

The Communications of Ted Kaczynski as part of his Terror Bombing Campaign

Theo Slade

2 Nov. 2022

Contents

Letter to San Francisco Examiner (December, 1985)	3
Letter to Warren Hodge of the New York Times (June 24, 1993)	6
First Batch of Letters: Offer to stop bombing if a major newspaper publishes his manifesto (April 1995)	7
Letter to Warren Hoge of the New York Times (April 24)	7
Letter to David Gelernter	11
Letter to Phillip A. Sharp	12
Letter to Richard J. Roberts	12
Letter to Earth First! Journal	12
Material Sent to LWOD	14
Letter to LWOD	14
Confidential note to LWOD	15
Letter to ACLU	17
Penthouse offer to publish (April 28)	17
Second batch of letters: Threatening to blow up an airliner, delivering the manifesto & other letters (June 1995)	19
Threat to blow up an airliner (June 27)	19
Letter to the Washington Post (June 27)	20
The Manifesto	21
Letter addressed to Warren Hodge of the New York Times (June 28)	24
Letter to Mr Guccione of Penthouse Magazine	28
Satisfying an itch to write letter responses to news articles	35
Tom Tyler Article, Letter & Open Letter Response	36
An Article Theorizing a Tech Induced Apocalypse is Written & The Unabomber Responds	42
Original PDF Scans of the Letters	48

Letter to San Francisco Examiner (December, 1985)

Ted:¹

TO THE SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

The bomb that crippled the right arm of a graduate student in electrical engineering and damaged a computer lab at U. of Cal. Berkeley last May was planted by a terrorist group called Freedom Club. We are also responsible for some earlier bombing attempts; among others, the bomb that injured a professor in the computer science building at U. of Cal., the mail bomb that injured the secretary of computer expert Patrick Fischer at Vanderbilt University 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ years ago, and the fire bomb planted at the Business School at the U. of Utah, which never went off. We have nothing against academics as such. We could have attacked businessmen or scientists working for private corporations. But academics are easy targets because anyone can walk into college buildings without being questioned, and academics are less likely to be suspicious of a package received in the mail than someone in the business world would be.

We have waited until now to announce ourselves because our earlier bombs were embarrassingly ineffectual. The injuries they inflicted were relatively minor. In order to influence people, a terrorist group must show a certain amount of success. When we finally realized that the amount of smokeless powder needed to blow up anyone or anything was too large to be practical, we decided to take a couple of years off to learn something about explosive and develop an effective bomb.

First, we had to learn some basic physics, chemistry and mathematics, since none of us had any scientific background to start with. Then we had to go through some time-consuming experiments. That we now have an effective bomb is shown by what we did to that electrical engineer's arm with less than two ounces of explosive. He would have been killed if he had been standing so as to take the fragments in the body instead of the arm. You can imagine what we will be able to do when we have worked out ways to

¹ Ted Kaczynski. Message to San Francisco Examiner C-248 [Letter]. Original link. Archived link.

use this explosive in larger quantities, say ten, twenty five or fifty pounds. We hope those computer freaks over at the university like fireworks, cause they are going to see some good ones.

To prove that we are the ones who planted to bomb at U. of Cal. last May, we will mention a few details that could be known only to us and the FBI men who investigated the incident. The explosive was contained in an iron pipe of nominal $\frac{3}{4}$ inch (actually about 13/16 inch) inside diameter. The ends of the pipe were closed with iron plugs secured with iron pins, of 5/16 inch diameter. One of the plugs had the letters FC (for Freedom Club) marked on it. (There was a metal disc attached to the plug to help assure a good seal. If this was not blown off it would be necessary to remove it in order to see the letters FC.) The bomb was ignited by electricity passing through a fine steel filament. The load-wires passing through the plug to the filament were 18 gauge with green insulation. The rest of the wiring was 16 gauge with flesh covered insulation. Six Duracell size D batteries were used. This should be enough to prove that we planted the bomb.

We enclose a brief statement partly explaining our aims. We hereby give the San Francisco Examiner permission to print in full any and all of the material contained in this envelope. We give ANYONE permission to print it. We want the material to be in the public domain so that anyone can print it. We don't know if this note is legally adequate to put our statement in the public domain, especially since we are not going to sign our names to this letter, but you can be sure we are not going to sue anyone for infringement of copyright for printing this material, so you might as well go ahead and print it.

– THE FREEDOM CLUB

1. The aim of the Freedom Club is the complete and permanent destruction of modern industrial society in every part of the world. This means no more airplanes, no more radios, no more miracle drugs, no more paved roads, and so forth. Today a large and growing number of people are coming to recognize the industrial-technological system as the greatest enemy of freedom. Many evidences of these changing attitudes could be cited. For the moment we content ourselves with mentioning one statistic. "According to a January 1980 poll, only 33 percent of the citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany [West Germany] still believe that technological development will lead to greater freedom; 56 percent think it is more likely to make us less free." This is from "1984: Decade of the Experts?" – an article by Johanno Strasser in 1934 revisited: Totalitarianism in our century, edited by Irving Howe and published by Harper and Row, 1983. (This article as

a whole helps to show the extent to which technology is becoming a target of social rebellion.)

2. The hollowness of the old revolutionary ideologies centering on socialism has become clear. Now and in the future the thrust of rebellion will be against the industrial-technological system itself and not for or against any political ideology that is supposed to govern the administration of that system. All ideologies and political systems are fakes. They only result in power for special groups who just push the rest of us around. There is only one way to escape from being pushed around, and that is to smash the whole system and get along without it. It is better to be poor and free than to be a slave and get pushed around all your life.

3. No ideology or political system can get around the hard facts of life in industrial society. Because any form of industrial society requires a high level of organization, all decisions have to be made by a small elite of leaders and experts who necessarily wield all the power, regardless of any political fictions that may be maintained. Even if the motives of this elite were completely unselfish, they would still HAVE TO exploit and manipulate us simply to keep the system running. Thus the evil is in the nature of technology itself.

4. Man is a social animal, meant to live in groups. But only in SMALL groups, say up to 100 people, in which all members know one another intimately. Man is not meant to live as an insignificant atom in a vast organization, which is the only way he can live in any form of industrialized society.

5. The Freedom Club is strictly anti-communist, anti-socialist, anti-leftist. One reason for this is that the left has a consistent record of unintentionally (when not intentionally) subverting rebel movements of any kind and turning them into leftist movements. Until now, leftism has had an image as THE ideology of rebellion, so that many persons who join any rebel movement are likely to be left-leaning. When enough leftists have joined such a movement it acquires a leftish aroma which attracts still more leftists until the movement becomes just another socialist sect. Therefore the Freedom Club must completely disassociate itself from any form of leftism. This does not imply that we are in any sense a right-wing movement. We are apolitical. Politics only distracts attention from the real issue.

6. Don't think that we are sadists or thrill-seekers or that we have adopted terrorism lightly. Though we are young we are not hot-heads. We have become terrorists only after the most earnest consideration.

The foregoing statement gives only a very incomplete indication of our goals and motives. We will explain ourselves more fully in later communications.

Letter to Warren Hodge of the New York Times (June 24, 1993)

Ted:¹

We are an anarchist group calling ourselves FC. Notice that the postmark on this envelope precedes a newsworthy event that will happen about the time you receive this letter, if nothing goes wrong. This will prove that we knew about the event in advance, so our claim of responsibility is truthful. Ask the FBI about FC. They have heard of us. We will give information about our goals at some future time. Right now we only want to establish our identity and provide an identifying number that will ensure the authenticity of any future communications from us. Keep this number secret so that no one else can pretend to speak in our name.

553-25-4394

¹ Ted Kaczynski. U-3: Letter and envelop from FC to Warren Hoge [Letter]. California University of Pennsylvania Special Collections. Original link. Archived link.

First Batch of Letters: Offer to stop bombing if a major newspaper publishes his manifesto (April 1995)

Letter to Warren Hoge of the New York Times (April 24)

Ted:¹

This is a message from the terrorist group FC. To prove its [sic.] authentic we give our identifying number (to be kept secret): 553-25-4394.

We blew up Thomas Mosser last December because he was a Burston-Marsteller executive. Among other misdeeds, Burston-Marsteller [sic.] helped Exxon clean up its public image after the Exxon Valdes incident. But we attacked Burston-Marsteller less for its specific misdeed 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

¹ Ted Kaczynski. U-7: Letter and envelop from FC to Warren Hoge (Assistant Managing Editor, NY Times) [Letter]. California University of Pennsylvania Special Collections. Original link. Archived link.

like computers and genetics. As for the bomb planted in the [crossed out] 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 ourselves 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 we 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 anti-industrial 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 nut. We won't waste our time arguing about whether we are nuts, but we certainly 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-technological system is widespread and growing.

Why do we announce our [crossed out] goals only now, through 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. We 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 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.

So 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 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 Epstein and the computer specialist David Gelernter. We did use a chlorate pipe bomb to blow up Thomas Mosser because we happened to have a piece

of light-weight aluminum pipe that was just right for the job. The Gelernter 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 effective [crossed out] than what we've used previously.

Since we no longer have to confine the explosive in a pipe, we are now free of limitations on the size and shape 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 briefcase-full or a suitcase-full of explosives we should be able to blow out the walls of substantial buildings.

Clearly we are in a position to 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 mixtures, filing trigger mechanisms out of scraps of metal or searching the sierras 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 welcome 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, 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 ~~[crossed out]~~ 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 society 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 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 ~~[crossed out]~~ 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 is 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 us from making any public statements at that time. We were very young then and our 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 sure 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 manuscript and send it to you. If the answer is unsatisfactory, we will start building our next bomb.

We encourage you to print this letter.

FC

P.S. Mr. Hoge, at this time we are sending letters to David Gelernter, Richard J. Roberts and Phillip A. Sharp, the last two being recent Nobel Prize winners. We are not putting our identifying number on these letters, because we want to keep it secret. Instead, we are advising Gelernter, Roberts and Sharp to contact you for confirmation that the letters do come from FC.

Letter to David Gelernter

Ted:²

Dr. Gelernter:

People with advanced degrees aren't as smart as they think they are. If you'd had any brains you would have realized that there are a lot of people out there who resent bitterly the way techno-nerds like you are changing the world and you wouldn't have been dumb enough to open an unexpected package from an unknown source.

In the epilog of your book, "Mirror Worlds," you tried to justify your research by claiming that the developments you describe are inevitable, and that any college person can learn enough about computers to compete in a computer-dominated world. Apparently, people without a college degree don't count. In any case, being informed about computers won't enable anyone to prevent invasion of privacy (through computers), genetic engineering (to which computers make an important contribution), environmental degradation through excessive economic growth (computers make an important contribution to economic growth) and so forth.

As for the inevitability argument, if the developments you describe are inevitable, they are not inevitable in the way that old age and bad weather are inevitable. They are inevitable only because techno-nerds like you make them inevitable. If there were no computer scientists there would be no progress in computer science. If you claim you are justified in pursuing your research because the developments involved are inevitable, then you may as well say that theft is inevitable, therefore we shouldn't blame thieves.

But we do not believe that progress and growth are inevitable.

We'll have more to say about that later.

FC

² Ted Kaczynski. U-4: Letter and envelop from FC to David Gelernter [Letter]. California University of Pennsylvania Special Collections. Original link. Archived link.

P.S. Warren Hoge of the New York Times can confirm that this letter does come from FC.

Letter to Phillip A. Sharp

Ted:³

Dr. Sharp: It would be beneficial to your health to stop your research in genetics. This is a warning from FC.

Warren Hoge of the New York Times can confirm that this note does come from FC.

Letter to Richard J. Roberts

Ted:⁴

Dr. Roberts: It would be beneficial to your health to stop your research in genetics. This is a warning from FC.

Warren Hoge of the New York Times can confirm that this note does come from FC.

Letter to Earth First! Journal

Ted:⁵

Earth First!:

This is a message from FC. The FBI calls us “unabom.” We are the people who recently assassinated the president of the California Forestry Association. We know that most radical environmentalists are non-violent and strongly disapprove of our bombings. But we have some things to say that should be of special interest to radical environmentalists. Even if you disagree with our conclusions you can hardly deny that the issues we raise are important ones that radical environmentalists should think about and discuss.

³ U-6: Letter and envelop from FC to Phillip A. Sharp

⁴ Ted Kaczynski. U-5: Letter and envelop from FC to Richard J. Roberts [Letter]. California University of Pennsylvania Special Collections. Original link. Archived link.

⁵ Ted Kaczynski. Letter to Earth First! C-258 [Letter]. California University of Pennsylvania Special Collections. Original link. Archived link.

We are enclosing a copy of a manuscript that we are sending to the New York Times, also a copy of the letter that we are sending to the Times with the manuscript. We have reason to hope that the NY Times will either publish the manuscript or arrange for its publication elsewhere. However, if neither the NY Times nor any other major periodical has published the manuscript, or begun to publish it in serialized form, or had it published elsewhere, or announced a definite date for its publication, within 5 months of the day this letter is postmarked, then the Earth First! Journal can publish the manuscript. You can publish it either serialized or in the form of a small book, and you will be welcome to [crossed out] keep any profit you may make from it. Contact NY Times for information concerning what is being done about publication of the manuscript.

We offered the NY Times a promise to desist from terrorism in exchange for publication of our manuscript in a widely read, nationally distributed periodical. Earth First! does not qualify as widely read, so we offer no such promise in [crossed out] exchange for publication in Earth First! However, if Earth First! is willing and able to get the manuscript published in book form, and if the book is [crossed out] distributed nationally and well publicized, then we will abide by the promise to desist from terrorism. Contact the NY Times [crossed out] for information concerning conditions that we laid down in our letters to that newspaper.

Whoever may first publish the manuscript, after a period of 6 months has elapsed since that first publication, anyone [crossed out] (including Earth First!) will have the right to publish the material freely. However, the period might possibly be extended beyond 6 months. See enclosed letter to NY Times.

In any case, you can immediately make up to 5 copies of the manuscript for your own use. If you wear gloves while making the copies you won't mess up any fingerprints or anything, so the FBI won't be able to claim you have damaged any evidence.

How do you know this letter really comes from FC? Some part of the letter we are sending to the NY Times will probably be published in the newspaper, and you can [crossed out] compare it with the copy we are sending you. The authenticity of the material that we are sending to the NY Times will be confirmed by means of our secret identifying number.

FC

Material Sent to LWOD

Letter to LWOD

Ted:⁶⁷

To LWOD [Live Wild or Die]: This is a message from FC Anarchist Terror Group. We are the people who have been blowing up computer scientists, biotech specialists, public relations experts and so forth. The FBI calls us “Unabom.” About the time you receive this letter you should hear through the media about another bombing, if everything works OK. Notice that this letter was postmarked either before or about the same time as the bombing hit the news, which proves that the letter is authentic. As a means of proving the authenticity of any further communications we may send to you, we give you an identifying number: 14962. Keep this number secret, so that when you receive a letter bearing it you will know that the letter comes from us. This is different from the identifying number that we gave to the New York Times.

We have a manuscript of between 29,000 and 37,000 words that we want to have published. We are writing to the New York Times to try to make a deal over it. We are telling the Times that if they will publish the manuscript serialized in their newspaper, or [crossed out] if they can get it published in book form, we will agree to stop blowing up scientists and corporate execs. For the moment we are more interested in propagating anti-industrial ideas than in killing another exec or biotech nerd.

However, we may find it useful to blow up more biotechnicians and the like at some time in the future, so we would prefer not to be bound by a promise to stop bombing. If we made such a promise we wouldn’t want to break it. So we are looking for some way to get our material published without having to make any promises or deals.

Would LWOD be willing to publish our manuscript in serial form? Or, better, could you get it published in book form and widely distributed to the general public? If you published it in serial form, how long would it take you to publish the whole thing? If you could get it published in book form, how widely would you distribute it and how long would it take you to get it published once we have sent you the manuscript? You’d be welcome to keep any profit you might make on the book and use it to propagate anti-industrial ideas.

⁶ Ted Kaczynski. Letter to LWOD with codes C-261 [Letter]. California University of Pennsylvania Special Collections. Original link. Archived link.

⁷ Ted Kaczynski. Letter to LWOD C-262 [Letter]. California University of Pennsylvania Special Collections. Original link. Archived link.

The manuscript contains: (1) an analysis of what is wrong with the industrial system; (2) a demonstration that the industrial system cannot be successfully reformed but must be destroyed; (3) appropriate strategy for revolutionaries seeking to destroy the industrial system.

Please give us your answer by placing a classified ad in the San Francisco [crossed out] Chronicle, preferably on May 1, 1995. The ad should begin with the words "Personal to MCHVP." We ask you to answer in SF Chronicle instead of LWOD because we know of only one place where we can get to LWOD, and if the FBI gets hold of this letter they will be able to watch the few places where it is possible to get LWOD and maybe catch us that way.

We enclose a copy of our letter to the NY Times.

Place the ad in the classification #420, "Personals." To place ad contact

San Francisco Newspaper Agency

Classified Dept.

925 Mission Street

San Francisco, CA 94103

toll free phone (800) 227-4423

Best Regards,

FC

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

Confidential note to LWOD

Ted:⁸

CONFIDENTIAL NOTE

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[crossed out] note.

The material in this envelope constitutes evidence in a felony case, so LWOD might get in trouble if it doesn't [crossed out] turn this stuff over

⁸ Ted Kaczynski. Letter to LWOD with codes C-261 [Letter]. California University of Pennsylvania Special Collections. Original link. Archived link.

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. This 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 sequences of numbers conveying a coded message.

The code works this way. It will be 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 [crossed out] 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 than 30, subtract 30 from it. The resulting sequence of numbers is what you publish in the 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 [crossed out] completely safe 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. Have 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.

FC

Los Angeles Times Classified Ads Phone Numbers

[213]~~~ 629-4411

(800) 234-4444

Address of Los Angeles Times

Los Angeles Times

Times Mirror Square

Los Angeles, CA 90052

Letter to ACLU

This is a letter or copy of a letter found in Ted's cabin. It's unknown whether or not he sent the letter though:⁹

ACLU Privacy and Technology Project:

This is a message from the terrorist group FC. The FBI calls us "unabom." We are sending the New York Times a manuscript that contains a good deal of material that is relevant to the problem of technological invasion of privacy. We think this manuscript ought to be of interest to the ACLU Privacy and Technology Project. We have reason to hope that the NY Times will arrange for publication of the manuscript, but if they do not, we imagine they would be willing to provide you with a copy of it if you asked for one.

FC

Penthouse offer to publish (April 28)

Time Magazine:¹⁰

⁹ Ted Kaczynski. Message to ACLU C-259 [Letter]. California University of Pennsylvania Special Collections. Original link. Archived link.

¹⁰ Unnamed. Unabomber . The Penthouse Connection [Essay]. Time. 28 Apr 1995. Original link. Archived link.

Three national publications – The New York Times, Time and Newsweek – are now struggling with an offer from the so-called Unabomber: publish a long article detailing his views, and he'll end his 17-year terror campaign. But Penthouse may take them off the hook. TIME New York correspondent Jenifer Mattos reports that Bob Guccione, chairman of General Media International, on Thursday issued an open letter to the Unabom suspect offering to publish the 37,000-word manuscript himself in Penthouse, or another magazine he owns "in the hope that it will receive the widest possible dissemination by the media so we can save lives." Guccione told TIME today that he couldn't understand other editors' uneasiness about the issue: "I would do it in an instant. ... In this instance, we should indulge him 100 percent. No censorship, no discussion with editors and the FBI and all that crap. Just publish and be damned." So far, Mattos notes, the Unabomber hasn't called.

Second batch of letters: Threatening to blow up an airliner, delivering the manifesto & other letters (June 1995)

In June, he took what was possibly his last coach out of the sleepy town of Lincoln, Montana for possibly a week long trip before he'd be arrested in just under a year.

No parcel bombs this time though. He had with him four thick 64 page envelopes of his manuscript, three of which went out to the New York Times, Washington Post and Penthouse.

As well as a prank letter to the San Francisco Examiner warning that he planned to blow up an airliner flying out of Los Angeles during the next six days. He would send a letter a day later before heading back to the cabin to acknowledge it was a prank, so the media didn't think I had just failed to build or send the bomb somehow.

Threat to blow up an airliner (June 27)

Letter addressed to Jerry Roberts of the San Francisco Examiner is received:¹

WARNING

The terrorist group FC, called Unabomber by the FBI, is planning to blow up an airline out of Los Angeles International Airport sometime during the next six days. To prove that the writer of this letter knows something about FC, the first two digits of their identifying number are 55.

This is a reference to the false Social Security number sent to Warren Hodge of the New York Times.

¹ Ted Kaczynski. U-8: Letter and envelop from "Frederick Benjamin Isaac Wood" ("FC") to Jerry Roberts (Editorial Page Editor, San Francisco Chronicle) [Letter]. California University of Pennsylvania Special Collections. Original link. Archived link.

The Washington Post:²

Officials today imposed extraordinary security at California airports and temporarily held air mail to and from the state after the Unabomber threatened to blow up an airliner leaving Los Angeles International Airport in the next six days.

However, at the end of a day of statewide confusion in air travel and mail delivery, senior law enforcement officials said that a letter had been sent by the Unabomber to the New York Times claiming that the initial threat was a hoax. The Times published portions of the letter in its Thursday editions that said the threat was "one last prank."

Letter to the Washington Post (June 27)

Court TV:³

The same day, Michael Getler, deputy managing editor at the Washington Post, receives a letter "from the terrorist group FC." The letter mentions the bomb at the Forestry Association and repeats the offer to desist from terrorism if an enclosed manuscript – a carbon copy of the one sent to Warren Hoge – is published.

* * *

Washington Post:⁴

This is a message from the terrorist group FC. The FBI calls us "unabom."

In a letter that we sent to the New York Times at the time of our bombing at the California Forestry Association, we offered to desist from terrorism if a manuscript we were preparing were published in accord with certain stated conditions. We are now sending that manuscript to the NY Times and we are sending copies to you, to Penthouse magazine and to a few other people.

If the NY Times is unwilling or unable to publish our manuscript (or arrange for its publication elsewhere) then we offer the Washington Post the

² William Claiborne. Unabomber Threatens, Then Calls It a Prank [Essay]. Washington Post. June 29, 1995. Original link. Archived link.

³ Multiple Authors. The Unabomber: A Chronology [Essay]. Court TV . archived on February 07, 2009. Original link. Archived link.

⁴ Ted Kaczynski. U-10 : Letter from FC to Washington Post [Letter]. California University of Pennsylvania Special Collections. 1995-06-24. Original link. Archived link.

same bargain that we offered the NY Times. NY Times has first claim to the right to publish the manuscript, after that the Washington Post and after that Penthouse. If NY Times gives permission, we have no objection to simultaneous publication in NY Times and Washington Post.

By the way, to verify that this letter really comes from FC, compare the enclosed copy of our letter to the NY Times with the original that we sent to the Times. The original bears our secret identifying number. We apologize for sending you such a bad carbon copy of our manuscript. We can't make copies at a public copy machine because people would get suspicious if they saw us handling our copies with gloves.

FC

The Manifesto

The contents of the manifesto are surprisingly cogent to many:⁵

At 35,000 words, *Industrial Society and Its Future* lays very detailed blame on technology for destroying human-scale communities. Kaczynski contends that the Industrial Revolution harmed the human race by developing into a sociopolitical order that subjugates human needs beneath its own. This system, he wrote, destroys nature and suppresses individual freedom. In short, humans adapt to machines rather than vice versa, resulting in a society hostile to human potential.

Kaczynski indicts technological progress for its destruction of small human communities and the rise of uninhabitable cities controlled by an unaccountable state. He contends that this relentless technological progress will not dissipate on its own, because individual technological advancements are seen as good despite the sum effects of this progress. Kaczynski describes modern society as defending against dissent an order in which individuals are "adjusted" to fit the system and those outside the system are seen as "bad".

This tendency, he says, gives rise to expansive police powers, mind-numbing mass media, and indiscriminate promotion of drugs. He criticizes both big government and big business as the inevitable result of industrialization, and holds scientists and "technophiles" responsible for recklessly pursuing power through technological advancements.

He argues that this industrialized system's collapse will be devastating and that quickening the collapse—before industrialization further progresses—will mitigate the devastation's impact. He justifies the trade-offs that come

⁵ Multiple Authors. Ted Kaczynski [Essay]. Wikipedia . 22 June 2022. Original link. Archived link.

with losing industrial society as being worth the cost. Kaczynski's ideal revolution seeks not to overthrow government, but rather, the economic and technological foundation of modern society. He seeks to destroy existing society and protect the wilderness, the antithesis of technology.

Zerzan also explained...⁶

[B]y the way he told me he got his ideas from Ellul, it's an American vernacular version of the technological society, that's his great gift, that's his great plus, he made it very readable, ... the original translation in English is hard to read, it has that abstract classical mode of the way French are taught to write and it's very off-putting I think in the rest of the world.

I think almost everyone can agree that it's good to get more variation in digestible versions of philosophy books and essays.

However, Kaczynski didn't include some central elements of Ellul's politics which are wholly sensible. Ellul valued using more minimal viable use technologies where practicable for one's own mental health and the environment, but he wasn't for destroying all industrial level technology:⁷

If we see technique as nothing but objects that can be useful (and we need to check whether they are indeed useful); and if we stop believing in technique for its own sake or that of society; and if we stop fearing technique, and treat it as one thing among many others, then we destroy the basis for the power technique has over humanity.

Ellul is a very admirable person for having played a very active role in the French Resistance.

Similarly to how George Orwell talks about getting to experience a glimpse of a more ideal world in anarchist Catalonia, Ellul writes fondly of the communalist caring society the bravest in society were able to build together under the noses of the fascist regime:⁸

In 1944, at the Liberation, I was part of the Movement of National Liberation, I even held certain positions in it, and had begun to believe the dream we had been dreaming during the last few years of the Resistance, often

⁶ Theo Slade. A Conversation with John Zerzan on Direct Action, School Shootings, Authenticity, Veganism & More [Video Interview]. Activist Journeys. Aug 9, 2021. Original link. Archived link.

⁷ Jacques Ellul. Perspectives on Our Age: Jacques Ellul Speaks on His Life and Work [Book]. House of Anansi Press Perseus-PGW. 2004. Original link. Archived link.

⁸ Jacques Ellul. Perspectives on Our Age: Jacques Ellul Speaks on His Life and Work [Book]. House of Anansi Press Perseus-PGW. 2004. Original link. Archived link.

expressed by the saying that we were going to move from Resistance to Revolution. But when we said that-and I would like to point out that Camus first used it in 1943 in combat groups-we did not mean a Communist, Stalinist, Soviet revolution. We meant a fundamental revolution of society, and we made great plans for transforming the press, the media, and the economic structures. They all had elements of socialism, to be sure; but I would say it was more of a Proudhonian socialism, going back to grassroots by means of a federative and cooperative approach.

The main problem with Ellul is simply that he infused many of his sensible arguments against technological overconsumption with fundamentally irrational Christian premises that were entirely unnecessary and make the argument fail for anyone who isn't a believing Christian. For example, he often posits that only Christian culture has been able to help with this problem in the past, and that only through more dedication to a peaceful Christian culture can we be saved from the problems we exist with today.

These weak arguments then inevitably lead to someone like Kaczynski to come along who buys the religiously apocalyptic vision, but not the proposed solution.

So, I wish Kaczynski had picked up a book that had a more secular critique of technological overconsumption that was harder to dismiss in its reformist prescriptions, but it may have just been a case of finding almost any book to justify his desires.

Ellul did in fact predict someone might try to twist his tech minimalist philosophy to justify violence and dedicated many books to arguing how we simply need a peaceful avoidance of engaging with high tech society in situations where we can use the minimum viable technology for the task we want to get done. But obviously Kaczynski dismissed these arguments:⁹

There are several ideas that Kaczynski takes from Ellul. One is that human beings are maladapted to life in a technological society I discussed that at the beginning the basic idea is that human beings evolved in a primitive Stone Age environment we're still genetically hunter-gatherers but now we've been thrust into this world of concrete and steel and we're psychologically ill-equipped to deal with that. ...

Now it's notable though that for Ellul the mismatch between human beings and the technological society was more social than biological and Ellul thought that the problem was that our norms and morals and social structures and communities can't evolve fast enough to keep up with technology, whereas Kaczynski wasn't concerned so much about those things he was concerned about our biology, so already there they diverge but the basic idea that we're maladapted or maladjusted to technology comes from Ellul

...

⁹ Griffin Kiegiel (Host). The Anti-Tech Cast [Podcast Interview]. The Ted K Archive. July 30, 2021. Original link. Archived link.

The problem with technology is that it has outstripped the evolution of our social structures and communities and norms ... and I think judging by the first part of the technological society Ellul thinks that in the past we were perfectly capable of resisting the pull of technique. So, he talks about several different societies that resisted the urge to prioritize means over ends. First he says look at the ancient Greeks, the ancient Greeks were incredibly sophisticated philosophically and scientifically, but he claims they had contempt for practical application, they could have used their knowledge to manipulate the world, but they didn't, they wanted to understand it, so he says for the Greeks there was a stark division between science/understanding of the world and technique/application.

Letter addressed to Warren Hodge of the New York Times (June 28)

Court TV:¹⁰

Warren Hoge at the Times receives another letter from "FC" that offers the identifying number used previously and includes a 65-page manuscript, referenced in the April 1995 letter and conditions for publication. The message ends by stating that the group has "no regret" that the April bomb blew up Gilbert Murray, whom it calls "the 'wrong' man," and not William Dennison.

* * *

New York Times:¹¹

This is a message from FC,

If the enclosed manuscript is published reasonably soon and receives wide public exposure, we will permanently desist from terrorism in accord with the agreement that we proposed in our last letter to you.

In that letter we stated that whoever agreed to publish the manuscript was to have exclusive rights to it for six months, after which the material was to become public property. We are willing to be flexible about the six month limit. The reason we offered exclusive rights (temporarily) was to provide an incentive for publication of the manuscript. Presumably, whoever published

¹⁰ Multiple Authors. The Unabomber: A Chronology [Essay]. Court TV . archived on February 07, 2009. Original link. Archived link.

¹¹ Ted Kaczynski. U-9: Letter and envelop from "FC" to Warren Hoge [Letter]. California University of Pennsylvania Special Collections. Original link. Archived link.

it would hope to profit by doing so. We assume that the six month limit should be ample if the material is published in a periodical, but if it is published in book form we don't know how long the publisher would need exclusive rights in order to have a reasonable expectation of making a profit. So if the NY Times arranges for publication in book form, we leave the period of exclusive rights to your discretion. But it should be no longer than necessary and in any case must not exceed one year, unless you publish in the Times good and convincing reasons for making it longer than that. We don't want our material to remain locked up by a copyright, especially if it is published in the form of a book and the book doesn't sell.

Contrary to what the FBI has suggested, our bombing at the California Forestry Association was in no way inspired by the Oklahoma City bombing. We strongly deplore the kind of indiscriminate slaughter that occurred in the Oklahoma City event. We have no regret about the fact that our bomb blew up the "wrong" man, Gilbert Murray, instead of William N. Dennison, to whom it was addressed. Though Murray did not have Dennison's inflammatory style he was pursuing the same goals, and he was probably pursuing them more effectively because of the very fact that he was not inflammatory.

A letter from an anarchist to the editors of the NY Times made us realize that we owe an apology to the radical environmentalist and non-violent anarchist movements. Statements we made in our letters to the NY Times would tend to associate us with anarchism and radical environmentalism and therefore might make the public think of anarchists and radical environmentalists as terrorists. So we want to make it clear that there is a NONVIOLENT anarchist movement that probably includes most people in America today who would describe themselves as anarchists. It's a safe bet that practically all of them strongly disapprove of our bombings. Many radical environmentalists do engage in sabotage, but the overwhelming majority of them are opposed to violence against human beings. We know of no case in which a radical environmentalist has intentionally injured a human being. (There was one injury due to a tree spiking incident, but the spiking was probably intended only to damage equipment, not injure people.)

We decided to call ourselves anarchists not in order to associate ourselves with any particular anarchist group or movement but only because we felt we needed some label to apply to ourselves and "anarchist" was the only one that seemed to fit. The term "anarchist" has been applied to a wide variety of attitudes and about the only thing these attitudes have in common is

opposition to the power of governments and other large organizations. That certainly fits us.

For an organization that pretends to be the world's greatest law-enforcement agency, the FBI seems surprisingly incompetent. They can't even keep elementary facts straight. Many news reports based on information provided by the FBI are incorrect and even contradict each other. Maybe some of these errors and contradictions are the result of journalists mistakes, but it appears that most are the fault of the FBI.

Examples: It was reported that the bomb that killed Gilbert Murray was a pipe bomb. It was not a pipe bomb but was set off by a home made detonating cap. (The FBI's so-called experts should have been able to determine this quickly and easily, especially since we indicated in an unpublished part of our last letter to the NY Times that the majority of our bombs are no longer pipe bombs.) It was also reported that the address label on this same bomb gave the name of the California Forestry Association incorrectly. This is false. The name was given correctly.

The FBI's theory that we have some kind of a fascination with wood is about as silly as it can get. They apparently base this theory mainly on the fact that we've used a lot of wood in the construction of bomb packages, and several of our targets have lived on streets that are named after trees or have names that include words like "wood," etc. As for our use of wood in construction, what other material is so light, so easy to work and so readily available in large chunks (such as a 2x4) from which suitable pieces can be cut? One FBI agent mentioned in support of the wood theory that we had used wood to make parts that could have been made out of metal. But why use metal where wood can be used? Wood is much lighter and easier to work. One of the reasons why we use wooden rather than cardboard boxes for mail bombs is that cardboard boxes crush easily and rough handling in the mail could cause damage to trigger mechanisms, possibly resulting in premature detonation. As for our use of "exotic" woods, we've used hickory from old tool handles, and we recognized redwood from its color, but apart from that we usually don't even know what kind of wood we are working with since we just use pieces of scrap lumber that we pick up here and there. As for the "polished" wood, it was only sanded. We sanded the outside of wooden boxes to remove saw marks so that packages would have a smooth, factory-made appearance, less likely to arouse suspicion. Some inside parts were sanded to remove possible fingerprints. Since wood is porous, sweat from the fingers probably penetrated the surface a short distance, so we assume that merely wiping wood does not reliably remove fingerprints. Some metal parts also were scrubbed with sandpaper or emery paper for a similar reason. It is well known that old fingerprints on metal can sometimes be brought out

by treating with acid, so presumably the sweat affects the surface of the metal chemically and merely wiping is probably not a reliable method of removing prints. As for the streets named after trees, wood, etc., that's only chance. Just check a street map of any suburban area and see how many of the street names include as a component either the name of some species of tree or a word such as "wood," "forest," "arbor," "grove" etc. The FBI must really be getting desperate if they resort to theories as ridiculous as this one about the supposed fascination with wood.

What about the morality of revolutionary violence? To the extent that the word "morality" refers to a code of behavior laid down by society, it is senseless to apply moral criteria to the actions of revolutionaries. Each society prescribes a system of morality that is designated to preserve the existence and facilitate the functioning of that society. Since revolutionaries work to overthrow the society in which they live, they have no reason to abide by its moral code. Of course, those who want to preserve the society always regard the revolutionaries as immoral.

But the word "morality" might also refer to consideration for others as motivated by sympathy or compassion (which exist independently of any socially prescribed code). In this sense one can ask about the morality of revolutionary violence. Do the revolutionaries' goals outweigh the harm they cause to others? Do the people they hurt "deserve" it?

Such questions can be answered only on a subjective basis, and we don't think it necessary for us to do any public soul-searching in this letter. But we will say that we are not insensitive to the pain caused by our bombings.

A bomb package that we mailed to computer scientist Patrick Fischer injured his secretary when she opened it. We certainly regret that. And when we were young and comparatively reckless we were much less careful in selecting targets than we are now. For instance, in one case we attempted unsuccessfully to blow up an airliner. The idea was to kill a lot of business people who we assumed would constitute a majority of the passengers. But of course some of the passengers would have been innocent people—maybe kids, or some working stiff going to see his sick grandmother. We're glad now that the attempt failed.

But even though we would undo some of the things we did in earlier days, or do them differently, we are convinced that our enterprise is basically right. The industrial-technological system has got to be eliminated, and to us almost any means that may be necessary for that purpose are justified, even if they involve risk to innocent people. As for the people who willfully

and knowingly promote economic growth and technical progress, in our eyes they are criminals, and if they get blown up they deserve it.

Of course, people don't kill others and risk their own lives just from a detached conviction that a certain change should be made in society. They have to be motivated by some strong emotional force. What is the motivating force in our case? The answer is simple: Anger. You'll ask why we are so angry. You would do better to ask why there is so much anger and frustration in modern society generally. We think that our manuscript gives the answer to that question, or at least an important part of the answer.

We encourage you to print this letter, but we don't require it as part of the condition for our promise to desist from terrorism.

FC

P.S. We want to add a qualification to our (temporary) grant of exclusive rights to whoever publishes our manuscript. We are sending copies of the manuscript to several other parties besides the NY Times. We want everyone to whom we have sent a copy to have the right to make a small number (say 5) of copies of their copy, for personal use or for private circulation.

FC

Note. Since the public has a short memory, we decided to play one last prank to remind them who we are. But, no, we haven't tried to plant a bomb on an airline (recently).

Letter to Mr Guccione of Penthouse Magazine

Court TV:¹²

June 29, 1995 - Penthouse publisher Bob Guccione also receives a letter in response to an earlier offer by his magazine to publish FC's manuscript. The letter states conditions for publication in Penthouse, but expresses a preference for publication in the Washington Post or New York Times, which it considers "respectable" publications. Among the conditions are a statement that the group reserves the right to one additional bomb after publication in Penthouse if other media do not publish it.

Here is the full letter by Ted. The ellipses are included in the original:¹³

¹² Multiple Authors. The Unabomber: A Chronology [Essay]. Court TV . archived on February 07, 2009. Original link. Archived link.

¹³ Ted Kaczynski. U-11: Letter and envelop from "FC" to Rob Guccione (Penthouse) [Letter]. California University of Pennsylvania Special Collections. Original link. Archived link.

Mr. Guccione:

This is a message from FC. The FBI calls us “unabom.” You offered to publish our manuscript in Penthouse in exchange for our promise to desist from terrorism, and that is what we are writing to you about.

We have not made any phone calls to you. No communication from FC should be accepted as authentic unless it is verified by means of our secret identifying number, which is known only to the New York Times and the FBI. With the present letter we are sending to the New York Times. That letter carries our identifying number (cut out on your copy) and you can confirm the authenticity of the present letter and accompanying material by comparing your copy of the NY Times letter with the original that we’ve sent to the Times.

We are also enclosing a copy of our manuscript. We are very pleased that you’ve offered to publish our stuff, and we thank you. We aren’t in the habit of reading sex magazines ourselves, but we don’t have anything against those who do read such magazines or those who publish them. However, it will obviously be to our advantage if we can get our stuff published in a “respectable” periodical rather than in Penthouse, because many people do consider sex magazines to be disreputable or worse. Moreover, if we’re not mistaken, Penthouse is basically an entertainment magazine that contains also some serious commentary. In such magazines the serious commentary to some extent serves as part of the entertainment. We are down on the entertainment industry because it is an “opium of the masses” (see paragraphs 147, 156 of our manuscript). So we don’t like the idea of playing footsy with that industry by allowing our writings to be used as entertainment. Therefore, if possible, we’d like to get our stuff published somewhere other than in Penthouse.

We are sending copies of our manuscript to the New York Times and the Washington Post. The NY Times is to have first claim on the right to publish the manuscript (or to arrange for its publication elsewhere), then the Washington Post, and after that Penthouse. If either the New York Times and the Washington Post is willing and able to publish our material (or arrange for its publication elsewhere) reasonably soon, then they will have exclusive rights to the material for a period that will probably be six months (see our letter to NY Times).

If neither the NY Times nor the Washington Post has published the material, or begun to publish it in serial form, or caused it to be published elsewhere, or announced a definite date for its publication, within 3 months from the day the present letter is postmarked, then Penthouse can publish the material, and will have exclusive rights to it for six months in accord

with the conditions stated in our letters to NY Times. BUT, Penthouse must publish the material (or publish the first instalment, if it is to be serialized) within two months after the expiration of the 3 month period we've just mentioned, and publication of the entire manuscript must be completed within about six months after the first instalment appears.

Also, the deal we offer Penthouse will have to be a little different from what we offered the New York Times. If we offer Penthouse the same promise we offered the Times (to desist permanently from terrorism) then the NY Times will have no incentive to find a "respectable" outlet for the manuscript. They may just say, "What the heck, let Penthouse publish it and that will stop the bombings." So to increase our chances of getting our stuff published in some "respectable" periodical we have to offer less in exchange for publication in Penthouse. Therefore, if our manuscript is published in Penthouse, and is not published and widely distributed through "respectable" channels, then we promise to desist permanently from terrorism, in accord with conditions specified in our letters to the NY Times, EXCEPT that we reserve the right to plant one (and only one) bomb, intended to kill, AFTER our manuscript has been published.

Since we are grateful for your offer to publish our manuscript, we are sending you an "exclusive" that you can print in Penthouse if you like.

Prior to June, 1993, when we sent a letter to the New York Times, the FBI led the public to believe that "the unabomber" had never explained his motives or claimed credit for any bombings. Since June, 1993 the FBI has maintained that our letter of that month was the first one from "the unabomber," and they have implied that the significance of the letters "FC" is unknown.

The FBI is probably lying. In December, 1985, shortly after we planted the bomb that killed a computer store owner, we sent a letter to the San Francisco Examiner in which we outlined our motives. This letter revealed that several bombs we'd planted were part of a series, not unrelated events, and it gave enough information about one of the bombs so that the FBI could be sure the letter was authentic. That letter was never mentioned in the Examiner.

Now it is conceivable that the letter was lost in the mail, but that doesn't seem likely, because in late December, 1985 there was an article in the Examiner about the bombings; this was the first news report that gave any indication that our various bombings were part of a series, and the article stated that it had not previously been realised that the bombings were related. So if the FBI is telling the truth, if they never received that letter, then we have to assume that the letter was lost in the mail and

that the FBI just happened to discover on its own at that time that the bombings were related. THis is too much of a coincidence to seem likely. It's more probable that the Examiner did receive the letter and turn it over to the FBI, and that the FBI, for some obscure reason of its own, asked the Examiner to suppress the letter.

We never followed that letter up with any further communications before June, 1993, because we discovered that the type of bomb we were using then was unreliable. It was a kind of pipe bomb that often failed to detonate properly unless made in a form that was so long nd heavy that it might easily arouse suspicion. So we decided that before attempting again to make a public statement we ought to go back to experimenting and develop a type of bomb that would enable us to be adequate terrorists. That we now have such a bomb is indicated by the success of our last four attacks. By the way, contrary to statements made by the FBI, these are not pipe bombs (except in the case of the Mosser bombing).

We give below some excerpts from our December, 1985 letter to the Examiner. We won't give the whole letter, because there is just a chance that the FBI may be telling the truth, that they never received the letter, and in that case, if we gave them the whole letter now some parts of it conceivably might be slightly useful to them in their effort to track us down.

The letters FC stand for "Freedom Club." We now think this name, which we adopted early, is rather inane, but since we've already been marking FC on bomb parts for a long time we may as well retain these letters as our signature.

EXCERPTS FROM 1985 LETTER TO SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

The bomb that crippled the right arm of a graduate student in electrical engineering and damaged a computer lab at U. of Cal. Berkeley last May was planted by a terrorist group called the Freedom Club. We are also responsible for some earlier bombing attempts; among others, the bomb that injured a professor in the computer science building at U. of Cal., the mail bomb that inured the secretary of computer expert Patrick Fischer at Vanderbilt University 3½ years ago, and the fire bomb planted in the Business School at U. of Utah, which never went off. ...

We have waited until now to announce ourselves because our earlier bombs were embarassingly ineffectual. The injuries they inflicted were relatively minor. In order to influence people, a terrorist group must show a certain amount of success. When we finally realized that the amount of smokeless powder needed to blow up anyone or anything was too large to be practical, we decided to take a couple of years off to learn something about explosives and develop an effective bomb. ...

... The ends of the pipe were closed with iron plugs secured with iron pins of 5/16 inch diameter. One of the plugs had the letters FC (for Freedom Club) marked on it. ...

We enclose a brief statement partly explaining our aims. We hereby give the San Francisco Examiner permission to print in full any and all of the material contained in this envelope. ...

1. The aim of the Freedom Club is the complete and permanent destruction of modern industrial society in every part of the world. ...
2. The hollowness of the old revolutionary ideologies centering on socialism has become clear. Now and in the future the thrust of rebellion will be against the industrial-technological system itself and not for or against any political ideology that is supposed to govern the administration of that system. All ideologies and political systems are fakes. They only result in power for special groups who just push the rest of us around. There is only one way to escape from being pushed around, and that is to smash the whole system and get along without it. It is better to be poor and free than to be a slave and get pushed around all your life.
3. No ideology or political system can get around the hard facts of life in industrial society. Because any form of industrial society requires a high level of organization, all decisions have to be made by a small elite of leaders and experts who necessarily wield all the power, regardless of any political fictions that may be maintained. Even if the motives of this elite were completely unselfish, they would still HAVE TO exploit and manipulate us simply to keep the system running. Thus the evil is in the nature of technology itself.
4. Man is a social animal, meant to live in groups. But only in SMALL groups, say up to 100 people, in which all members know one another intimately. Man is not meant to live as an insignificant atom in a vast organization, which is the only way he can live in any form of industrialized society.
5. The Freedom Club is strictly anti-communist, anti-socialist, anti-leftist. ... This does not imply that we are in any sense a right-wing movement. We are apolitical. Politics only distracts attention from the real issue.

This was now the third letter in which he attempted to mislead investigators about his age and education, in this case quoting the first letter, whilst pretending to believe he thought it likely the original letter was lost in the post. The missing parts he wanted investigators to focus on were quote:

... First, we had to learn some basic physics, chemistry and mathematics, since none of us had any scientific background ...

... Though we are young we are not hot-heads. ...

* * *

Time Magazine:¹⁴

Penthouse publisher Bob Guccione told TIME today that he has offered the Unabomber a regular column in the magazine. Guccione, who claims to have spoken briefly by telephone with the Unabomber four days ago, plans to announce the offer on the magazine's Internet site. The Unabomber had said that if The New York Times, the Washington Post, TIME and other major news organizations refused to carry his 35,000-word manifesto, he would accept Guccione's offer to publish it in Penthouse. But in a bizarre turn as media critic, the Unabomber said in that case he would reserve the right to kill one more person, since publishing in Penthouse would not be as prestigious as appearing in the other publications. "I can't do it under those circumstances," Guccione told TIME's Jenifer Mattos today. But he came up with a counter-offer: "In place of killing one more person, a one-page monthly column in the magazine, where they can continue to communicate with the American public in a kind of interactive way, where they could answer letters and respond to critics. It would begin immediately as soon as they gave me the go-ahead, and go on indefinitely." Guccione, who described the Unabomber as sounding "subdued, quiet, quick, tentative" during their 15-second conversation, says he also received a four-page letter, half of its contents exclusively sent to him, which he will publish in the October issue of Penthouse.

Buffalo News:¹⁵

In a full-page advertisement titled "An Open Letter to the Unabomber", published in today's New York Times, Penthouse magazine publisher Bob Guccione offered the Unabomber a monthly column in his magazine if he agrees not to strike again.

Bob Guccione:¹⁶

¹⁴ Time Staff. Exclusive . . . The New Penthouse Offer [Essay]. Time. June 30, 1995. Original link. Archived link.

¹⁵ Arthur Spiegelman. Unabomber Excerpts Show State of Mind 2 Papers Publish 3,000 Words From Manifesto Reflecting His Concerns' [Essay]. Buffalo News. Aug 3, 1995. Original link. Archived link.

¹⁶ Robert Graysmith. Unabomber: A Desire to Kill [Book]. Regnery Publishing; Distributed to the trade by National Book Network. 1997. Original link. Archived link.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE UNABOMBER

I am a little miffed and a whole lot disappointed by your recent communication. In your first letter to the New York Times (date) you categorically undertook to "desist from all terrorist activities" if the Times or "some other nationally distributed periodical" agreed to publish your manifesto. Well ... I agreed! I agreed immediately and without reservation. Within 24 hours of your letter appearing in the New York Times, I put out a press release saying that I believed your offer was genuine and that on the basis of that belief, I was prepared to publish you fully and without censorship in the next available issue of Penthouse.

Not everyone in the media agrees with that position. Many think that any attempt to strike a deal with you is journalistically unethical and contrary to the proposition that government, big business and the press do not negotiate with terrorists. I answered those and other accusations in the following manner:

1. You held no individual newspaper or other periodical hostage. You did not insist on publication in any one particular forum failing which you would continue to kill. Had you done so, the New York Times would have turned its back and so would I.
2. I disagreed with the popular belief that you are a serial killer and should be treated like one. I pointed out that serial killers derive the whole of their satisfaction from the act of killing that killing was an end in itself. In your case, I suggested that killing was merely a *means* to the end. Your objectives are much bolder and infinitely more elaborate. You want to change the world! Killing people was your way of attracting attention to a personal philosophical doctrine with vast socio-political change at its center.
3. I further held that anyone who has taken the trouble to write a literate, 37,000 word, philosophical manifesto and who set about killing people to get it published, is most unlikely to destroy the credibility of his thesis by publicly going back on his word. For this reason alone, I do not believe that you would kill again.

In your recent, personal letter to me, however, you have already begun to change the rules. You now say that simple publication in the New York Times or the Washington Post is no longer enough to stay the killings. You are asking for the additional publication of three new statements or "up-dates" annually for three successive years. A commitment to publish something, sight unseen, well into the future is unlikely win favor at either the Times or the Post. Nor would anyone in our industry blame them!

Furthermore, if both the Times and the Post eventually decline to publish you and the rights fall to Penthouse, you will permit publication in these pages but you will penalize us all by taking one more life. That, you say, is the price of appearing in a somewhat less than "respectable" periodical.

You are wrong! Over the years, Penthouse has won just about every distinguished, journalistic award a magazine could win. It has attacked and exposed elements of every, well entrenched power base in the country from government and religion to big business and organized crime. Our weapons are truth, dedication and an utterly fearless disregard for retaliation. I have been featured on presidential "hit-lists"; I've been the object of retaliatory, I.R.S. audits; I've been bugged, sued, pursued and shot at, but I haven't killed anybody yet!

The demographic mix of our audience is virtually the same as that of the New York Times and the Washington Post, but our total readership is many millions more than the total readership of the Times and the Post *combined*.

Penthouse is one of the biggest and most quoted magazines in the history of our industry. For 25 years it was and continues to be the single, biggest selling magazine in the Pentagon. If it's attention you want, you'd be hard pressed to do better.

To further tempt you from extracting one additional "penalty" should publication fall to me, I propose to offer you one or more unedited pages in Penthouse every single month for an indefinite period of time. Consider it a regular column in which you may continue to proffer your revolutionary philosophy, answer critics and generally interact with the public. Surely this would be preferable to the three annual updates you are requesting from the New York Times, et al.

In return, I am asking you to put an end to all terrorist activities now and forever. I'm still the only friend you have in the media. Don't let my willingness to publish you make fools of us both!

Satisfying an itch to write letter responses to news articles

At the same time as mailing the manifesto to the major newspapers, he wrote two letters responding to articles he'd read. The first was to a psychologist who'd been quoted in an article about him, who he also sent a photocopy of the transcript. The second was a simple response to a Scientific American article.

Writing letters to small newspapers was a past time he must have enjoyed returning to, only this time anonymously under the terror group named ‘Freedom Club’ he knew his ideas could reach a wider audience.

Thankfully he made the mistake of firstly using his real name when corresponding with newspapers back in the 70s about his anti-technology philosophy, and secondly leaving copies of all the letters in his family house, which his brother would discover later and hand over to the FBI.

Ted:¹⁷

The next major remission of the insomnia came in late June of 1995. Then the most important part of my work was done and I felt I could really relax. For a month or so I took it easy - I worked on my subsistence chores but did other work only to the extent that I felt like doing it. And I enjoyed the luxury of beautiful, sweet sleep, eight hours or more on most nights.

Tom Tyler Article, Letter & Open Letter Response

April 19, 1995: The San Francisco Chronicle publishes an article about the Oklahoma City bombing and the lengthy spate of bombings attributed to the Unabomber.

The first person quoted in the Chronicle article is Tom Tyler, a social psychology professor at the University of California at Berkeley.

June 30, 1995: Tyler receives a letter from the Unabomber, along with a copy of the manifesto. Ted explained the reason he wrote to Tom is that he had read the article and would like to challenge his views:¹⁸

“I said in the article that the Oklahoma City bomber and the Unabomber were examples of people who had exaggerated feelings that the government was out to get them,” Tyler later recalls. “The Unabomber objected to that characterization of him.”

July 4, 1995: Tyler then went onto publish an open letter in the San Francisco Chronicle that he knew the Unabomber read, where he said he welcomed Kaczynski’s suggestion that revolution “need not be violent or sudden,” he also said that Kaczynski is not alone in feeling discontented with today’s society, and that “it is wrong to simply say that people who are dissatisfied are in some way non-rational.” However, he also argued that industrial-technological society can be reformed.

¹⁷ Ted Kaczynski (Author) & Kelli Grant (Curator). An attack of desire for women [Letter]. Yahoo News. Original link. Archived link.

¹⁸ George Lardner and Lorraine Adams. To Unabomb Victims, a Deeper Mystery [Essay]. Washington Post. April 14, 1996. Original link. Archived link.

The Initial Article Quoting Tom Tyler

LOSS OF FAITH IN INSTITUTIONS / Bombings Linked To Social Malaise:¹⁹

In a letter to one of his victims, the mysterious terrorist called the Unabomber warns of the evils of technology.

On a Michigan farm, as he is allegedly plotting the Oklahoma City bombing, Timothy McVeigh complains bitterly to neighbors that the U.S. government has become a tyrannical force.

They operate at very different extremes – the Unabomber declaring himself a left-wing anarchist, and McVeigh drawn to the growing militia movement on the right – but they seem to share a fundamental fear: A monolithic world order is robbing individuals of control.

"Whether it's the technological elite or the government, it's the same basic idea," said Tom Tyler, head of the social psychology group at the University of California at Berkeley. "It's an exaggerated idea of a kind of secret, all-powerful group that's controlling people's lives."

Although such views are typically marginalized as paranoid or fringe, some experts say they are merely the extreme expressions of a broader social malaise that also drives more "mainstream" movements, such as the backlash against immigrants.

Americans, the analysts say, feel rootless and powerless. Faced with worrisome changes brought about by rapid technological advances, economic upheaval and the end of the Cold War, they are losing faith in basic social institutions – government, big business and the media.

"This kind of extremism usually comes during times of perceived threat and ambiguity, where people are not exactly sure what's happening," said social psychologist John Dovidio of Colgate University. "We have a society that's in moral chaos. Our values are shifting in ways it's hard for anybody to feel comfortable with."

Experts often relate such anxieties to turbulent economic times, when people feel shut out of job opportunities or excluded from the mainstream. Economic insecurity is a common explanation for the recent rise of citizens' militias and hate groups.

Although the Unabomber seems less motivated by economic worries, his vision of computers taking over the world manifests a similar fear of being left behind, said sociologist Seymour Martin Lipset at George Mason University in Virginia.

¹⁹ Pamela Burdman. LOSS OF FAITH IN INSTITUTIONS / Bombings Linked To Social Malaise [Essay]. SF Gate. 1 May 1995. Original link. Archived link.

Disdain for big business, big government – and by extension, "big technology" – is nothing new in America, said Lipset.

"It declined sharply during the Depression and the New Deal," he said. "But since the Second World War, things have been reverting back to the classic American fear of the state. ... This is the most anti-statist country in the developed world."

Most people cope with troubled times without resorting to violence. But their fears may emerge in other ways.

"If we looked at more typical citizens who might be distrusting their government, the way that's getting manifested are things like the anti-immigration initiative, and 'three strikes, you're out,' the idea that we've got to have order and stop these people from destroying our society," said Tyler at UC Berkeley.

Psychologists typically distinguish between normal people and a small number of individuals who make some claim to the moral high ground to justify harming others. But, some warn, these extremists are really on a continuum with the rest of society and cannot simply be dismissed.

"I get nervous when it is said that these people are nuts, it doesn't reflect anything, it's just these crazies," said University of California at Santa Cruz psychology professor Thomas Pettigrew. "They said the same thing about people who desecrated Jewish synagogues. They always said that about the Klan."

While most experts agree that the recent acts of terrorism on U.S. soil are somehow a sign of the times, there is little consensus about what they portend.

One school of thought predicts that society will grow increasingly intolerant – and violent.

"We know that in Germany, the hyperinflation of the 1920s produced enormous insecurity in the middle class, then the depression broke open, the boundaries of society fell apart and the Nazi party came to power," said social psychologist Raphael Ezekiel at Michigan University.

"A big part of what they were doing was creating violence in the streets, then saying, 'Look, the government can't protect us from violence in the streets.' "

Others, such as Dovidio, say that the current rise in extremism reflects the ebb and flow of society and that tragedies like the Oklahoma bombing may actually inspire a search for greater harmony.

"Society has in general a self- corrective nature," said Dovidio. "Crises develop, kind of the flash points, and those crises help to bring people together again and develop a new sense of direction and coherence."

* * *

Letter to Tom Tyler

Ted's letter:²⁰

Dr. Tyler:

This is a message from FC. The FBI calls us "unabom." We read a newspaper article in which you commented on recent bombings, including ours, as an indication of social problems. We are sending you a copy of a manuscript that we hope the New York Times will get published for us.

The trouble with psychologists is that in commenting on what people say or do they often concentrate exclusively on the non-rational motivations behind speech or behavior. But human behavior has a rational as well as an irrational component, and psychologists should not neglect the rational component. So if you take the trouble to read our manuscript and do any further thinking about the "unabom" case, we suggest that you should not only consider our actions as a symptom of some social or psychological problems; you should also give attention to the substance of the issues that we raise in the manuscript. You might ask yourself, for example, the following questions:

Do you think we are likely to be right, in a general way, about the kind of future that technology is creating for the human race?

If you think we are wrong, then why do you think so? How would you answer our arguments? Can you sketch a PLAUSIBLE scenario for the future technological society that does not have the negative characteristics indicated by our scenario?

If you think we are likely to be right about the future, do you consider that kind of future acceptable? If not, then what, if anything, do you think can be done about it?

Do you think our analysis of PRESENT social problems is approximately correct? If not, why not? How would you answer our arguments?

²⁰ Ted Kaczynski. U-13: Letter from "FC" to Dr. Tom Taylor [Letter]. California University of Pennsylvania Special Collections. 1995-06-24. Original link. Archived link.

If you think we have identified some present social problems correctly, do you think anything can be done about them? Will they get better or worse with continual growth and progress?

We apologize for sending you such a poor copy of our manuscript. We can't make copies at a public copy machine because people would get suspicious if they saw us handling our copies with gloves.

FC

* * *

Tom Tyler's Open Letter Response

An Open Letter – Professor to Unabomber / Response addresses concerns of 'FC' by Tom Tyler:²¹

On May 1, The Chronicle published an article using both the Oklahoma bombing and the actions of the Unabomber (FC) as examples of general social malaise in America. I was one of several psychologists interviewed for the article.

I have received a letter from FC commenting on that story, along with a copy of his manuscript, "Industrial Society and its Future." I have read the manuscript and am writing this open letter to address the concerns raised by FC, both in his letter to me and in the manuscript itself.

I regret that we cannot communicate more directly. Hopefully, you will read this reply to the questions you have raised. In your letter, you suggest that we look beyond the questions of whether you have social or psychological problems and consider the substance of the issues you raise in your manuscript. This seems to me a fair request.

There is a widespread feeling of social malaise in our society today and we need to consider why people have those feelings. It is wrong to simply say that people who are dissatisfied are in some way nonrational.

We should also consider whether the structure of society is hurting people and needs to be changed. The manuscript you prepared directly addresses this issue.

I agree that it is important for all Americans to talk about what is wrong with our society and to try to find ways to improve it. By circulating your manuscript you are encouraging us to think about these important issues.

²¹ Tom Tyler. An Open Letter – Professor to Unabomber / Response addresses concerns of 'FC' [Essay]. SF Gate. July 4, 1995. Original link. Archived link.

I have tried to read and consider your arguments with an open mind. I think violent actions are wrong, and I am pleased that you have decided to communicate your ideas by sending me (and others) your manuscript.

I cannot completely present or comment on all of the issues you raise in your lengthy manuscript within this letter. But I would like to note what seems to me to be several key arguments. The central point of your manuscript is that the economic and technological changes in our society have had a negative effect on people's lives.

Your concerns about widespread feelings of inferiority and over-socialization into conformity with society's rule are widely shared, as is your suggestion that many people do not find their lives very satisfying. Many people today do feel that they have little control over their lives and few opportunities for autonomy.

As you say, they do not feel that they have power over their lives. I think that your feelings and concerns are widely shared. Many people in America are searching for ways to make their lives more fulfilling. I agree with you that technology is resulting in many social problems and that our society has to address those problems and their solution.

You also argue that industrial- technological society cannot be reformed. Here I am less certain that I agree. There have been increasing signs that people are making choices that create individual freedom and local autonomy for themselves.

People quit jobs in corporations to start their own small businesses, people move from large cities to the country, people voluntarily conserve water, recycle their trash, and lower their use of electricity and natural gas.

People are finding many ways to change their lives in positive ways. It seems to me that the revolution you advocate is already occurring. Instead of being trapped in the system through psychological or biological manipulation, people are finding ways to live better lives. People are developing the type of anti-technology ideology that you advocate in your manuscript.

Of course, many people's lives continue to be difficult, and change takes time.

But, given evidence that people are able to make choices that give them a sense of control, does it not seem possible that society can change?

You suggest two ways of creating social change: Developing an alternative ideology and promoting social stress and instability.

As I have noted, there is already evidence that people themselves are developing an alternative ideology that lessens the importance of technology and increases their control and autonomy over their lives.

But how is it useful to promote social stress and instability, especially through acts of violence?

My impression is that people react to violence by becoming less willing to change. Instead of encouraging social change, threats of violence make people fearful and unwilling to consider new ideas.

How can you encourage people to think about your alternative ideology by creating fear and insecurity?

I think that education is the key to changing people. Would it not be possible to try to develop the core group of intelligent, thoughtful, rational people that you describe in your manuscript?

That core group could articulate and develop a new ideology that allows us to move beyond the problems of technological-industrial society. Many members of our society would welcome new ideas about how to deal with the problems created by technology. That group could change society by showing people a better way to live their lives. Do you have thoughts about how such a group could be formed? Who should be on it? What the most important issues for it to address might be?

Let me close by saying that I especially welcome your suggestion in the manuscript that a "revolution" that changes the economic and technological basis of our society need not be violent or sudden. It can occur peacefully and over a period of decades. In that spirit, I think our society should consider the important issues you raise in your manuscript.

* * *

Finally, Ted made a note of having read Tylers' open letter response in his journal:²²

[He] doubts my claim that the system can't be reformed, and suggests that my revolution is already in progress. As evidence, he mentions that people are moving to the country and recycling their trash.

An Article Theorizing a Tech Induced Apocalypse is Written & The Unabomber Responds

June 28, 1995 Scientific American also receives a letter whose author claims to be "the terrorist group FC" which references a 1993 article in the magazine on particle accelerators and discusses negative aspects of scientific advances on society.

²² Ted Kaczynski. C2: Checks papers for publication of manuscript; lists hiding places for various articles with maps; list of names at Orvana Mining; serial numbers of guns; location of telephone boxes [Journal]. California University of Pennsylvania Special Collections. Original link. Archived link.

The Initial Scientific American Article

Strange Matters; Can advanced accelerators initiate runaway reactions? By Russell Ruthen²³

If you have trouble sleeping, you don't want to know about the physicist's worst nightmare: an atom smasher produces a new form of matter even more stable than everyday protons and neutrons, thereby triggering a cataclysmic, self-sustaining reaction that consumes the earth.

Although no serious scientists believe an atomic collision could ever lead to a global meltdown, they still want to be very, very sure it will never happen. Since the beginning of the nuclear age, researchers have met many times—usually behind closed doors—to discuss whether there was any chance that a proposed experiment might initiate a catastrophic event. Physicists rarely discuss the issue openly, fearing bad public relations, but recently some have given candid accounts of the secret meetings. “It’s a real concern,” observes Henry J. Crawford of the University of California at Berkeley. “Whenever scientists have started a new accelerator program, one of the first talks is always on this topic.”

Indeed, one of the most astonishing debates of this subject was revealed by Subal Das Gupta and Gary D. Westfall in *Physics Today*. The story began some 30 years ago, when the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory was planning to build a particle accelerator called the Bevalac. At the time, two theorists, Nobel laureate Tsung Dao Lee and the late Gian-Carlo Wick, raised the possibility that conditions of extreme energy and density could create a new phase of dense and stable nuclear matter. If this substance, known as Lee-Wick matter, existed and could be generated, the physicists feared, it would quickly accrete every atom around it—namely, the laboratory, California and the rest of the planet.

Researchers realized that the Bevalac had a shot at making Lee-Wick matter, and under no circumstances did they want to prove the theorists right during a test run of the machine. “We took the issue very seriously,” comments Westfall, who was a member of the Bevalac’s scientific staff at the time. “We appointed a blue-ribbon committee to make sure there was no chance it would happen.”

The committee, which included Miklos Gyulassy, who is now at Columbia University, met several times. Together they concluded that the Bevalac had no chance of initiating a nuclear disaster. The physicists reasoned that nature had already performed the relevant experiment: the earth, moon

²³ Russell Ruthen. Strange Matters. *Scientific American*, August 1993, Page 17. Original link. Archived link.

and all celestial bodies are constantly bombarded with an extraordinary number of high energy particles that are produced by stars. Some of the particles collide with atoms on the earth and create conditions that equal or surpass anything the Bevalac could do. Yet the planet was still reassuringly here. Nor had any such event destroyed the moon, which had been struck by countless high-energy particles for at least a few billion years.

In the 1970s the operation of the Bevalac and other accelerators confirmed that Lee-Wick matter did not exist. This happy state of affairs can be explained. When an atomic nucleus collides with another and is compressed into a volume about one fourth its normal value, it expands in about a thousandth of a billionth of a billionth of a second. Nuclear matter that has been compressed somewhat is simply not stable.

But what happens if nuclear matter is compressed to more extreme densities? If two nuclei collide at energies a bit beyond those that modern atom smashers can achieve, the nuclei should transform into so-called strange matter. The protons and neutrons of an atom are themselves made up of quarks, and when the quarks collide at high energy, they may yield a heavier particle: the strange quark. The consensus among theorists is that certain combinations of strange quarks with others are stable. Strange matter should grow through the accretion of ordinary atoms. But not to worry. The droplet of matter should not get much larger than a few million strange particles, theorists think. All such particles should carry a relatively large quantity of positive charge that should ultimately cause the droplet to burst apart. "The basic idea is that at equilibrium the stuff has a net positive charge, and as a result it would turn its own reactions off," Crawford says.

So how can theorists be absolutely certain that an accelerator will never spawn a voracious clump of strange matter? The question was first posed seriously in 1983, when researchers were designing the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC). The collider, now under construction at Brookhaven National Laboratory, promises to be the world's most powerful smasher of heavy atoms and could quite possibly generate strange matter. Piet Hut of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, N.J., put everyone's fears to rest. Applying the same logic his predecessors had used, Hut showed that innumerable cosmic particles collide with atoms on the earth and moon, creating conditions far more extreme than those of RHIC. Calculations similar to Hut's have been done "for all the accelerators that have been built so far," Crawford says, and therefore physicists know they are "not going to be walking in any dangerous territory."

Although there is no instrument yet built that could cause the earth to become a lump of strange matter, such transformations may occur in other

celestial bodies. If a droplet of strange matter forms within a star made of dense neutral matter, it might initiate a chain reaction that would create a strange-matter star. Physicists say such events can occur only in the heavens. Let's hope they are right.

* * *

Letter to Scientific American

Ted's letter response:²⁴

We write in reference to a piece by Russel Ruthen, "Strange Matters: Can Advanced Accelerators Initiate Runaway Reactions?" *Science and the Citizen*, *Scientific American*, August, 1993.

It seems that physicists have long kept behind closed doors their concern that experiments with particle accelerators might lead to a world-swallowing catastrophe. This is a good example of the arrogance of scientists, who routinely take risks affecting the public. The public commonly is not aware that risks are being taken, and often the scientists do not even admit to themselves that there are risks. Most scientists have a deep emotional commitment to their work and are not in a position to be objective about its negative aspects.

We are not so much concerned about the danger of experiments with accelerated particles. Since the physicists are not fools, we assume that the risk is small (though probably not as small as the physicists claim). But scientists ~~[crossed out]~~ and engineers constantly gamble with human welfare, and we see today the effects of some of their lost gambles: ozone depletion, the greenhouse effect, cancer-causing chemicals to which we cannot avoid exposure, accumulating nuclear waste for which a sure method of disposal has not yet been found, the crowding, noise and pollution that have followed industrialization, massive extinction of species and so forth. For the future, what will be the consequences of genetic engineering? Of the development of super-intelligent computers (if this [unreadable])? Of understanding of the human brain and the resulting inevitable temptation to "improve" it? No one knows.

We emphasize that negative PHYSICAL consequences of scientific advances often are completely unforeseeable. (It probably never occurred to the chemists who developed early pesticides that they might be causing many cases of disease in humans.) But far more difficult to foresee are the

²⁴ Ted Kaczynski. Letter to *Scientific American* (U-12) C-260 [Letter]. California University of Pennsylvania Special Collections. Original link. Archived link.

negative SOCIAL consequences of technological progress. The engineers who began the industrial revolution never dreamed that their work would result in the creation of an industrial proletariat or the economic boom and bust cycle. The wiser ones may have guessed that contact with industrial society would disrupt other cultures around the world, but they probably never imagined the extent of the damage that these other cultures would suffer. Nor did it occur to them that in the West itself technological progress would lead to a society tormented by a variety of social and psychological problems.

EVERY MAJOR TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCE IS ALSO A SOCIAL EXPERIMENT. These experiments are performed on the public by the scientists and by the corporations and government agencies that pay for their research. The elite groups get fulfilment [sic.], the exhilaration, the sense of power involved in bringing about technological progress while the average man gets only the consequences of their social experiments. It could be argued that in a purely physical sense the consequences are positive, since life-expectancy has increased. But the acceptability of risks cannot be assessed in purely actuarial terms. “(P)eople also rank risks based on ... how equitably the danger is distributed, how well individuals can control their exposure and whether risk is assumed voluntarily.” (M. Granger Morgan, “Risk Analysis and Management.” *Scientific American*, July, 1993, page 35.) The elite groups who create technological progress share in control of the process and assume the risks voluntarily, whereas the role of the average individual is necessarily passive and involuntary. Moreover, it is possible that at some time in the future the population explosion, environmental disaster or the breakdown of an increasingly troubled society may lead to a sudden drastic lowering of life expectancy.

However it may be with the PHYSICAL risks, there are good reasons to consider the SOCIAL consequences of technological progress as highly negative. This matter is discussed at length in a manuscript that we are sending to the New York Times.

The engineers who initiated the industrial revolution can be forgiven for not having anticipated its negative consequences. But the harm caused by technological progress is by this time sufficiently apparent so that to continue to promote it is [crossed out] grossly irresponsible.

This letter, which we invite you to print in *Scientific American*, is from the terrorist group FC. To prove that this letter does come from FC, we quote below the entire fourth paragraph of a letter that we are sending to the

New York Times. The authenticity of the letter to the Times is confirmed by means of our secret identifying number.

FOURTH PARAGRAPH OF LETTER TO NY TIMES:

Contrary to what the FBI has suggested, our bombing at the California Forestry Association was in no way inspired by the Oklahoma City bombing. We strongly deplore the ind of indiscriminate slaughter that occurred in the Oklahoma City event. We have no regret about the fact that our bomb blew up the “wrong” man, Gilbert Murray, instead of William N. Dennison, to whom it was addressed. Though Murray did not have Dennison’s inflammatory style he was pursuing the same goals, and he was probably pursuing them more effectively because of the very fact that he was not inflammatory.

Original PDF Scans of the Letters

- Letter from Enoch W. Fischer to Percy Addison Wood U-1
- Letter from “Ralph C. Kloppenburg” to Dr. James V. McConnell C-247
- Message to San Francisco Examiner C-248
- Letter and envelop from FC to Warren Hoge U-3
- Letter and envelop from FC to Warren Hoge U-7
- Letter and envelop from FC to David Gelernter U-4
- Letter and envelop from FC to Phillip A. Sharp U-6
- Letter and envelop from FC to Richard J. Roberts U-5
- Letter to Earth First! C-258
- Letter to LWOD with codes C-261
- Letter to LWOD C-262
- Message to ACLU C-259
- Letter and envelop from “Frederick Benjamin Isaac Wood” (“FC”) to Jerry Roberts U-8
- Letter from FC to Washington Post U-10
- Letter and envelop from “FC” to Warren Hoge U-9
- Letter and envelop from “FC” to Rob Guccione (Penthouse) U-11
- LOSS OF FAITH IN INSTITUTIONS; Bombings Linked To Social Malaise Essay
- Letter from “FC” to Dr. Tom Taylor U-13
- Scientific American Essay
- Letter to Scientific American (U-12) C-260

The Ted K Archive

Theo Slade

The Communications of Ted Kaczynski as part of his Terror Bombing Campaign
2 Nov. 2022

Excerpts from the book The Ultimate Ted Kaczynski Research Document.

www.thetedkarchive.com