

Primitive luddism

timer clock

Contents

1. Our politics and ideas	3
2. The left and the right and their flaws	3
Centrism	3
Libertarians	4
The right	4
The left	4
Primitive luddism, the idea.	5
“But primitivism is unrealistic”	5
How primitivism will be achieved	5
Why is primitivism is necessary for a society without technology?	6
Moralism, industrial societies accelerant.	6
Distractions as means of deluded ideas	6
Radical reactionarism, my strategy	7
Sheepism, societies greatest fallacy	7
Enlightened idiots	8
“You’re a hypocrite”	8
Complete abandonment of technology for anti-tech people without ATR is suicide for the movement itself	8
The flaws of agricultural society	9

The world government and society are completely fucked.

1. Our politics and ideas

Virtually everyone in first world countries is obsessed with this stupid two side idea that they'll all deny over and over again. America is slowly being killed by tribalism in politics, everyone is so obsessed with the idea of each election being "the important one" that they're becoming insane over it, the moral acceptance of murder because of political disagreement, the cult like following around one person, there's barely any actual views left its all just stupid tribalism. Europe isn't really any better its being killed by the shifted overton window every politician is a leftist in the wider spec, its just leftists going against leftists with slightly different ideas there's barely anything new brought to the table, places like the UK are becoming complete authoritarian shitholes, Asia is possibly worse even in the 1st world places like Japan and South Korea the lack of individualism is the perfect environment for tyranny to begin like we've already seen with the CCP.

2. The left and the right and their flaws

The left and the right wings exist worldwide, many people feel like they are immune to them or that they are exclusive to something else but inevitably most eveyones ideology and ideas fall directly into the left or right wing. Neither the left or right wing are against modern society and its way of functioning, that's my main form of identifying them, they both just want standard ideologies already created by another person and also want the large majority to follow their idea. In my opinion at least this mentality simply leads to stupidity in the majority, people are given a set of ideas and told to base theirs off it instead of actually forming their own. The left and right wing are very baseless, their ideas hold little longevity and can easily be overpowered by another belief leading to the tribalism described previously. Inevitably people will form their own ideas and become leaders, new groups will raise in politics with new beliefs and eventually society will either accept or reject their ideas both destroying the left and right wing systems longevity.

Centrism

Centrism is this idea that neither the left nor right wing are politically correct which is equally as flawed as the left and right wing originally were.

Centrism is rarely ever a fully defined ideology, it's just a form of self identity for people either to afraid or embarrassed to say that they support the left or the right but almost all people who claim to be Centrist end up leaning towards one of them.

Libertarians

In my opinion Libertarians are no different than Centrists, slightly more logical and defined but still suffering similar issues. Libertarian beliefs are full of infighting and badly written ideas such as the NAP that no group of people calling themselves libertarians can fully agree on what it defines. The right. The right is a struggling group that barely has any ideas left on its own, the right has been heavily diminished by social politics making their ideas unpopular and considered wrong.

The right

The right is also very flawed in their ways of holding onto outdated ideas to an extreme extent, the right is obsessed with preserving the past in its ideas to the point that they appear, at least to me, afraid of the future but they also seem to embrace the idea of progression at the same time. One of the most popular right wing candidates to ever exist in North America works with a man who makes artificial intelligence and electronic automobiles, both things that the right heavily rejects.

The left

The left as a political group are solely based off morals, they hold very little actual ideas for the future of humanity, economics, society and government. As long as one thing seems morally right to a leftist it is considered correct, viable and a good thing for everyone, which is why in my opinion leftism has become the most common political ideology, it's easy for a simple mind to understand simple ideas of morality and not think past it, regardless of how good it is for the future or any other value. Unlike other ideologies which have a few variations that go between far and standard, the left has a large amount of variations such as anarchism, communism, socialism but despite having so many variations if their ideologies the majority of them aren't actually anything meaningful. Communism and socialism have differences but they both have the same issues, in my opinion ideologies that give the government massive amounts of power and revolve around the government controlling the economy and industry will inevitably fail or become the opposite of what they call themselves like most "communist" countries today. Communism also seems to be the core of all leftism in itself, yes other ideologies exist that can be considered leftist but all of them at some point have communistic ways and the overall mentality of leftists seems to all be based a "the workers" victim complex which is very relevant in their "revolutionary" movements. How they block roads, provoke police, harm themselves, all generally masochistic actions that seem to all come from the idea of either making themselves appear or be victims or die for a "greater good" both very flawed and moralistic ways of protest or revolution. They also tend to have a hard time actually debating their ideas and instead use moral high-grounds and deflections to make "points" which ends up convincing some but not

really in a good way of spreading the actually ideology, leading to more stupid left wing movements like ACAB which don't really have a base to them and seem fairly useless even from a left wing point of view. Their moralism and victim mentality was made very visible by the 2024 US presidential election where a large majority of leftists (western "progressive" leftists) were having emotional breakdowns over one president but yet still never really criticized trump much in these actions just honestly bitched and whined about it, also while feeling the need to film themselves further showing their victim complex.

Primitive luddism, the idea.

Primitive luddism is the name I've given my idea or worldview, I avoid the usage of the term "ideology" as I do not consider my idea to be a political ideology nor an ideal and it's not achievable by any political standard in the first place. Primitive luddism is a branch of anti-tech ideas, following the idea that agriculture and permanent settlements are a flaw for humanity and lead to its and the world's inevitable industrialization. Primitive luddism could be considered no different than anarcho-Primitivism or standard primitivism but I view it as different, primitive luddism follows the same revolutionary reactionarism as some anti-tech views like neo luddism. In a primitive luddite idea the destruction of industrialism and modern society come before anything else not a strewn out pipe dream idea like the usual primitivist has.

"But primitivism is unrealistic"

Yes primitivism *is* unrealistic, but the only reason it is unrealistic is due to the fact that the average primitivist only looks at it at its own ideological point not that it can be adjacent to another idea such has the idea of an anti-tech revolution, mainly described in *Anti-Tech Revolution: Why and How*.

How primitivism will be achieved

By far the most common argument I see against primitivism or in this case primitive luddism is that it can't be achieved, while in my opinion it can. Primitive luddism can be achieved through many ways after the events of an anti-tech revolution, such as low populations, unstable community, insufficient human needs from agriculture, environmental issues preventing small scale agriculture from reforming on a natural scale and land areas where agriculture is simply not possible and a nomadic hunter gatherer lifestyle is necessary for survival, this is one of the main reasons I love colder environments on a personal scale.

Why is primitivism is necessary for a society without technology?

Primitive is necessary for multiple reasons from more moralistic ones to the entire long term existence of an anti-tech society. One, it's necessary for long term anti-tech life as agricultural societies advance significantly faster than post Neolithic revolution societies, humans lived as hunter gatherers for over a hundred thousand years compared to a measly rough twelve thousand years of agricultural society, look at the difference from the Neolithic revolutions to today and think about if you'd rather an agricultural society or hunter gatherer society for preventing advancement. Two, hunter gatherer societies are the most natural form of human society and life, it is a balance of nature and humanity, humans are not dumb apes and have the ability to use somewhat advanced creations and form societies and culture yet are not destroying the nature around them. Three, hunter gatherer societies are inevitably more happy than agricultural or modern societies, they sustain themselves individually largely, but still have an element of community, culture and society, their lives are fulfilling they have unique experiences and they are not controlled by any large force that will inevitably form in any agricultural or modern society.

Moralism, industrial societies accelerant.

Moralism or in this case moralistic ideas is the broad term for ideas that have little to no logical base, yet in my own definition still make sense to people. A moralistic idea can appear as a logical, reasonable, helpful idea, yet it usually becomes a distraction or deflection from a bigger idea or issue. Moralistic ideas fuel industrialism by promoting its ideas further, such as modern medicine, the idea of a better society where everyone can live regardless of ailment comes across as amazing and utopian to an average person, while it still fuels the core idea of industrial progress. Moralistic deflections, moralistic deflections are my idea of an ethic or idea that pushes people away from realizing industrialisms flaws, sort of like the systems neatest trick but an entire mental idea Resulting* from the systems neatest trick along with stupidity and lack of self thinking. Examples of this are veganism, standard environmentalism, progressive justification, oppressed vs oppressor ideas, all of these ideas could have a factual and logical basis but they are just distractions from the core cause of why the people who support them specifically feel the need to, industrial issues.

Distractions as means of deluded ideas

Distractions in anti-tech communities are a plague, rather moralistic, factual or reactionary, all they accomplish for said group is a distracted deluded community that

draws the wrong group of people for anti-tech ideas. I'm not saying that every anti-tech group has to only discuss anti-tech ideas one hundred percent of the time, if anything I find it good for anti-tech communities to form their own lifestyles and culture, every other revolutionary or general political movement has but the Distractions that I've personally seen plague anti-tech communities mimics that of leftists, notice how leftists got completely distracted from their own views by social events throughout modern times. This is not just a message to anti-tech community owners or communities in general, there is a personal idea to it as well, don't let an outside disagreement or issue cloud your ideas for anti-tech movements and don't focus on one specific element of industrialism so much so that you forget to be anti-tech and become anti said thing.

Radical reactionarism, my strategy

As you may have noticed through my writing my idea is an observational, critical idea based off my experiences. I have observed that everyone has a way of thinking in terms of their ideas, rather a political, philosophical or ideological idea everyone thinks around a specific idea, a leftist sees comfort, safety and equality as the best base of ideas, a rightist views independence, glory and longevity as the best base of ideas. When a persons ideas are criticized they will almost always seek a deflection based off their opposing idea and your argument, but what happens when there are no deflections?, this is where my idea of radical reactionarism comes into play. When you criticize all idea a equally and deny them all it forces the opposing person to argue yours based off your own idea, therefore forcing them to actually understand your idea, something very uncommon in modern societies way of debating ideas or form a logical argument against your idea causing them to see fallacies in their own idea.

Sheepism, societies greatest fallacy

In modern society, it's become very clear that people with functional critical thinking skills and the ability to have their own opinions have become an endangered species and modern societies elements push this even further. In the past people had no reason for in depth ideas and lived individualistic communal lives where their community was their biggest issue and on rare occasions some abnormally intelligent person would have a unique philosophical idea. In modern society everyone is forced to see the modern world in all of its flaws and have an opinion on it, including the most mind numbingly stupid of them, but here's the issue, these opinions aren't unique at all, they're massively generalized "ideas" that are just something the said person was told, nothing ever learned from experience or individual thinking. This leads to people becoming sheep, forced into sides of ideas that they most of the time don't even fully understand

or know about. Eventually critical and individual thinking will be destroyed by this fallacy in society.

Enlightened idiots

Enlightened idiots is the name I've given to a group or more majority of people who have acknowledged a flaw in society, the systems, the political system or some other idea similar. Enlightened idiots claim to have an idea that could fix all the world's problems, they claim to be different from the rest and extremely radical and intelligent, yet they are always the most conformist, moralistic, leftist people to exist. You are not the leader of the idea you chose even if you created it yourself you cannot determine how people will react to your idea regardless of if they are supporting or abolishing it. Utopias do not exist, regardless of what it is reality and ideal are very different concepts, anyone can make an ideal, only certain things work in reality.

“You’re a hypocrite”

By far one of the most common arguments I've seen against by ideas and anti-tech ideas in general is that they're hypocritical, due to the fact that anti-tech people still use elements of technology. This is a completely stupid deflection ad hominem, this argument falls closer to an insult or high-ground than an actual criticism, usually made by ignorant people who don't understand the values or more so simplicity of anti-tech ideas. Anti tech ideas and specifically my ideas aren't aimed to tell an individual how to live their life in modern society, if I was telling people to go join tribes and completely abandon modern society it would be hypocritical. All anti-tech ideas and my ideas specifically do at their core is acknowledge that modern society, industrialism and civilization is flawed, the acknowledgment of this very well leads to a lifestyle around rejecting modern society but it's not its core point.

Complete abandonment of technology for anti-tech people without ATR is suicide for the movement itself

While it may seem logical for the end goal of an individual following anti-tech ideas to be abandonment of technology individually, I think this shouldn't be the advertised idea. Even the creators of anti-tech ideas such as Ted Kaczynski had levels of technological usage. Without any form of communication to modern society anti-tech ideas lose their ability to gain new members, strengthen themselves and propagate

themselves. If every anti-tech person abandons technology, they devolve into a bunch of random hippies and hobos, never expanding and never accomplishing anything.

The flaws of agricultural society

1. Agricultural society leads to industrial advancements. Humans were hunter gatherers for 250,000 years, compared to a measly 12,000 years since the Neolithic revolutions to today.
2. Hunter gatherer/tribal societies are objectively happier than both industrial and agricultural societies. This may seem flawed or untrue from a modernistic perspective but any observation of the few tribal societies left, compared to historic agricultural societies and our current societies points to it.
3. Agriculture is unhealthy for humans.

Any basic knowledge of nutrition will show that large amounts of grains, breads and other generally mass grown foods aren't especially healthy, while you may argue that it's not actually unhealthy with a proper diet, why should humans have to have a diet? In a hunter gatherer society the need to monitor food intake was practically non-existent. What food was found or hunted was ate, it was all natural and rarely imbalanced.

4. Agriculture is civilization.

When farming begins for humans it inevitably becomes civilization, the idea of infinite food directly outside your door is an enticing but gluttonous idea in the way it effects humanity. People will inevitably build permanent settlements around Agriculture leading to state, class, large scale war, every flaw that political sides aimed to change is a flaw of Agriculture and civilization.

5. Agriculture enslaves us.

Agriculture has enslaved humanity since it was created. It removes all differences in human life and forces us to all live off the idea of civilization and farming. Yes certain agricultural societies may have differences but they all fall into the trap of working indirectly for their survival instead of forming their own ways for survival somewhat uniquely as tribal societies did. It also enslaves us by trapping us under the idea that it is the best way to live, forcing us into settlements with the idea that nature will kill us if we don't rely on agriculture for food and settlements for safety, it alienates us from how we were naturally supposed to live.

6. We all want to be hunter gatherers, any viewing of modern and even decently past media will show that there is a certain... romanticization of the collapse

of society, nomadic life, self sustaining, independence, even more so relevant in our political perspectives, autonomy of a certain type is always a brought up topic from every political perspective, everyone wants to be free of something, it's something we all crave.

7. It's inherently corrupt, as state before agriculture itself is civilization. All civilizations are subject to certain doctrines such as politics, power struggles, class, over reliance. From any political perspective you'll see points that things such as the class system, social functions are flawed, these will inevitably never be *fixed* at best you can put a band aid over them but they still exist in said civilization and always will. All political ideological solutions are granted by a primitive society, social issues are irrelevant and usually solved quickly, smaller societies are just less prone to mass disagreement and have a more communal nature. Class is a complete different system, in modern society or civilized society its not humanly possible to achieve certain levels on the class system, you aren't going to go from a trailer park to a billionaire, you aren't going to go from a peasant to royalty. "Political" power in tribal societies is vastly different for the better, in modern society its funneled into a few shitty systems, in tribal societies leaders have very little power and if they do enforce rules they're enforced fairly communally.

The Ted K Archive

timer clock
Primitive luddism

<discordapp.com/attachments/.../Primitive_luddism-updated.pdf>
Run of the mill anonymous primitivist skreed.

www.thetedkarchive.com