LETTER TO EDITORS OF LWOD. We urge you to print this in LWOD.

Many of the people who want to destroy the industrial form of society are concerned about the population problem and therefore refrain from having children: Ne believe this is a serious mistake. Scientific studies have shown that spotal attitudes tend to be inherited. No one suggests that a person's social attitudes are directly determined by his or her genetic constitution. but there is good reason to believe that children inherit personality traits that make them likely, in the context of the present society, to develop one or another set of social attitudes. Some scientists question this conclusion, but their arguments are rather flimsy and are ideologically motivated. Anyway, if social attitudes are not inherited then they are passed on through childhood training, because it is certain that a person's attitudes tend, on the average, to resemble those of his parents; allowing of course for frequent individual exceptions and for changes in the social situation that occur between one generation and another. Unlike us, earlier generations of rebels tended to attack particular social evils rather than industrial society as a whole, because in their day it had not yet become evident that the evil was inherent in interestation industrialism itself. But the general tendency to a rebellious attitude to-ward modern society is commonly passed from parents to children, whether gene-tically or through training.

By refraining from having children, rebels against the industrial system may be handing the world over to the growths. ("Growth" is our word for anyone who favors economic growth and all that amaging expenses the growths have as many children as they like, while many radicals. refrain from having children from concern over the population problem, there danger that with each successive generation the proportion of growths in the population will increase and the proportion of rebels will decrease.

We too are disgusted at the present grossly overpopulated state of the world and we agree that it is necessary to reduce the earth's population as much as possible. But the best way to reach a goal is not always to head di-

rectly toward it.

What the earth's population will be 50 or 100 years from now depends mainly on the form of society that will then exist. The present sconomically oriented form of society, based on industrialism, tends inexorably to grow to the limit of the available resources. By creating new genetically altered plants, or maybe through some form type of artificial photosynthesis, this form of society will greatly increase the world's food producing capacity and will allow or encourage its population to grow to the limit of that capacity. Or, even if the population does not grow to the limit, the demands of the ever expanding industrial system will stress the earth's resources to the maximum. So if the present form of society survives, the world that it creates will be a horrible

Therefore the important goal is to destroy the present form of society and 

ite industrial base.

If anti-industrial rebels give a reproductive advantage to the growths by refraining from having children, they will be slowing present population growth only slightly and they will be increasing the likelihood that the growths will win out, that the present form of society will survive and that the world of the future will be a horror.

If the rebels have as many children as they can, they will be accelerating present population growth only slightly and they will be increasing the number of anti-industrial rebels, hence the probability that the present form of society can be eliminated, and consequently the likelihood that the world's pop-

ulation can be greatly reduced in the future.

So it would be best for those who hate industrialism to outbreed the growths until the present form of society has been done away with.

Copy of letter sent to New York Times. You can print it in LWOD if you like.

This is a message from the terrorist group FC. To prove its authenticity we give our identifying number (to be kept secret): (omitted)

We blew up Thomas Mosser last December because he was a Burston-Marsteller executive. Among other misdeeds, Burston-Marsteller helped Exxon clean up its public image after the Exxon Valdez incident. But we attacked Burston-Marsteller less for its specific misdeeds than on general principles. Burston-Marsteller is about the biggest organization in the public relations field. This means that its business is the development of techniques for manipulating people's attitudes. It was for this more than for its actions in specific cases that we sent a bomb to an executive of this company.

Some news reports have made the misleading statement that we have been attacking universities or scholars. We have nothing against universities or scholars as such. All the university people whom we have attacked have been specialists in technical fields. (We consider certain areas of applied psychology, such as behavior modification, to be technical fields.) We would not want anyone to think that we have any desire to hurt professors who study archaeology, history, literature or harmless stuff like that. The people we are out to get are the scientists and engineers, especially in critical fields like computers and genetics. As for the bomb planted in the Business School at the U. of Utah, that was a botched operation. We won't say how or why it was botched because we don't want to give the FBI any clues. No one was hurt by that bomb.

In our previous letter to you we called curselves anarchists. Since "anarchist" is a vague word that has been applied to a variety of attitudes, further explanation is needed. We call ourselves anarchists because \*\* would like, ideally, to break down all society into very small, completely autonomous units. Regrettably, we don't see any clear road to this goal, so we leave it to the indefinite future. Our more immediate goal, which we think may be attainable at some time during the next several decades, is the destruction of the worldwide industrial system. Through our bombings we hope to promote social instability in industrial society, propagate antiindustrial ideas and give encouragement to those who hate the industrial system.

The FBI has tried to portray these bombings as the work of an isolated We won't waste our time arguing about whether we are nuts, but we cortainly are not isolated. For security reasons we won't reveal the number of members of our group, but anyone who will read the anarchist and radical environmentalist journals will see that opposition to the industrial-techno-

logical system is widespread and growing.

Why do we announce our goals only now, though we made our first bomb some seventeen years ago? Our early bombs were too ineffectual to attract much public attention or give encouragement to those who hate the system. found by experience that gunpowder bombs, if small enough to be carried inconspicuously, were too feeble to do much damage, so we took a couple of years off to do some experimenting. We learned how to make pipe ha bombs that were powerful enough, and we used these in a couple of successful bombings as well as in some unsuccessful ones. Unfortunately we discovered that these bombs would not detonate consistently when made with three-quarter Inch steel water pipe. They did seem to detonate consistently when made with massively reinforced one inch steel water pipe, but a bomb of this type made

a long, heavy package, too conspicuous and suspicious looking for our liking. Bo we went back to work, and after a long period of experimentation we developed a type of bomb that does not require a pipe, but is set off by a detonating cap that consists of a chlorate explosive packed into a piece of small diameter copper tubing. (The detonating cap is a miniature pipe bomb.) We used bombs of this type to blow up the genetic engineer Charles Epatein and the computer specialist David Golernter. We did use a chlorate pipe bomb to blow up Thomas Mosser because we happened to have a piece of lightweight aluminum pipe that was just right for the job. The Gelarater and Epstein bombings were not fatal, but the Mosser bombing was fatal even though a smaller amount of explosive was used. We think this was because the type of fragmentation material that we used in the Mosser bombing is more effect-

ive than what we've used previously.

free of limitations on the size and shapes of our bombs. We are pretty sure we know how to increase the power of our explosives and reduce the number of batteries needed to set them off. And, as we've just indicated, we think we now have more effective fragmentation material. So we expect to be able to pack deadly bombs into ever smaller, lighter and more harmless looking packages. On the other hand, we believe we will be able to make bombs much bigger than any we've made before. With a briefense-full or a suitease-full of explosives we should be able to blow out the walls of substantial buildings.

Clearly we are in a position to dam do a great deal of damage. And it doesn't appear that the FBI is going to catch us any time soon. The FBI is a joke.

The people who are pushing all this growth and progress garbage deserve to be severely punished. But our goal is less to punish them than to propagate ideas. Anyhow we are getting tired of making bombs. It's no fun having to spend all your evenings and weekends preparing dangerous mixures, filing trigger mechanisms out of scraps of metal or searching the sterras for a place

isolated enough to test a bomb. So we offer a bargain.

We have a long article, between 29,000 and 37,000 words, that we want to have published. If you can get it published according to our requirements we will permanently desist from terrorist activities. It must be published in the New York Times, Time or Newsweek, or in some other widely read, nationally distributed periodical. Because of its length we suppose it will have to be serialized. Alternatively, it can be published as a small book, but the book must be well publicized and made available at a moderate price in bookstores nationwide and in at least some places abroad. Whoever agrees to publish the material will have exclusive rights to reproduce it for a period of six months and will be referred to any profits they may make from it. After six months from the first appearance of the article or book it must become public property, so that anyone can reproduce or publish it. (If material is serialized, first instalment becomes public property six months after appearance of first instalment, second instalment becomes public property six months after appearance of second instalment, etc.) We must have the right to publish in the New York Times, Time or Newsweek, each year for three years after the appearance of our article or book, three thousand words expanding or clarifying our material or rebutting criticisms of it.

The article will not explicitly advocate violence. There will be an unavoidable implication that we favor violence to the extent that it may be necessary, since we advocate eliminating industrial acciety and we ourselves have been using violence to that end. But the article will not advocate violence explicitly, nor will it propose the overthrow of the United States Government, nor will it contain obscenity or anything else that you would be likely to

regard as warmenaptations unacceptable for publication.

How do you know that we will keep our promise to desist from terrorism if our conditions are met? It will be to our advantage to keep our promise. We want to win acceptance for certain ideas. If we break our promise people will

lose respect for us and so will be less likely to accept the ideas.

Our offer to desist from terrorism is subject to three qualifications. First: Our promise to desist will not take effect until all parts of our article or book have appeared in print. Second: If the authorities should succeed in tracking us down and an attempt is made to arrest any of us, or even to question us in connection with the bombings, we reserve the right to use violence. Third: We distinguish between terrorism and sabotage. By terrorism we mean actions motivated by a desire to influence the development of a society and intended to cause injury or death to human beings. By sabotage we mean similarly motivated actions intended to destroy property without injuring human beings. The promise we offer in to desist from terrorism. We reserve the right to engage in sabotage.

It may be just as well that failure of our early bombs discouraged as from making any public statements at that time. We were very young then and our

## NY TIMES LETTER, PAGE 3

thinking was crude. Over the years we have given as much attention to the development of our ideas as to the development of bombs, and we now have something serious to say. And we feel that just now the time is ripe for the

presentation of anti-industrial ideas.

Please see to it that the answer to our offer is well publicized in the media so that we won't miss it. Be oure to tell us where and how our material will be published and how long it will take to appear in print once we have sent in the manuscript. If the answer is satisfactory, we will finish typing the renuscript and send it to you. If the answer is unsatisfactory, we will start building our next bomb.

We encourage you to print this letter.

FU

## CONFIDENTIAL NOTE

5 001

Enclosed is a letter that presumably will require general discussion by the LWOD staff. But this confidential note contains material that should be known to as few people as possible. So whichever LWOD person opens this envelope, he or she should hide this note and reveal its existence to no one, except when absolutely necessary. Read the other material in this envelope before reading the rest of this confidential material in this envelope.

The material in this envelope constitutes evidence in a felony case, so LWOD might get in trouble if it doesn't then turn this stuff over to the FBI. It is always possible that your group may contain an FBI infiltrator who will report our letter to his bosses. And if you do publish our manuscript the FBI will know about it. So LWOD may want to give these documents to the FBI (except this confidential note, which can safely be kept secret).

This creates a possible problem, because the FBI will be able to confuse you or us by sending LWOD a fake manuscript or placing a fake ad in the SF Chronicle or some such COINTELPRO trick. Or the FBI may ask the Chronicle not to print your ad on the grounds that it would contribute to "criminal" activity. To get around that, we should have some completely confidential

way of communicating. This can be established as follows.

Place an ad in the classified section of the Los Angeles Times, classification #1660, "Personal messages." The ad should preferably appear on May 9, 1995, but in any case leave a few days between the time when the Chronicle ad appears and the time when the LA Times ad appears. The ad should begin, "Dear Stargazer, the mystic numbers that control your fate are ..." and it should be signed "Numerologist." In between there will be a sequence of num-

bers conveying a coded message.

The code works this way. It will be a random number code and therefore unbreakable. Use the series of random numbers that we have given on another sheet. Begin by encoding your message according to the following system: For A put 1, for B put 2, for C max put 3, etc. up to 26 for Z. For space between two words put 27, for period put 28, for comma put 29, for question mark put 30. When you have your message coded by this system you will have a series of numbers that we can call the basic sequence. You then change the basic sequence by adding to it the numbers of the random sequence. To the first number of the basic sequence add the first number of the random sequence, to the second number of the basic sequence add the second number of the random sequence and so forth. Whenever the sum is greater that 30, subtract 30 from it. The resulting sequence of numbers is what you publish in LA Times. See example on other sheet.

In your coded ad please give us an address to which we can send you messages with assurance that they will be many taxtiques and confidential. (We won't send you any uncoded message that could get you in trouble if it got into the wrong hands.) Also please tell us in your coded ad whether your open ad in SF Chronicle is authentic

and can be taken at face value.

Your coded ad probably won't use up all the numbers of the random sequence. Save the rest of the sequence in case we want it for future use. NEVER USE ANY PART OF THE RANDOM SEQUENCE TWICE. To do so would enable the FBI to decode the message.

We give a separate, confidential identifying number for verification of

any messages we may send you: 82771.

Legally the FBI can't open first class mail without a warrant, but there's always a chance they might have opened the present envelope anyway, so this system of passing confidential messages isn't 100% secure.

Los Angeles Times Classified Ads Phone - Numbers

 $(213) \quad 629 - 4411$   $(800) \quad 234 - 4444$ 

Address of Los Angeles Times

Los Angeles Times Times Mirror Equare Los Angeles, CA 90053