# Ted Kaczynski's Letter Correspondence with Steven Fischler (Pacific Street Films)

## Contents

Beau to Ted — December 29 1998												3
Ted to Steven — March $24$ , $1999$ .												3
Beau to Ted — June 1 1999												6
Steven to Ted — June 2 1999												6

#### Beau to Ted — December 29 1998

Source: <www.thetedkarchive.com/library/beau-context-books-correspondence>

... Finally, a young man called today requesting a catalogue of forthcoming books. He did not give his name or the company he worked for when Travis asked. Travis put the call through to me, since he knows that we have not publicly announced the launching of Context Books, which will not happen until February or March. Only people in the industry know so far, and nobody knows anything about the titles. I was suspicious, and asked him how he had heard about us. He put me on hold, and when he returned, instead of answering my question, reiterated his request for information about the Spring list. I asked him again. He put me on hold again. He then said he was calling for Joel Sucher, and that he worked for Pacific Street Films. I told him that if Mr. Sucher had any specific questions, he should call me. I recalled that Fischler worked there. I know of only one film they have done: "Anarchism in America." I suspect they were poking around for information. Have you told Fischler anything? Mike called him a few weeks back, but he cannot remember whether he told them that I was publishing his book, but he did not mention Truth versus Lies. I will not discuss anything with him or anyone else from his operation until I hear from you. Mike told me that Fischler is interested in making a film about you...

## Ted to Steven — March 24, 1999

**Source:** <www.facebook.com/groups/323586984907/posts/10164586500384908>

#### Dear Steve:

I apologize for taking so long to reply to your letters, but I've spent a month formulating answers to a long list of difficult questions from my lawyer, and now I'm trying to catch up with the accumulated backlog of correspondence.

In reply to your letter of February 12, the time for an interview is not yet. However, I've been thinking about what the goals of such an interview should be.

It seems to me that a biographical sketch would not be very useful, since I can make biographical information about myself available through my writing. I also question whether an interview with you would be a good vehicle for anti-technological ideas — in part because such ideas are best directed not at a mass audience but at a small minority of radicals who are predisposed to accept them.

So I've been thinking that any documentary you might make about me might be most effective if it used my case as a tool for exposing some of the slimy aspects of the way our society functions. The documentary might make the following points:

- 1. That it is common practice among court-appointed attorneys to lie to, deceive, and manipulate their clients.
- 2. That shrinks' diagnoses, in a forensic  $\dots$

## Dear Steve:

I apologize for taking so long to reply to your letters, but I've spent a month formulating answers to a long list of difficult questions from my lawyer, and now I'm trying to catch up with the accumulated backlog of correspondence.

In reply to your letter of February 12, the time for an interview is not yet. However, I've been thinking about what the goals of such

an interview should be.

It seems to me that a biographical sketch would not be very useful, since I can make biographical information about myself available through my writing. I also question whether an interview with you would be a good vehicle for antitechnological ideas—in part because such ideas are best directed not at a mass audience but at a small minority of radicals who are predisposed to accept them.

So I've been thinking that any documentary, you might make about me might be most effective if it used my case as a Tool for exposing some of the slimy aspects of the way our society functions. The documentary might make the following points:

(1) That it is common practice among court-appointed attorneys to lie to, deceive,

and manipulate their clients.

(2) That shrinks' diagnoses, in a forensic

#### Beau to Ted — June 1 1999

**Source:** <www.thetedkarchive.com/library/beau-context-books-correspondence>

... In their favor is the fact that they are anarchists, regardless of their approach which admittedly differs from your own. They are also straight shooters. I think the odds would be good for creating a successful documentary with them. They had a good suggestion with regard to my hope that we could get you on a program like 60M in a manner that both promoted public awareness of your book and redressed the media distortions that have been perpetrated against you thus far. They suggested taping footage for a news program when they shoot their documentary. You could then answer questions that the public may have in a manner that could not be used against you. I think this is a very good solution...

### Steven to Ted — June 2 1999

 $\textbf{Source:} \quad < www.thetedkarchive.com/library/ted-kaczynski-derrick-jensen-derrick-jensen-letters>$ 

... [E]ven if something were to be given to Beau, in writing, the reality of a network establishment honoring such a contract, is 'EMUS,' a phrase coined by an unscrupulous record promoter who used this as a label on his records ('sue me' backwards). 60-Minutes has the best lawyers in the entertainment business, and once a piece is run, (and they've garnered their audience, ratings, and ad revenue), they have more than enough time to entertain lawsuits — which usually, after much time and money is expended on the part of the plaintiff, are thrown out. ...



www.thetedkarchive.com