some ways I think he is rather like me — self-contained and somewhat cold toward others. For him, friends may be only a source of entertainment. But I may be wrong — I don’t know these people well.

But be that as it may, the charcters in the dream who were dupin gyou and using you represented, in a vague way some of your friends and people under whose influence you have fallen, [CROSSED OUT: normally] especially Dale Edwards, Heidegger, Linda Patrik and Denis Du Bois.

That being said, the dream was as follows. [ADDED LATER: I saw you as you were when you were about 18.]

We were in our old house in Evergreen Park. Our parents were vaguely present but in the background. I was in the living room. You came home and began talking enthusiastically about some people you had just been with and under whose influence you had fallen. They appeared to be some kind of a crackpot cult-group. Soon afterward, 3 members of this cult group came in the door; their object was to tighten their hold on you. They were unmistakeably sinister and sly. As each one came in I confronted him, defied him, and killed him. The last and most sinister of the three I tore to pieces with my bare hands. Then the house was free of these intruders for an interval, but you gave me that the big-shot, the leader of the group, was still to come. And then he did appear at the door. At first he appeared as a short, fat, middle-aged man with a jolly, smiling face, but with something sinsiter about him. He introduced himself as “Lord Daddy Lombrosis.” He

came into the house and walked across the living room to the kitchen, and as he did so he turned into a tall, well-built, handsome man with greying hair, age fifty or thereabouts, with a kindly, paternal, dignified expression on his face: and he looked like a man whome one would respect. He walked across the kitchen to the counter where the sink was turned back to the counter and stood facing us. I felt awed by him and thought, "This is God!" Yet in my heart I defied him. I still felt something in the background that was vaguely sinister. He wanted to do us good, to be kind to us, but the price he demanded was *submission* to him. And moreover I had a vague feeling that his tools were deception and psychological manipulation. I stood between you and him, defying him and keeping you from both what was good and what was evil in what he had to offer. Pretty soon he went and sat on a chair between the stove and the kitchen table. He and I were looking each other straight in the eyes, and soon I had the feeling that he was trying to hypnotize me or gain psychological control over me through some sort of deception. Gradually the room became dark and his face turned into a television screen; the pupils of his eyes became two black dots that flew around on the television screen in symmetrical patterns. I felt here that his slyness and deception were fully revealing themselves. But still I defied him and stood between him and you.

Then the room became light again, the television screen disappeared, and Lord Dadddy Lombrosis was again the tall, handsome, kindly man he'd been before. But now he hung his head a little and seemed discouraged — discouraged because we had rejected him and thus prevented him from fulfilling his kindly intentions towards us. With a sigh he walked slowly thorough the house and to the front door. I had the powerful and awesome feeling that as Lord Daddy Lombrosis walked out of the house — ALL IN THAT HOUSE **WERE** TO BE LEFT WITHOUT HOPE. As Lord Daddy Lombrosis passed out the front door the question passed through my mind — *Who will come next?* I did not speak the question, but you offered a tentative answer just as if I had spoken it. You said in an awed tone: "Satan?"

Then I ran to the door to catch Lord Daddy Lombrosis. He had just gone out, and I saw that snow had begun to fall. There was a light layer of it on the ground, maybe half an inch. Lord Daddy Lombrosis had become invisible, but as he waled away slowly from the house, leaving it forever and leaving it without hope, his shoes left prints in the snow; the prints appearing one after another making his progress away from the house. I ran after him begging him not to leave like this, not to leave my little brother without hope. Over and over I begged him, but the footprints just kept receding slowly and sadly through the snow. Finally I threw myself

at his feed and cried, “No, don’t leave my brother without hope, give him another chance!” and I started to say, “and me too”, but I caught my self and said, “*No! Not me! I will never* give in! But my *poor*, weak, innocent little brother! Don’t leave *him* without hope!” But the footprints just kept going off through the snow. And then I woke up with a terrible sense of fear and foreboding. It was a remarkable and very frightening dream

In addition to the meanings indicated above, it seemed to me that the dream had some more general significance. Besides the other things he represented, Lord Daddy Lombrosis stood for the Technological Society itself. The technological society, as well as demanding submission and using deception, illusion and manipulation, also has other aspects, such as security and morality, and my inner rebellion against that society entails a certain degree of guilt, which was involved in the dream along with my sense of guilt at attacking your illusions. And to a degree you have submitted to the technological society by accepting one of the substitutes that it offers for the real life that it denies us. The substitute in question is the ideology of “Art” and “Philosophy” and all that stuff, which for many people like you serve as an unreal dream-world which enables you to forget the emptiness of life in the technological society and offers you a kind of spurious hope.<sup>6</sup>

Quoting a short analysis of this dream:

Ted’s “Lord Daddy Lombrosis” story was written at about the time that his father died of lung cancer back in Lombard. Ted denies that Lombrosis is a symbolic stand-in for his dad. Instead, writes Ted, Lombrosis is “Technological Society,” the representatives of which must be vanquished. But Ted was never entirely sure, even as a child, who his real enemies were. He knew only that he was very unhappy, and that someone ought to suffer for it... In *The Secret Agent* there is also a fellow named Lombroso, a phrenologist who figures in the novel as a representative of pseudo-science.<sup>7</sup>

## Acting as if animism were true

Quoting Ted in an 1999 interview with an ex-Earth First! Journal editor:

“This is kind of personal,” he begins by saying, and I ask if he wants me to turn off the tape. He says “no, I can tell you about it. While I was living

---

<sup>6</sup> Two Dreams

<sup>7</sup> The Fictions of Ted Kaczynski

in the woods I sort of invented some gods for myself” and he laughs. “Not that I believed in these things intellectually, but they were ideas that sort of corresponded with some of the feelings I had. I think the first one I invented was Grandfather Rabbit. You know the snowshoe rabbits were my main source of meat during the winters. I had spent a lot of time learning what they do and following their tracks all around before I could get close enough to shoot them. Sometimes you would track a rabbit around and around and then the tracks disappear. You can’t figure out where that rabbit went and lose the trail. I invented a myth for myself, that this was the Grandfather Rabbit, the grandfather who was responsible for the existence of all other rabbits. He was able to disappear, that is why you couldn’t catch him and why you would never see him... Every time I shot a snowshoe rabbit, I would always say ‘thank you Grandfather Rabbit.’ After a while I acquired an urge to draw snowshoe rabbits. I sort of got involved with them to the extent that they would occupy a great deal of my thought. I actually did have a wooden object that, among other things, I carved a snowshoe rabbit in. I planned to do a better one, just for the snowshoe rabbits, but I never did get it done. There was another one that I sometimes called the Will ‘o the Wisp, or the wings of the morning. That’s when you go out in to the hills in the morning and you just feel drawn to go on and on and on and on, then you are following the wisp. That was another god that I invented for myself.”<sup>8</sup>

Quoting Ted’s 1978 Journal:

Today I had a most joyous morning. I went up the gulch just to get nettles, at dawn; but the Wisp called me, so that I ended by going up on the ridge, in the mostly snow-free areas, by way of the old Gold Dollar mine. (Many times in the morning I just like to wander at random, following the “will of the wisp”. When I get the urge to wander like that, I say to myself that “the wisp is calling me.” Only a few days ago, it occurred to make a kind of spirit or demigod out of the wisp, as I did a few years ago out of the Grandfather Rabbit who I invented. Grandfather Rabbit, though he can appear and disappear at will, nevertheless has a definite form, being that of an unusually large snowshoe rabbit. The Wisp, on the other hand, has no form at all, being invisible; unless, just possibly, it might be glimpsed for a moment now and then out of the corner of the eye as a bit of thistledown or some such thing floating on the breeze. The Wisp is the that which makes you want to get out and move and wander and look listen, when you see the first pink clouds at dawn or when the early morning sunlight strikes the mountainsides or when the southwest wind starts blowing. I can’t express

---

<sup>8</sup> Theresa Kintzs’ Interview with Ted Kaczynski

how intensely I love these things. And the better I get to know these hills the better I love them. I never get tired of them.).<sup>9</sup>

Quoting Ted's 1980 Journal:

...after getting 4 rabbits, I tracked down another one, took aim at its head, with my finger on the trigger just as if I were really going to kill it, then lowered the rifle and said to the rabbit: "Rabbit, I spare thy life. Give my regards to Grandfather Rabbit." This was not just the impulse of a moment. I tracked that rabbit with the definite intention of sparing it when I found it. It was a sort of way of expressing my feelings about snowshoe hares; these animals having a special significance for me; also it is nice to think that I know the rabbits not only as a predator, but also as...is it too ridiculous to say, as a friend? I felt a kind of childish delight after performing this action — i.e., after sparing the rabbit. Later I shot a 5<sup>th</sup>...<sup>10</sup>

## 1999 — A Fantasy

Quoting an essay Ted wrote in prison:

I here present this fantasy just as I wrote it down after it came to me on the evening of August 23, 1999. I've made no changes other than a minor deletion for the purpose of avoiding offense to a certain religions group, and corrections of spelling, capitalization, and punctuation.

---

8/23/99. This evening I became prematurely sleepy a couple of hours after dinner, so I lay down and slept for about three hours. After I woke up I lay in a drowsy state for fifteen minutes or so, and these are the thoughts that came to my mind:

I thought of resting, of drifting away relaxed and immersed in peace and beauty, and, as always, peace and beauty were associated in my mind with images of the forests and mountains of Western Montana. These are ideas that have religious quality, and they led me to think about God — if there is a God.

If there is a God, it can't be the god of the Christians or Jews. That god is not God but a cruel devil. The real God — if there is a God — is the

---

<sup>9</sup> A Review and Compilation of the Writings of Ted Kaczynski

<sup>10</sup> A Review and Compilation of the Writings of Ted Kaczynski

unknown life-force that brought into existence the Sun, the solar system, and the Earth with its varied forms of life. Maybe — in fact *probably* among some others of the billions of stars in the universe — this God, the life-force has brought into existence other planets like Earth that are richly endowed with life. But it does not seem that it — the life-force — has meant us to know or encounter these other islets of life in the universe. It has given us only our own little islet of life — the Sun and the Earth. If there is a God then the only one of its manifestations that we can ever know is here. We can see and meet the life-force only in what we find around us: the sky, the Sun, the rain, the mountains and plains, the plants, the animals, the birds, insects, fish ... . In other words, Nature. It is through Nature that we meet God — if there is a God.

The priceless gift that the life-force has given us is that of freedom. To do what we will, to follow our God-given instincts. All animals have this freedom. So did early humans — the forest pigmies of Africa, for example. The so-called god of the Christians and Jews is in reality a devil because it tries to rob us of our freedom through cruelty and threats. This devil-god is a tyrant and a totalitarian, and is in reality a creation of diseased human beings — it is an expression of their sado-masochistic impulses. The real God, the life-force, gave Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden the right to do whatever they wished, but warned them against eating from the Tree of Knowledge. It was the Judeo-Christian devil-god in the form of a snake that persuaded them to eat from the Tree of Knowledge. “Knowledge” of what? Of “good and evil,” shame, sin (see Genesis 3) — the tools that the devil-god uses to control us, to rob us of our freedom. After Genesis 3 the god of Judeo-Christian scripture is no longer the life-force that gave us freedom but the devil-god that enslaves us. The snake usurped the place of the real God.

What about Jesus? That depends on how you understand him. The Gospels can be interpreted in a thousand different ways. Sadistic priests use Jesus merely as another tool for imposing their will on us, for convincing us that our wholesome instincts are “sin.” Other interpretations are possible. Neitzche’s interpretation, as expressed in *The Antichrist*, is as plausible as any of the other 999 interpretations of the scriptural Jesus, and also is plausible as a conjecture about what the historical Jesus may have been. If we accept Nietzche’s interpretation, then we can imagine that Jesus was sent by the real God, the life-force, to liberate man from sin, not in the way conceived by orthodox Christianity, but by undoing what was done in the Garden of Eden and freeing human beings from the social discipline imposed by civilization: “Ye shall be as little children and have no thought for the morrow.” We might then imagine that the devil-god invented by the

priests and authoritarians had Jesus crucified in order to prevent him from liberating the human race.

Freedom, again, is the priceless gift given to us by the life-force, and it includes freedom from the fear of death. Animals do not fear death. They will fear a predator and run from it, and they will do what they have to do in order to survive, but they do not fear death itself. They are not even capable of forming a conception of such a thing as death. Primitive man, too, has little fear of death. He does what he has to do in order to survive, but when death becomes inevitable he accepts it stoically and without fear. Death is the natural conclusion of the life-cycle. By dying one gives room to new life and one's body provides nourishment for other organisms. We must liberate ourselves from fear of death, be as little children, and give no thought to the morrow. This is part of what is necessary for the recovery of our lost freedom.

But wait. The time has not yet arrived. The recovery of our freedom requires more than being as little children. The forces that enslave us are intelligent, calculating, ruthless, and disciplined. To defeat them we will have to be even more intelligent, calculating, ruthless, and disciplined than they are. We will have to exercise enough self-discipline to endure hardship, suffering, and protracted struggle. Only after the evil in the world has been overthrown will we be able to let down our guard and be as little children.

---

Added January 22, 2000. The sentence, "Ye shall be as little children" does not appear in the Gospels. However, it certainly concords with the spirit of the Gospels. "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein." (Luke 18:17) "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." (Matthew 18:3) "Take therefore no thought for the morrow ... ." (Mathew 6:34)

As for my comments concerning Nietzsche's interpretation of Jesus, see sections 32-35 of Nietzsche's *The Antichrist*.

In any case, let it be remembered that what I've written about is only a record of some ideas and feelings that came to me when I was in a drowsy state. I do not claim they make any sense or that they are consistent with other things that I've said or written.

Added 7/4/05. When I made this transcription I should not have deleted "Muslims" on pages 2 & 3. Not that it matters now. — TJK



## 2001

Quoting Ted from a 2001 interview with Ted's lady love:

**TJK:** ... The rabbit is clipped through the head. Such a shot ordinarily kills the rabbit instantly, but the animal's hind legs usually kick violently for a few seconds so that it bounces around in the snow. When the rabbit stops kicking I walk up to it and see that it's quite dead. I say aloud "Thank you, Grandfather Rabbit"—Grandfather Rabbit is a kind of demigod I've invented who is the tutelary spirit of all the snowshoe rabbits. I stand for a few minutes looking around at the pure-white snow and the sunlight filtering through the pine trees. I take in the silence and the solitude. It's good to be here. ...

**BVD:** I respect and appreciate your thanking Grandfather Rabbit. I'm reminded of the real origins of the ritual or custom of saying grace before a meal: A solemn awareness of sacrifice, that all life gives itself so that other life may live...Do you believe in fate?

**TJK:** No.

**BVD:** Do you believe in God?

**TJK:** No...<sup>11</sup>

## 2002 — The Aftermath of 9/11

Quoting Ted from an interview with an ex-Earth First! Journal editor:

It seems to me, that there are discontented groups that could be very useful if we could, so to speak, recruit them.

Then when the right moment comes, they will be in a position to strike. The thing is that people will tend to be attracted to a movement not only on the basis of agreeing with its ideas, but if they see it as effective, having a clear-cut agenda, cohesive, purposeful and active.<sup>12</sup>

Quoting a letter from Ted to David Skrbina:

---

<sup>11</sup> Joy Richards Interview with Ted Kaczynski

<sup>12</sup> Theresa Kintzs' Interview with Ted Kaczynski

In certain quarters, there is a rejection of modernity, among muslim militants, and I'm wondering what extent it might be useful to our movement to carry on discussions with the Muslim militants and see whether there is sufficient common ground there for any sort of alliance.

If he were simply that, I might be inclined to support him, but my guess is that his motive is less an opposition to modernity than a desire to create an Islamic 'great power' that would be able to compete on equal terms with other great powers of the world. If that is true, then he is just another ruthless and power-hungry politician, and I have no use for him.

Concerning the recent terrorist action in Britain: Quite apart from any humanitarian considerations, the radical Islamics' approach seems senseless. They take a hostile stance toward whole nations, such as the US. or Britain, and they indiscriminately kill ordinary citizens of those countries. In doing so they only strengthen the countries in question, because they provide the politicians with what they most need: a feared external enemy to unite the people behind their leaders. The Islamics seem to have forgotten the principle of "divide and conquer": Their best policy would have been to profess friendship for the American, British, etc. people and limit their expressed hostility to the elite groups of those countries, while portraying the ordinary people as victims or dupes of their leaders. (Notice that this is the position that the US. usually adopts toward hostile countries.)

So the terrorists' acts of mass slaughter seem stupid. But there may be an explanation other than stupidity for their actions: The radical Islamic leaders may be less interested in the effect that the bombings have on the US. or the UK. than in their effect within the Islamic world. The leaders' main goal may be to build a strong and fanatical Islamic movement, and for this purpose they may feel that spectacular acts of mass destruction are more effective than assassinations of single individuals, however important the latter may be. I've found some support for this hypothesis:

"[A] radical remake of the faith is indeed the underlying intention of bin Laden and his followers. Attacking America and its allies is merely a tactic, intended to provoke a backlash strong enough to alert Muslims to the supposed truth of their predicament, and so rally them to purge their faith of all that is alien to its essence. Promoting a clash of civilizations is merely stage one. The more difficult part, as the radicals see it, is convincing fellow Muslims to reject the modern world absolutely (including such aberrations as democracy), topple their own insidiously secularizing quisling governments, and return to the pure path."<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Ted Kaczynski's Letter Correspondence With David Skrbina

Quoting Ted's essay 'Hit where it hurts':

Now it's true that the U.S. House of Representatives recently voted to ban cloning of human beings, and at least some congressmen even gave the right kinds of reasons for doing so. The reasons I read about were framed in religious terms, but whatever you may think of the religious terms involved, these reasons were not technologically acceptable reasons. And that is what counts.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Hit where it hurts

The Ted K Archive

Ted Kaczynski's flirtations with the supernatural

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