

**“Why did you do it?”**

Ted Kaczynski

# Contents

1. Letter From Ted to Unknown . . . . .	3
A. Letters between Lydia Eccles & Ted . . . . .	4
<b>1. Letter from Lydia to Ted</b> . . . . .	4
<b>2. Letter from Ted to Lydia</b> . . . . .	5
Letter from Ted to an Unknown Philosophy Enthusiast . . . . .	5
Letter from a robber to Ted . . . . .	7
Letter from Ted to John Zerzan . . . . .	7
Letter from Ted to [REDACTED] . . . . .	7
Letter from Ted to [REDACTED] . . . . .	7
B. Extremely Short Letter Series . . . . .	8
<b>Letter from [REDACTED] to Ted</b> . . . . .	8
<b>Letter from Ted to [REDACTED]</b> . . . . .	8
Letter from Ted to a Turkish vegan-primitivist . . . . .	8
C. Letter Series on the book <i>Ice Brothers</i> . . . . .	19
<b>Letter from Betty S. Wilson to Ted</b> . . . . .	19
<b>Letter from Ted to Betty</b> . . . . .	19

Over the years, Kaczynski has replied to dozens of letters in which he defended his actions. He has never expressed remorse.

## 1. Letter From Ted to Unknown

1. Quite apart from any personal sensitivities of my own, I don't think it's a good idea to refer to the Unabomber's "criminal career". True, the Unabomber carried out actions that were "crimes" in the sense that they were highly illegal. But the same is true of such admired revolutionaries as George Washington, Simon Bolivar, and Emiliano Zapata. I don't know whether Washington, Bolivar, and Zapata ever killed anyone with their own hands, but they certainly organized armies, trained them, and led them into battle, and they were legally and morally as responsible for the resulting deaths as if they had killed with their own hands. Needless to say, their revolutionary uprisings were highly illegal, and if they had been captured by the regimes against which they revolted, they no doubt would have been severely punished for their "crimes".

But no one today refers to the "criminal careers" of Washington, Bolivar, and Zapata. Why? Because they are conventionally accepted as revolutionary heroes and their actions are assumed to have been justifiable because necessary in order to remedy certain evils.

Maybe you think revolutionary generals like Washington, Bolivar, and Zapata are to be placed in a different category than an assassin who kills by stealth, and that the general who illegally kills thousands is to be judged more leniently than the assassin who kills one or a few. But on July 20, 194[TEXT CUT OFF] when Claus von Stauffenberg planted bomb in an attempt to kill Hitler, he acted by stealth, yet no one today calls Stauffenberg a "criminal".

So, when you refer to the Unabomber's "criminal career" you are in effect telling people that the Unabomber's actions were less justifiable than those of Washington, Bolivar, Zapata, and Stauffenberg; hence, that the issues that motivated the Unabomber were less important than those that motivated Washington, Bolivar, Zapata, and Stauffenberg. If you really believe that to be true, then you're welcome to call the Unabomber a "criminal".

But I don't think you do really believe that to be true. So you might want to give some thought to the fact that by referring to the Unabomber as a "criminal" you are helping the system to trivialize the whole problem of technology — to make it seem that what the Unabomber fought for was considerably less important than the principles that George Washington fought for, such as "no taxation without representation". Yet I don't think you would seriously maintain that the issue of taxation without representation can compare in importance with that of the survival of the human race.

## A. Letters between Lydia Eccles & Ted

### 1. Letter from Lydia to Ted

Lydia Eccles  
P.O. Box 201  
Allston, MA 02134  
Theodore John Kaczynski  
Fed Reg #04475-046  
USP Florence AdMax  
P.O. Box 8500  
Florence, CO 81226

August 20, 2012

Dear Ted,

This letter is in response to the letter you wrote to Mark Cohen. You are stating explicitly something I've known and assumed implicitly for a long time, so I would like to tell you in detail how it's looked from my side.

I have been corresponding with you since a month or two after your trial and sentencing, a period of over fifteen years. Over these years I have corresponded with or had phone conversations with many other people corresponding with you, including the archivist at University of Michigan, lawyers, publishers, authors, academics, philosophers, filmmakers and other artists. You have also sent me, on many occasions, carbon copies of your correspondence with others in which you expressed ideas you wanted me to also be aware, to save you the time of transcribing them by hand. I've read many letters which you asked me to forward to others, for your convenience or to save postage. I've transcribed correspondence from you to send by email to others. I've had phone conversations or even met in person with others whom you had periods of intensive correspondence with, and who had also gotten to know you quite well.

So I have had broad exposure to your communication with others, and have long observed the nature of people's interest in communicating with you. Throughout this entire time period, the purpose of this communication has been the exchange of ideas and critical dialogue about the political problem of unrestrained technological development and its impact upon humanity and the natural world.

Many of your correspondents have explicitly stated that they disavow the acts which led to your imprisonment, but feel that the critique you express concerning the fate of human dignity, wilderness and the planetary life system is the central challenge our democratic society, and global society, must face.

Many of your correspondents are actively engaged in producing political or artistic public expression in one form or another, including books, journalistic articles, academic teaching, films or visual art. I'm also aware of visual artists who have exhibited work inspired by your ideas without ever having directly corresponded with you.

You have frequently written to me of your disgust when people write to you because they are interested in you as a “notorious criminal” and of your aversion to personal fame or a focus upon your personal history rather than your ideas. You ignore such correspondents. You have also steadfastly refused to talk to the press, even though all the major press have contacted you for interviews, since you feel they are not interested in dealing seriously with the social questions you raise.

On no occasion in my experience have you or any of your correspondents discussed, advocated, invoked or encouraged illegal actions in any form.

Your correspondence arises through interest in the ideas and political philosophy expressed in your essay “Industrial Society and Its Future,” and personal friendships that result from political dialogue. Your dialogue has social and historic import, which is why the La Alameda Archive is collecting your papers. I intend to donate my correspondence with you to the Labadie so they will be available for academic research. Engagement with your ideas as been and is very important in my own political development and has inspired and informed my art projects. And this all makes sense to me, because public expression of ideas concerning human welfare and entering into a our collective thought process seems to me to have been your true aim all along.

Love,  
[SIGNED: Lydia]

## **2. Letter from Ted to Lydia**

Dear Lydia,

Thanks for your letters of 5/22/12 and your letter of 5/24/12. But I’m disappointed that you — like a lot of other people, apparently — misinterpreted my entry in that Harvard alumni book. ...

## **Letter from Ted to an Unknown Philosophy Enthusiast**

... I’m really not interested in arguing with your girlfriend’s philosophy teacher, but here are some questions that your girlfriend can ask her, if she likes:

A. If the philosophy teacher had been born and raised in Nazi Germany, under that system of propaganda and education, would she have believed that Jews were morally reprehensible?

B. If the philosophy teacher had been born and raised in medieval Europe, would she have believed that heretics were morally reprehensible, and that it was alright to burn them alive if they refused to recant?

C. The Crow Indians, ca. 1830–40, believed that if a Crow man was struck by anyone not a member of the tribe, then he was shamed forever if he failed to kill the offender

immediately.<sup>(1)</sup> If the philosophy teacher had been born and raised among the Crow Indians during the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, would she have believed the same?

D. If the philosophy teacher had been born and raised in Saudi Arabia 70 years ago ...

E. Do the philosophy teacher's beliefs about what is morally reprehensible have anything to do with the culture in which she actually has been born and raised? Specifically, do they have anything to do with the media propaganda to which she is exposed daily?

F. Should one always accept the moral beliefs current in one's society, regardless of what they may be? How does one know whether to reject some of the moral beliefs of one's society?

G. I once met a man who had been in the German army during World War II. My father reported that this guy told him, "Yeah, we believed all that stuff about Jews. How were we to know? ...

L. If I remember correctly, the Jews in the Warsaw Ghetto fought to the death against the German soldiers who invaded their dwelling place. At some point the Jews must have realized that further resistance was hopeless — that they were going to die no matter how hard they fought. Yet they continued fighting and killing German soldiers right to the end. The German soldiers weren't necessarily bad people, they were just suckers for Nazi propaganda, or they may have fought only because they were forced to do so. Was it morally reprehensible for the Jews to continue killing German soldiers even when they knew that they were accomplishing nothing by doing so?

M. Is physical security, or maximization of life-expectancy, the highest value, or are there any non-material values that take precedence even over life itself?

N. Most people will agree that it is morally acceptable to preserve one's own life by killing an attacker. Is it ever morally acceptable to kill in defense of a non-material value?

O. More specifically, is it ever morally acceptable to kill in defense of one's personal freedom? For example, would it have been morally acceptable for a black slave ca. 1850 to kill his master in order to escape from slavery?

P. Would it have been morally acceptable for a black slave ca. 1850 to kill his master even if he had no hope of gaining his freedom by doing so?

If your girlfriend asks her philosophy teacher these questions, I would be curious to know what her answers are. I can also provide many other questions that may challenge this teacher.

Best regards,  
Ted Kaczynski

---

<sup>(1)</sup> See *Journal of a Trapper*, by Osborn(e) Russell, who reported this on the basis of personal experience among the Crows.

## Letter from a robber to Ted

Sunday  
7-7-'96

Hey Ted,

How's it going? I'm in El Dorado County Jail on a second degree robbery charge.

Listen, I like some of your ideas about technology...

## Letter from Ted to John Zerzan

February 2, 1998

Dear John,

... In the past you have assured me repeatedly that you believe in my innocence. I've been somewhat concerned that my guilty plea may have shaken your belief, so I want to remind you that people sometimes plead guilty without being so, because that may represent the least undesirable alternative in a given legal situation, and I want to assure you that I am not in fact the Unabomber.

With continued gratitude for your friendship and support

Ted

## Letter from Ted to [REDACTED]

August 26, 2000

Dear [REDACTED]

I apologize for taking so long ...

To begin with, I am somewhat irritated by your apparent assumption that I am the Unabomber. You must be aware that I am legally challenging the validity of my conviction. DO you imagine I would be doing so if I were really the Unabomber? Use your common sense.

## Letter from Ted to [REDACTED]

Dear Mr. [REDACTED] ...

1. Do I consider myself a terrorist? That's a matter of semantics... so I don't have an answer to your question.

2. Am I planning to write an autobiography? I doubt that I'll ever find time to do that. While I was in the Sacramento County Jail I did write a book titled *Truth versus Lies*, which was not exactly an autobiography but it did contain a great deal of autobiographical information. Due to possible legal problems (libel and copyright, it was not published. But it may be published (perhaps in modified form at some time

in the future. A copy of the manuscript is in the Labadie Collection, a division of the Hatcher Library at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor...

## **B. Extremely Short Letter Series**

### **Letter from [REDACTED] to Ted**

Dear Mr. Kaczynski,  
Do you fear death?  
Sincerely,  
[REDACTED]

### **Letter from Ted to [REDACTED]**

Dear Mr. or Ms. [REDACTED]  
No.  
Sincerely yours,  
Ted Kaczynski  
[... I felt that this laconic letter demanded an equally laconic reply ...]

## **Letter from Ted to a Turkish vegan-primitivist**

October 4, 2003

Dear Mr. [REDACTED]:

I am sorry I have taken so long to answer your letter dated August 12. I am usually busy, especially with answering correspondence, and your letter is one that could not be answered hastily, because some of your questions require long, complicated, carefully-considered answers.

For this same reason, it would cost me an unreasonable amount of time to answer all of your questions. So I will answer only some of them the ones that seem to me to be most important and those that can be answered easily and briefly.

Question 2. I was born in Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A., on May 22, 1942.

Question 3. I graduated from an elementary school and a high school in Evergreen Park, Illinois. I received a bachelors degree from Harvard University, and masters degree and doctors degree in mathematics from the University of Michigan.

Question 4. after receiving my doctors degree from the University of Michigan, I was an assistant professor of mathematics for two years at the University of California.

Question 5. I have never been married and have no children.

Question 6,7,8,9. A complete answer to these questions would be excessively long and complicated, but I will say the following:



The process through which I came to reject modernity and civilization began when I was eleven years old. At that age I began to be attracted to the primitive way of life as a result of reading of the life of Neanderthal man. In the following years, up to the time when I entered Harvard University at the age of sixteen, I used to dream of escapinbg from civilization and going to live in some wild place. During the same period, my distaste for modern life grew as I became increasingly aware that people in industrial society were reduced to the status of gears in a machine, that they lacked freedom and were at the mercy of the large organizations that controlled the conditions under which they lived.

After I entered Harvard University I took some couses in anthropology, which taught me more about primitive peoples and gave me an appetite to acquire some of the knowledge that enabled them to live in the wild. For example, I wished to have their knowledge of edible plants. But I had no idea where to get such knowledge until a couple of years later, when I discovered to my surprise that there were books about edible wild plants. The first such a book that I ought was *Stalking the Wild asparagus*, by Euell Gibbons, and after that when I was home from college and graduate school during the summers, I went several times each week to the Cook County Forest Preserves near Chicago to look for edible plants. At first it seemed eerie and strange to go all alone into the forest, away from all roads and paths. But as I came to know the forest and many of the plants and animals that lived in it, the feeling at strangeness disappeared and I grew more and more comfortable in the woodland. I also became more and more certain that I did not want to spend my whole life in civilization, and that I wanted to go and live in some wild place.

Meanwhile, I wa doing well in mathematics. It was fun to solve mathematical problems, but in a deeper sense mathematics was boring and empty because for me it had no purpose. If I had worked on applied mathematics I woul have contributed to the development of the technological society that I hated, so I worked only on pure mathematics. But pure mathematics was only a game. I did not understand then, and I still do not understand, why mathematicians are content to fritter away their whole lives in a mere game. I myself was completely dissatisfied with such a life.

I knew what I wanted: To go and live in some wild place. But I didnt know how to do so. In those days there were no primitivist movements, no survivalists, and anyone who left a promising careers in mathematics to go live among forests or mountains would have been regarded as foolish or crazy. I did not know even one person who would have understood why I wanted to do such a thing. So, deep in my heart, I felt convinced that I would never be able to escape from civilization.

Because I found modern life absolutely unacceptable, I grew increasingly hopeless until, at the age of 24, I arrived at a kind of crisis: I felt so miseravle that I didnt care whether I lived or died. But when I reached that point, a sudden change took place: I realized that if I didnt care whether I lived ot died, then I didnt need to fear the consequences of anything I might do. Therefore I could do anything I wanted. I was free! That was the great turning-point in my life because it was then that I acquired

courage, which has remained with me ever since. It was at that time, too, that I became certain that I would soon go to live in the wild, no matter what the consequences. I spent two years teaching at the University of California in order to save some money, then I resigned my position and went to look for a place to live in the forest.

Question 9. It would take too much time to give a complete answer to the last part of your ninth question, but I will give you a partial answer by quoting what I wrote for my journal on August 14, 1983:

The fifth of August I began a hike to the east. I got to my hidden camp that I have in a gulch beyond what I call Diagonal Gulch. I stayed there through the following day, August 6. I felt the peace of the forest there. But there are few huckleberries there, and though there are deer, there is very little small game. Furthermore, it had been a long time since I had seen the beautiful and isolated plateau where the various branches of Trout Creek originate. So I decided to take off for that area on the 7<sup>th</sup> of August. A little after crossing the roads in the neighborhood of Crater Mountain I began to hear chain saws; the sound seemed to be coming from the upper reaches of Roaster Bill Creek. I assumed they were cutting trees; I didn't like it but I thought I would be able to avoid such things when I got onto the plateau. Walking across the hillsides on my way there, I saw down below me a new road that had not been there previously, and that appeared to cross one of the ridges that close in Stemple Creek. This made me feel a little sick. Nevertheless, I went on to the plateau. What I found there broke my heart. The plateau was criss-crossed with new roads, broad and well-made for roads of that kind. The plateau is ruined forever. The only thing that could save it now would be the collapse of the technological society. I couldn't bear it. That was the best and most beautiful and isolated place around here and I have wonderful memories of it.

One road passed within a couple of hundred feet of a lovely spot where I camped for a long time a few years ago and passed many happy hours. Full of grief and rage I went back and camped by South Fork Humbug Creek

The next day I started for my home cabin. My route took me past a beautiful spot, a favorite place of mine where there was a spring of pure water that could safely be drunk without boiling. I stopped and said a kind of prayer to the spirit of the spring. It was a prayer in which I swore that I would take revenge for what was being done to the forest. My journal continues:

and then I returned home as quickly as I could because I have something to do!

You can guess what it was that I had to do.

Question 10, 17. anything like a complete answer to these questions would take too much time. But the following remarks are relevant:

The problem of civilization is identical with the problem of technology. Let me first explain that when I speak of technology I do not refer only to physical apparatus such as tools and machines. I include also techniques, such as the techniques of chemistry, civil engineering, or biotechnology. Included too are human techniques such as those of propaganda or of educational psychology, as well as organizational techniques could

not exist at an advanced level without the physical apparatus the tools, machines, and structures on which the whole technological system depends.

However, technology in the broader sense of the word includes not only modern technology but also the techniques and physical apparatuses that existed at earlier stages of society. For example, plows, harness for animals, blacksmiths tools, domesticated breed of plants and animals, and the techniques of agriculture, animal husbandry, and metalworking. Early civilizations depended on these technologies, as well as on the human and organizational techniques needed to govern large numbers of people. Civilizations cannot exist without the technology on which they are based. Conversely, where the technology is available civilization is likely to develop sooner or later.

Thus, the problem of civilization can be equated with the problem of technology. The farther back we can push technology, the farther back we will push civilization. If we could push technology all the way back to the stone age, there would be no more civilization.

Question 11. In reference to my alleged actions you ask, “Don’t you think violence is violence?” Of course, violence is violence. And violence is also a necessary part of nature. If predators did not kill members of prey species, then the prey species would multiply to the point where they would destroy their environment by consuming everything edible. Many kinds of animals are violent even against members their own species. For example, it is well known that wild chimpanzees often kill other chimpanzees. See, e.g., *Time Magazine*, August 19, 2002, page 56. In some regions, fights are common among wild bear: The magazine *Bear and Other Top Predators*, Volume 1, Issue 2, pages 28–29, shows a photograph of bears fighting and a photograph of a bear wounded in a fight, and mentions that such wounds can be deadly. Among the sea birds called brown boobies, two eggs are laid in each nest. After the eggs are hatched, one of the young birds attacks the other and forces it out of the nest, so that it dies. See article “Sibling Desperado”, *Science News*, Volume 163, February 15, 2003.

Human beings in the wild constitute one of the more violent species. A good general survey of the cultures of hunting-and-gathering people is *The Hunting Peoples*, by Carleton S. Coon, published by Little, Brown and Company, Boston and Toronto, 1971, and in this book you will find numerous examples in hunting-and-gathering societies of violence by human beings against other human beings. Professor Coon makes clear (pages XIX, 3, 4, 9, 10) that he admires hunting-and-gathering peoples and regards them as more fortunate than civilized ones. But he is an honest man and does not censor out those aspects of primitive life, such as violence, that appear disagreeable to modern people.

Thus, it is clear that a significant amount of violence is a natural part of human life. There is nothing wrong with violence in itself. In any particular case, whether violence is good or bad depends on how it is used and the purpose for which it is used.

So why do modern people regard violence as evil in itself? They do so for one reason only: They have been brainwashed by propaganda. Modern society uses various forms of propaganda to teach people to be frightened and horrified by violence because the

technoindustrial system needs a population that is timid, docile, and afraid to assert itself, a population that will not make trouble or disrupt the orderly functioning of the system. Power depends ultimately on physical force. By teaching people that violence is wrong (except, of course, when the system itself uses violence via the police or the military), the system maintains its monopoly on physical force and thus keeps all power in its own hands.

Whatever philosophical or moral rationalizations people may invent to explain their belief that violence is wrong, the real reason for that belief is that they have unconsciously absorbed the systems propaganda.

Questions 12, 13, 14, 15. All of the groups you mention here are part of a single movement. (Let's call it the GA (Green Anarchist) Movement.) Of course, these people are right to the extent that they oppose civilization and the technology on which it is based. But, because of the form in which this movement is developing, it may actually help to protect the technoindustrial system and may serve as an obstacle to revolution. I will explain:

It is difficult to suppress rebellion directly. When rebellion is put down by force, it very often breaks out again later in some new form in which the authorities find it more difficult to control. For example, in 1878 the German Reichstag enacted harsh and repressive laws against Social-Democratic movement, as a result of which the movement was crushed and its members were scattered, confused, and discouraged. But only for a short time. The movement soon reunited itself, became more energetic, and found new ways of spreading its ideas, so that by 1884 it was stronger than ever. G.A. Zimmermann, *Das Neunzehnte Jahrhundert: Geschichtlicher und kulturhistorischer Rückblick*, Druck und Verlag von Geo. Brumder, Milwaukee, 1902, page 23.

Thus, astute observers of human affairs know that the powerful classes of a society can most effectively defend themselves against rebellion by using force and direct repression only to a limited extent, and relying mainly on manipulation to deflect rebellion. One of the most effective devices used is that of providing channels through which rebellious impulses can be expressed in ways that are harmless to the system. For example, it is well known that in the Soviet Union the satirical magazine *Krokodil* was designed to provide an outlet for complaints and for resentment of the authorities in a way that would lead no one to question the legitimacy of the Soviet system or rebel against it in any serious way.

But the "democratic" system of the West has evolved mechanisms for deflecting rebellion that are far more sophisticated and effective than any that existed in the Soviet Union. It is a truly remarkable fact that in modern Western society people rebel in favor of the values of the very system against which they imagine themselves to be rebelling. The left rebels in favor of racial and religious equality, equality for women and homosexuals, humane treatment of animals, and so forth. But these are the values that the American mass media teach us over and over again every day. Leftists have been so thoroughly brainwashed by media propaganda that they are able to rebel only in terms of these values, which are values of the technoindustrial system

itself. In this way the system has successfully deflected the rebellious impulses of the left into channels that are harmless to the system.

Rebellion against technology and civilization is real rebellion, a real attack on the values of the existing system. But the green anarchist, anarcho-primitivists, and so forth (the GA Movement have fallen under such heavy influence from the left that their rebellion against civilization has to a great extent been neutralized. Instead of rebelling against the values of civilization, they have adopted many civilized values themselves and have constructed an imaginary picture of primitive societies that embodies these civilized values. They pretend that hunter-gatherers worked only two or three hours a day (which would come to 14 to 21 hours a week), that they had gender equality, that they respected the rights of animals, that they took care not to damage their environment, and so forth. But all that is a myth. If you will read many reports written by people who personally observed hunting-and-gathering societies at a time when these were relatively free of influence from civilization, you will see that

(i) All of these societies ate some form of animal food, none were vegan.

(ii) Most (if not all) of these societies were cruel to animals.

(iii) The majority of these societies did not have gender equality.

(iv) The estimate of two or three hours of work a day, or 14 to 21 hours per week, is based on a misleading definition of work. A more realistic minimum estimate for fully nomadic hunter-gatherers would probably be about forty hours of work per week, and some worked a great deal more than that.

(v) Most of these societies were not nonviolent.

(vi) Competition existed in most, or probably all of these societies. In some of them competition could take violent forms.

(vii) These societies varied greatly in the extent to which they took care not to damage their environment. Some may have been excellent conservationists, but others damaged their environment through over-hunting, reckless use of fire, or in other ways.

I could cite numerous reliable sources of information in support of the foregoing statements, but if I did so this letter would become unreasonably long. So I will reserve full documentation for a more suitable occasion. Here I mention only a few examples.

*Cruelty to animals.* Mbuti pygmies:

“The youngster had spread it with his first thrust, pinning the animal to the ground through the fleshy part of the stomach. But the animal was still very much alive, fighting for freedom... Maïpe put another spear into its neck, but it still writhed and fought. Not until a third spear pierced its heart did it give up the struggle.

“...[T]he Pygmies stood around in an excited group, pointing at the dying animal and laughing...

“At other times I have seen Pygmies singeing the feathers off birds that were still alive, explaining that the meat is more tender if death comes slowly.

And the hunting dogs, valuable as they are, get kicked around mercilessly from the day they are born to the day die.” Colin Turnbull, *The Forest People*, Simon and Schuster, 1962, page 101.

Eskimos: The Eskimos with whom Gontran de Poncins lived kicked and beat their dogs brutally. Gontran de Poncins, *Kabloona*, Time-Life Books, Alexandria, Virginia, 1980, pages 29, 30, 49, 189, 196, 198–99, 212, 216.

Siriono: The Siriono sometimes captured young animals alive and brought them back to camp, but they gave them nothing to eat, and the animals were treated so roughly by the children that they soon died. Allan R. Holmberg, *Nomads of the Long Bow: The Siriono of Eastern Bolivia*, The Natural History Press, Garden City, New York, 1969, pages 69–70, 208. (The Siriono were not pure hunter-gatherers, since they did plant crops to a limited extent at certain times of year, but they lived mostly by hunting and gathering. Holmberg, pages 51, 63, 67, 76–77, 82–83, 265.)

Lack of gender equality. Mbuti pygmies. Turnbull says that among the Mbuti, A woman is in no way the social inferior of a man (Colin Turnbull, *Wayward Servants*, The Natural History Press, Garden City, New York, 1965, page 270), and that the woman is not discriminated against (Turnbull, *Forest People*, page 154). But in the very same books Turnbull states a number of facts that show that the Mbuti did not have gender equality as that term is understood today. A certain amount of wife-beating is considered good, and the wife is expected to fight back. *Wayward Servants*, page 287. He said that he was very content with his wife, and he had not found it necessary to beat her at all often. *Forest People*, page 205. Man throws his wife to the ground and slaps her. *Wayward Servants*, page 211. Husband beats wife. *Wayward Servants*, page 192. mbuti practice what Americans would call date rape. *Wayward Servants*, page 137. Turnbull mentions two instances of men giving orders to their wives. *Wayward Servants*, page 288–89; *Forest People*, page 265. I have not found any instance in Turnbull's books of wives giving orders to their husbands.

Siriono: The Siriono did not beat their wives. Holmberg, page 128. But: A woman is subservient to her husband. Holmberg, page 125. The extended family is generally dominated by the oldest active male. Page 129. [W]omen .. are dominated by the men. Page 147. Sexual advances are generally made by the men . If a man is out in the forest alone with a woman he may throw her to the ground roughly and take his prize without so much saying a word. Page 163. parents definitely prefer to have male children. Page 202. Also see pages 148, 156, 168–69, 210, 224.

Australian Aborigines: Farther north and west [in Australia] [p]erceptible power lay in the hands of the mature, fully initiated, and usually polygy-

nous men of the age group from thirty to fifty, and the control over the women and younger males was shared between them. Carleton S. Coon, *The Hunting Peoples* (cited earlier), page 255. Among some Australian tribes, young women were forced to marry old men, mainly so that they should work for the men. Women who refused were beaten until they gave in. See Aldo Massola, *The Aborigines of South-Eastern Australia: As They Were*, The Griffin Press, Adelaide, Australis, 1971. I don't have the exact page, but you will probably find the foregoing between pages 70 and 80.

Time spent working. A good general discussion of this is by Elizabeth Cashdan, *Hunters and Gatherers: Economic Behaviour in Bands*, in Stuart Plattner (editor), *Economic Anthropology*, Stanford University Press, 1989, pages 21–48. Cashdan discusses a study by Richard Lee, who found that a certain group of Kung Bushmen worked a little more than forty hours per week. And she points out on pages 24–25 that there was evidence that Lee's study was made at a time of year when the Kung worked least, and they may have worked a great deal more at other times of year. She points out on page 26 that Lee's study did not include time spent on care of children. And on pages 24–25 she mentions other hunter-gatherers who worked longer hours than the Bushmen studied by Lee. Forty hours per week is probably a minimum estimate of the working time of fully nomadic hunter-gatherers. Gontran de Poncins, *Kablooda* (cited earlier), page 111, stated that the Eskimos with whom he lived toiled fifteen hours a day. He probably did not mean that they worked fifteen hours every day, but it is clear from his book that his Eskimos worked plenty hard. Among the Mbuti pygmies who use nets to hunt, Net-making is virtually a full-time occupation in which both men and women indulge whenever they have both the spare time and the inclination. Turnbull, *Forest People*, page 131. among the Siriono, the men hunted, on average, every other day. Holmberg, pages 75–76. they started at daybreak and returned to camp typically between four and six o'clock in the afternoon. Holmberg, pages 100–101. this makes on average at least eleven hours of hunting, and at three and a half days a week it comes to an average of 38 hours of hunting per week, at the least. Since the men also did a significant amount of work on days when they did not hunt (pages 76, 100), their work week, averaged over the year, had to be far more than forty hours. Actually, Holmberg estimated that the Siriono spent about half their waking time in hunting and foraging (page 222), which would mean about 56 hours a week in these activities alone. With other work included, the work week would have had to be well over sixty hours. The Siriono woman enjoys even less respite from labor than her husband, and the obligation of bringing her children to maturity leaves little time for rest. Holmberg, page 224. For other information indicating

how hard the Siriono had to work, see pages 87, 107, 157, 213, 220, 223, 246, 248–49, 254, 268.

Violence. As mentioned earlier, numerous examples of violence can be found in Coon's *The Hunting Peoples*. According to Gontran de Poncins, *Kabloona*, pages 116–120, 125, 162–165, 237–238, 244, homicides usually by a stab in the back were rather common among his Eskimos. The Mbuti pygmies were probably one of the least violent primitive peoples that I know of, since Turnbull reports no cases of homicide among them (apart from infanticide; see *Wayward Servants*, page 130). However, throughout *The Forest People* and *Wayward Servants* Turnbull mentions many beatings and fights with fists or sticks. Paul Schebesta, *Die Bambuti-Pygen vom Ituri*, Volume I, Institut Royal Colonial Belge, Brussels, 1938, pages 81–84, reports evidence that during the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century the Mbuti waged deadly warfare against the village-dwelling Africans who also lived in their forest. (For infanticide, see Schebesta, page 138.)

Competition. The presence of competition in hunting-and-gathering societies is shown by the fights that occurred in some of them. See for example Coon, *Hunting Peoples*, pages 238, 252, 257–58. If a physical fight isn't a form of competition, then nothing is.

Fights may arise from competition for mates. For instance, Turnbull, *Wayward Servants*, pages 206, mentions a woman who lost three teeth in fighting with another woman over a man. Coon, page 260, mentions fighting over women by Australian aboriginal men. Competition for food may also lead to quarreling. This is not to say that sharing [of meat] takes place without any dispute or acrimony. On the contrary, the arguments that ensue when the hunt returns to camp are frequently long and loud. Turnbull, *Wayward Servants*, page 158. Coon refers to vociferous arguments over sharing of whale meat among certain Eskimos. *Hunting Peoples*, page 125.

\* \* \*

I could go on and on citing concrete facts that show how ridiculous is the image of primitive peoples as non-competitive, vegetarian conservationists who had gender equality, respected the rights of animals, and didn't have to work for a living. But this letter is already too long, so the examples already given will have to suffice.

I don't mean to say that the hunting-and-gathering way of life was no better than modern life. On the contrary, I believe it was better beyond comparison. Many, perhaps most investigators who have studied hunter-gatherers have expressed their respect, their admiration, or even their envy of them. For example, Cashdan, page 21, refers to the hunting-and-gathering way



of life as highly successful. Coon, page XIX, refers to the full and satisfactory lives of hunter-gatherers. Turnbull, *Forest People*, page 26, writes: [The Mbuti] were a people who had found in the forest something that made their life more than just worth living, something that made it, with all its hardships and problems and tragedies, a wonderful thing full of joy and happiness and free of care. Schebesta writes, page 73: How varied are the dangers, but also the joyous experiences on his hunting-excursions and countless journeys through the primeval forest! We of an unpoetic, mechanical age can have no more than an inkling of how deeply all of that touches the forest people in their mystical-magical thinking and shapes their attitude. And on page 205: The pygmies stand before us as one of the most natural of human races, as people who live exclusively in compliance with nature and without violation of their physical organism. Among their principal traits are an unusually sturdy naturalness and liveness, and an unparalleled cheerfulness and freedom from care. They are people whose lives pass in compliance with the laws of nature.

But obviously the reasons why primitive life was better than civilized life had nothing to do with gender equality, kindness to animals, non-competitiveness, or nonviolence. Those values are the soft values of modern civilization. By projecting those values onto hunting-and-gatherer societies, the GA Movement has created a myth of a primitive utopia that never existed in reality.

Thus, even though the GA Movement claims to reject civilization and modernity, it remains enslaved to some of the most important values of modern society. For this reason, the GA Movement cannot be an effective revolutionary movement.

In the first place, part of the GA Movement's energy is deflected away from the real revolutionary objective to eliminate modern technology and civilization in general in favor of the pseudo-revolutionary issues of racism, sexism, animal rights, homosexual rights, and so forth.

In the second place, because of its commitment to these pseudo-revolutionary issues, the GA Movement may attract too many leftist people who are less interested in getting rid of modern civilization than they are in the leftist issues of racism, sexism, etc. This would cause a further deflection of the movement's energy away from the issues of technology and civilization.

In the third place, the objective of securing the rights of women, homosexuals, animals, and so forth, is incompatible with the objective of eliminating civilization, because women and homosexuals in primitive societies often do not have equality, and such societies are usually cruel to animals. If one

goal is to secure the rights of these groups, then ones best policy is to stick with modern civilization.

In the fourth place, the GA Movements adoption of many of the soft values of modern civilization, as well as its myth of a soft primitive utopia, attracts too many soft, dreamy, lazy, impractical people who are more incline to retreat into utopian fantasies than to take effective, realistic action to get rid of the technoindustrial system.

In fact, there is grave danger that the GA Movement may take the same route as Christianity. Originally, under the personal leadership of Jesus Christ, Christianity was not only a religious movement but also a movement toward social revolution. As a purely religious movement Christianity turned out to be successful, but as a revolutionary movement it was a complete failure. It did nothing to correct the social inequalities of its time, and as soon as the Christians had an opportunity to make a deal with the emperor Constantine they sold out and became part of the power-structure of the Roman Empire.

There appear to be some disquieting resemblances between the psychology of the GA Movement and that of early Christianity. The analogies between the two movements are striking: primitive utopia = Garden of Eden; development of civilization = the Fall, original sin, eating the apple from the Tree of Knowledge; the Revolution = Day of Judgment; return to primitive utopia = arrival of the Kingdom God. Veganism probably plays the same psychological role as the dietary restrictions of Christianity (fasting during Lent) and of other religions. The risks taken by activists in using their bodies to block logging machinery and so forth can be compared to the martyrdom of early Christians who died for their beliefs (except that the Christianss martyrdom required far more courage than the tactics of todays activists do). If the GA Movement takes the same path as Christianity, it too will be a complete failure as a revolutionary movement.

The GA Movement may be not only useless, but worse than useless, because it may be an obstacle to the development of an effective revolutionary movement. Since opposition to technology and civilization is an important part of the GA Movemetns program, young people who are concerned about what technological civilization is doing to the world are drawn into that movement. Certainly not all of these young people are leftists or soft, dreamy, ineffectuel types; some of them have potential to become real revolutionaries. But in the GA Movement they are outnumbered by leftists and other useless people, so they are neutralized, they become corrupted, and their revolutionart potential is wasted. In this sense, the GA Movement could be called a destroyer of potential revolutionaries.

It will be necessary to build a new revolutionary movement that will keep itself strictly separate from the GA Movement and its soft, civilized values. I don't mean that there is anything wrong with gender equality, kindness to animals, tolerance of homosexuality, or the like. But these values have no relevance to the effort to eliminate technological civilization. They are not revolutionary values. An effective revolutionary movement will have to adopt instead the hard values of primitive societies, such as skill, self-discipline, honesty, physical and mental stamina, intolerance of externally-imposed restraints, capacity to endure physical pain, and, above all, courage.

P.S. Letters addressed to me sometimes fail to reach me, so if you should write to me and get no answer, you can assume that I did not receive your letter. TJK

Sincerely yours,

Ted Kaczynski

Enclosures: Photocopies of pages 28 and 29 of magazine *Bears and Other Top Predators*, Volume 1, Issue 2.

Photocopy of article "Sibling Desperado", *Science News*, Volume 163, February 15, 2003

## C. Letter Series on the book *Ice Brothers*

### Letter from Betty S. Wilson to Ted

... I am the widow of the late Sloan Wilson. Over the eight years since Sloan and I were first questioned by the Federal Bureau of Investigation about the reason you allegedly chose "Ice Brothers" as a casing for a destructive device I too have considered that question...

### Letter from Ted to Betty

February 18, 2005

Dear Mrs. Wilson,

... You ask why the novel *Ice Brothers*, by your late husband, Sloan Wilson, was chosen by the Unabomber to conceal a bomb. I have never admitted to being the Unabomber (except in my guilty plea, which was involuntary), but I assume that anyone who wanted to conceal a bomb in a hollowed-out book would be indifferent to the content of the book and would consider only those of its characteristics that were relevant to his purpose, such as its size and shape. So it was probably mere chance that the Unabomber selected a copy of *Ice Brothers*.

Sincerely yours,  
Ted Kaczynski

## The Ted K Archive

Ted Kaczynski  
“Why did you do it?”

<[documentcloud.org/documents/2697421-Why-Why-did-you-do-it.html](https://documentcloud.org/documents/2697421-Why-Why-did-you-do-it.html)>

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