

The Internet's Favorite T*rrorist

Wendigoon



Nov 1, 2023

Contents

Transcription	4
Introduction	4
Ted’s Life Story	5
David Kaczynski	27
Ted memes	33
The Manifesto	36
Final Analysis	60
Acknowledgements	63

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g5yatQ80GVI>

Transcription

Introduction

Hello everybody. Happy Halloween. Today we are going to be talking about Teddy Kay, AKA Uncle Ted, AKA Ted Kaczynski, AKA The Unabomber. Ted Kaczynski has become not only one of the most infamous criminals in American history, but also one of its most beloved. If you've been on the Internet for any amount of time, then you've likely seen this face. In some documentary or propaganda or cursed Maine. And that's because Ted Kaczynski has become more than the crimes he committed and has instead become this kind of public figure whose idea supersedes the man himself. So today, not only do I want to talk about the story of the Unabomber campaign, the series of attacks. He committed how he evaded capture for so long and how he was eventually caught, as I do with most of my true crime video. But I also want to talk about his legacy, why people view him the way that they do, why he might have committed the actions that he did, and of course, the manifesto. This is also the point where I should clarify to any YouTube moderators or federal agents watching this, despite the fact that I'm holding a manifesto and that it is contained. On my computer, under a file named Peanut Butter Recipe with highlighted portions I in no way support the Unabomber or his actions. This video exists for educational and entertainment. Purposes I in no way condone any of the things that I say here or throughout the rest of the video. This is simply a form of entertainment, so to speak. So please do not demonetize this video or show up at my house. I have no idea who I'm kidding about that first part. This video has terrorist in the title. This is absolutely getting demonetized. But regardless, Ted. Kaczynski has become one of the most famous cult figures. In modern American culture, so we're going to talk. About it a. Couple of announcements to make before the video actually. For one, I had an interview with the federal agent who worked the Ted Kaczynski case herself. She was able to give some amazing stories and theories regarding the Unabomber investigation, and a lot of our conversation shaped a lot of my opinions and thoughts that you're gonna see throughout this video. So if you're interested in seeing the full interview that I had with her, and it was a fantastic time. A link to. It will be in the description. Check it out if you decide you want more windego Ted Kaczynski content and also. Stick around to the end of the video. Not something I can say yet, but just stick around to the end of the video, like literally the last few seconds of it. You're gonna love it. Remember that mention of how this

video is absolutely not gonna get monetized because YouTube already hates me. So you know who am I kidding?

Ted's Life Story

So, without further ado, let's go ahead and talk about the story, legacy and mythology of Ted Kaczynski. But to do all of that, we have to 1st establish who this guy was and what his story was. So let's begin by talking about the life. Of the unabomber. Now, before we analyze the motives, psychology and politics of Ted Kaczynski and the impact that he's had on culture as a whole, let's make sure we're all on the same page by talking about the actual story of the Unabomber himself. A story that is quite interesting, given Ted's upbringing as well as a nearly two decade evasion. Of the FBI and the story of the man that needs to be understood before we can dissect the legend, most stories that dig into the story of the Unabomber tend to focus on the mystery of the manhunt itself, because, again, this guy maintained A bombing campaign for 17 year. Years and the FBI was none the wiser as to his identity. Had it not been for one tip they got at the end of the. Investigation. So rather than. Focusing on the mystery of unmasking, Ted Kaczynski, which spoilers, the Unabomber was Ted Kaczynski. Sorry to ruin it for you. I want to look at the story of Ted Kaczynski's life and what he was doing. And what he was thinking during the Unabomber campaign. So with that in mind, let's talk about Ted.

Theodore. John Kaczynski was born to his parents, Wanda and Theodore Richard Koza. On May the 22nd of 1942, seven years after Ted was born in 1949, his parents would have another child, Ted's brother David Kaczynski. Both Ted and David were born in Chicago, IL, but three years after David's birth in 1952, the family relocated to Evergreen Park. So in Illinois, to everyone who knew them, and by all accounts we can find, the Kaczynski's were a very happy and healthy family.

The parents were very active in the community. David and Ted got along great and to any outsider looking in, it seemed that the family lived the ideal nuclear lifestyle. However, to those within and close to the. Family it wasn't hard to tell that something about Ted was just different. David Kaczynski would later recount going to his mother at a young age and asking why Ted doesn't have as many friends as David does, or why Ted doesn't seem to be as outgoing or interested in meeting people as the rest of the family. David recounts a story that his mother told. Him in which when Ted was only a few weeks old, he became very ill. During this illness Ted's parents brought him to the hospital and the nurses kept him on sick watch and in intensive care for a few weeks while his parents were close by. And they assured that nothing bad happened to Ted while he was at the hospital, Ted was separated from his parents. And especially his mother during this crucial developmental point in his life, David said that his mother recalled after this event, Ted never seemed to cry as much. Or need the comfort of his mother that he had before, even at such a young age. And it's because of this

that Ted's parents often feared that Ted had abandonment issues due to this day in the hospital. Now, that's not to say that Ted was outright hateful or despising of his parents or David at any point during this time, but perhaps his family. Attributed some of his social misgivings to this developmental delay from a young age, David was told by his mother that whatever happens to Ted never abandoned him, because that's the thing that Ted fears the most. And these are words that would echo in David's mind in several years to come. However, Ted's social issues weren't the only things that were very apparent about the young boy from a young age. Ted was remarkable at any school subject or curriculum that came his way. It was apparent to his parents, as well as teachers, that he was running. Circles around everyone else in his grade. So in the 5th grade, Ted Kaczynski was administered an IQ test, an IQ test, or an intelligence quotient. Test. As many of you are aware.

There is a test that determines one ability to problem solved, or pattern recognition or what have you and IQ of 100 is the standard, or the perfectly middle line of intelligence on the test grading scale. Well, different grading charts have different criteria. It's typically considered that an IQ of 80 or below is low. And an IQ of 120 or higher is high or genius intelligence. When Ted Kaczynski was tested in the 5th grade, he scored 167. That puts him on the level. Of people like. Albert Einstein and also explains why school subjects seem trivial to him, so seeing his. Aptitude for learning Ted was allowed to skip the 6th grade. Well, of course his parents didn't mean anything negative by this.

They wanted their son to succeed and thought that this was a device to maintain that Ted would later write that he saw this move. Move as being devastating to his social life well before he was able to get along at a decent pace with kids in his class. Now he was the lowest ring on the totem pole and in his later writings he would consider this move skipping a grade during middle school to be part of the reason he turned out how he did and as the years went on, Ted remained. A bright and scholarly study. But an isolated one in high school, Ted would join several clubs related to science like biology and math clubs, and he would even join the school's marching band and have a series of friends known as The Briefcase Boys for their habit of bringing a briefcase to different classes and meetings. However, people who knew him during this time. Say that despite joining all of these clubs and even banned, it wasn't for social status, but was instead another way to maintain his studies. This was seen when, again, by maintaining such high grades, Ted Kaczynski skipped the 11th grade, and by doing summer. Classes graduated high school at the age of 15. Ted Kaczynski was accepted to Harvard University at the age of 15 and began attending Harvard at the age of 16 before he even had his driver's license. And of course, while his parents and those around him wanted this for his benefit, knowing what we know now, we can look back and see how this laid the groundwork. For things to come. So in 1958, at the age of only 16 years old, Ted began attending Harvard University and immediately was leagues beyond the rest of his class. Academically, he was excelling beyond people several years older than him. But again, socially, he was quite stunted. And then of course,

there is the one tricky question about Ted's time at Harvard University that has been the main talking point. Whenever the unabombers legitimacy or his motives are ever discussed, it was the point that his defense team fought for when Ted, inevitably. To trial it is a point that has been brought up in the news for decades since, and that is the question was Ted Kaczynski a part of the MK Ultra experiments? And the answer to that is yes, kinda. For those of you who watched the Wendy Goon channel, I'm sure you know what MK Ultra. But for those who may be uninitiated, Mkultra was a series of alleged CIA experiments that took place during the Cold War that had the ultimate goal of mind control or torture methods or population control, depending on who you ask. Basically, the US government controlling. U.S. citizens against their will. So how does Ted Kaczynski tie into all of that? Well, during his time at Harvard, Ted met a professor by the name of Henry Murray. Murray was holding what was officially described. As a debate room between various students, the idea being that the bright young minds at Harvard could come forward to Murray and present a series of beliefs and ideas that they hold to their character, and then they could debate with Murray and other professors at the college as to the legitimacy of their beliefs. And this was all gauged to be some sort of social study or better understanding of the Harvard mindset, when in actuality, that is not what this experiment was at all. See, unbeknownst to Ted Kaczynski Henry Murray was a former member of the OSS, the OSS or the Office of Strategic Services, was the predecessor to the CIA that existed during World War 2 during World War 2, the government collected a series of intelligence agents to keep track of what other countries or different bodies within government are doing. And after World War Two was over, they didn't want to just throw those guys. So the office of Strategic Services became the Central Intelligence Agency, or the CIA. And it seems that Murray was holding a sort of experiment for CIA records. This experiment in actuality, was to have students at Harvard bring forward papers or speeches prepared, discussing their personal. Ideas and convict. And to then verbally berate them regarding those convictions, some audio records still exist of Ted Kaczynski's conversations with Murray during these experiments. It seems that the purpose of this experiment was to understand how much berated or belittling it took to make someone. Gave up on their ideas and you could say this would be used for interrogation or population control or media control or what have you. We don't know what the purpose of these trials was for sure, because for some reason the records regarding these trials are still under lock and key. Meaning that it was almost for certain part of some CIA experiment. Ted Kaczynski was a part of these trials for three years that he was at Harvard. Now a lot of the details around these Harvard experiments get overblown things like that awful manhunt miniseries, say that Ted was, like, strapped down to a chair. And electrocuted and like had rows of people laugh and mock him when no, and because of that some details of the Harvard experiment may seem underwhelming by comparison. But this was a guy who was already socially inept, who now had a superior, a professor at the college yell at him once a week on a schedule about how stupid his ideas were. Ted would later write about how he

considered Murray to be a jerk, or just some guy he didn't like, but. Even in spite of how smart Ted. Was I don't think he realized how much this might have had an. Effect on him because you take a. Guy who despises social settings and is already beginning to despise some fabric of society as a whole. And then you yell. At him about it for. Three years again, it's another piece in the puzzle of what Ted would eventually. Despite this, Ted would graduate from Harvard in 1962 with a bachelor's degree in mathematics. He also graduated with a GPA of 3.12, and if you're like, oh, I thought he would get a perfect 4.0 he really didn't care about the other, like required classes. He had to take that weren't science. Which he just liked me for real. After graduating from Harvard, Kaczynski would pursue A doctorate, and he would do so at the University of Michigan. He took the position at Michigan, despite being also accepted to universities like Berkeley or Chicago, because Michigan offered him a teaching position. His colleagues and professors at the University of Michigan. Said that Kaczynski operated on a level most of them could hardly understand, he was entirely dedicated to his work and was so knowledgeable about things like geometric function. And that sometimes it seemed he was speaking another language. Some of his teachers even going on to say that he is the best student they have ever seen. Now there is something else that happened to Ted Kaczynski in 1966, during his stay at Michigan. And I understand that this event is a very sensitive topic that I am going to handle with care. But I believe that his reaction to this event. Is important for what he would later become. So in the years leading up to 1966, Ted Kaczynski, at least according to David and a few people who were close to him so that he always had an interest in women, that he always, you know, desired to date a woman, that he was sexually attracted to them. But due to his social misgivings. He never had a lot of luck with the ladies and it's because of this, despite his best. Efforts Ted Kaczynski maintained a kind of sexual frustration and in writings that he would later write about, this time began to feel levels of misogyny. Not in so much that he felt any kind of violence or belittlement to their status as a person, more so that he just kind of felt an aversion to them. He overall began to feel uncomfortable. Around women as a whole, or at least not yet. I mentioned all that to say in 1966, within his own right. Ted Kaczynski began to believe that he was transgender for several weeks in 1966, Ted would write about his feelings regarding being transgender and the thoughts that he was having regarding it, and even set up an appointment with his achiev Trist to discuss gender reassignment. Ted went as far to go to the appointment. To meet with this psychic. Centrist. But while he was in the psychiatrist waiting room, he immediately felt that all of this was a. Mistake and he. Got up and left the room and.

Then he immediately. After this, Ted writes for pages and pages about how he wanted to kill the psychiatrist. Ted would write about how he. Would go about it. How he would ensure that there was no evidence left behind and it's the first time in Ted's writings that we see a tinge of murderous fantasy. Now I want to make it very clear there are several dozens of reports from gender or professionals from doctors who have far more experience than myself. In the nature of gender reassignment or transgender

individuals, and between the psychologists and other doctors who have read over Ted's writings, it is by and large believed that Ted was not actually transgender. And all of

The writings from that few week period, again, there's nothing about wanting. To be a woman. As a whole, all of the things he describes are explicitly sexual or fantasies. This or other things that I don't want to discuss in detail because I try to maintain some aspects of a family friendly channel, but aside from these sexual fantasies, Ted never gave any indication that he was transgender during this period of time, and even given the sexual fantasies never mentioned it anywhere in his writings. Outside of this few week period and the majority of psychiatrists who have looked at this case. Believe it to be an outlet of Ted's sexual frustration, but the important part here is that after leaving that psychiatrist office, Ted starts to think that murdering people is a solution to his problems. Of course, we all understand that it's not the psychiatrist fault that Ted just so happened to make an appointment with that Ted was dealing with this experience. But nevertheless, Ted felt that murdering that person might make it better in his writings. Reflecting on this revelation that murdering the psychiatrist might make his problems go away, Ted says I felt disgusted about what my uncontrolled sexual cravings had almost led me to do. And I felt humiliated, and I violently hated the psychiatrist. Just then there came a major turning point in my life. Like a Phoenix, I burst from the ashes of my despair to a glorious New Hope. In 1967, Kaczynski finished his doctoral dissertation, a paper called Boundary. Functions to this day, mathematicians who read boundary. Functions say that Ted wrote something that could only be understood by a few people in the world. So after receiving his doctorate in 1967, the then only 25 year old Ted Kaczynski became an acting assistant professor at the University of California, Berkeley. By September of the next year, he was given a full assistant. Professor position, meaning that Kozinski was on track for a very long and fulfilling career in academics. However, according to students that had Kaczynski as a professor, he was a terrible teacher. He taught directly from the book. He did not take questions from the. Class and his social skills once again not the best. Many said that he seemed uncomfortable just being in front of a classroom of people in the 1st place and then much less trying to teach them. Perhaps because of this, on June the 30th of 1969 dead, Kaczynski resigned from teaching, having only been there for two years, however. In interviews that Kaczynski would later give, he says that by the time he had taken the job at. Berkeley. He had no interest in maintaining his career in mathematics or participating in society as a whole. We'll discuss the validity of that when we talk about the psychology and beliefs of Kaczynski later in this video. But according to Ted, at least later on, he only took the job at Berkeley so that he could make money for a couple of years. To afford to dip out of society altogether, having in his mind been wronged by those around him, and losing the game of life time and time again, Kaczynski took what money he had and went to live with his parents in Illinois, with the eventual goal of stepping away from humanity. Forever. So shortly after resigning from Berkeley in 1969, Ted returns to live with his family in Illinois. For two years, Ted lives at his parents house. While he works odd jobs around

the greater Chicago area. He tells his family that his ultimate goal is to find a piece of property out in nature. And right now, he's just building up the capital. To purchase a piece. Land David was proud of his brother and thought that Ted was being a sort of pioneer, living away from what society would normally dictate. So in 1971, David accompanies Ted to Lincoln Mt and while in Lincoln, Ted, with the help of his brother, would purchase a piece of land just outside of town. Now, while Lincoln itself is already situated well. Into the mountains of Montana Ted's piece of property was especially so, and on this remote piece of property. 40 Ted built himself a 10 by 14 foot cabin. Aside from a few neighbors who owned adjoining acreage around the area, Ted was now completely isolated. He owned no vehicle and would occasionally bike out to town if he was in need of supplies, but for the most part he had set out to live as a recluse in the mountains of Montana. Now, while Ted did earn some money. For himself in those two years, he was working in Illinois, the vast majority of his livelihood at this point came from his. Parents, the \$2100 that Ted used to buy the piece of land, ate through most of his savings. But considering Ted's remedial lifestyle, it didn't seem to put a strain on his family. In Ted's writings at this time, it seems that he maintained his deep fear of people he was untrusting with. Anyone he came into contact with. Even people who were completely friendly to him around the town of Lincoln. And despite his isolated way of living, Ted immediately found problems with the few people who live nearby. For example, nearby there was a group of guys who would often go dirt biking in the hills around Lincoln, not on Ted's property, mind you. Just kind of close to Ted's property. Ted spoke in his journal how he hated these. Guys and their noise pollution that he said, we're in the environment. On top of that, there was a nearby sawmill that was relatively low scale in its production. But of course Ted had a problem with it because he saw it as someone who hates nature, destroying the environment for technologies means. And in his journal began to fantasize about destroying the sawmill. During this time, Ted became more and more reliant on nature, both physically and mentally. He would occasionally bike out to local stores to get things like rice or seeds, with the eventual goal of becoming totally self reliant. He began to plant fruits and vegetables outside of his cabin. With the intent of storing up enough supplies to last through the winter, he became moderately successful at this. As the years went on, but initially still required several trips to the local stores. He would bathe in the nearby rivers, and aside from things like detergent to clean his clothes, made an effort to live entirely on the woods around him. His primary food source would be things like rabbit or squirrel with what crops he could grow to supplement those meals. He also had a 22 rifle that he would use to hunt these animals, but mentally he began to dive more into the naturalist lifestyle. In the scarce interview that he would give while in prison, Ted often mentioned how he could sit for hours or even days at a time and never be bored, just soaking in the environment he lived in. He would speak of how technology erodes the mine and makes people feel this constant need to entertain and stimulate themselves, but that when all of that is stripped away. Boredom disappears as one can learn to be content with whatever environment they're in. You would later

mention that he considered things like mathematics or relationships. To all be. Sort of games. Things to hold over the mind until something better comes along, and as far as Ted was concerned, where he was at now. Was really living. And one interview that he would give Ted said while I was living in the woods, I sort of invented some gods for myself. Not that I believed in these things intellectually, but they were ideas that sort of corresponded with some of the feelings. I had, I think the first one I invented was Grandfather Rabbit, you know, the snowshoe rabbits were my main source of me during the winters. I had spent a lot of time learning what they do and following their tracks all around before I could get close enough to shoot them. Sometimes you would track a rabbit around and around, and then the tracks disappear. You can't figure out where the rabbit went and lose the trail. I invented a myth for myself that this was the grandfather rabbit, the grandfather who was responsible for the existence of all other rabbits. He was able to disappear. That is why you couldn't catch him and why you would. Never see him. Every time I shot the snowshoe rabbit, I would always say thank you Grandfather. Rabbit after a while I acquired an urge to draw snowshoe rabbits. I sort of got involved with them to the extent that they would occupy a great deal of my thought. I actually did have a wooden object that, among other things, I carved a snowshoe rabbit in. I plan to do a better one just for the snowshoe rabbits. But I never did get it done.

There was another one that I sometimes called the will oh, wisp, or the wings of the morning. That's when you go out in the hills in the morning and you. Just feel drawn. To go on and on and on and on.

Then you are following the wisp. That was another God that I invented for myself. And as Ted began to ruminate. In this idea that he had found the truth that he was the only one who. Really got what living was all about. It led to a. Disdain for those that didn't get it for the others as he saw them. This also compounded off his continuing disdain for technology itself, because. Of course to. Him technology was the main thing that was holding us back from this true purpose. So these thoughts of violence that he previously had. Just considered against people in the new. By region, he now made a reality. Remember those guys who would go dirt biking around the trails near his home while Ted followed them back to where they were staying one night and proceeded to take an axe to destroy not only their dirt bikes and part of the house that they lived in, but also broken side of the house, destroyed a bunch of their stuff, and defecated in their bathtub.

There's another group of guys who would go snowmobiling during the winter, so Tad broke into their garage and poured sugar in their gas tanks.

The lumber mill that I mentioned earlier. Well, in 1975. Ted set part of it on fire. He would also vandalize. And destroy any construct. Equipment that was left away from prying eyes. Now you may be asking yourself, how did he break all of these things over the course of three or four years and never get caught for it? And that was because most of the people who lived around him would vouch for him. Authorities would often

visit the guy who ruined the lumber mill, or people who lived in the region, and when they were asked if they think Ted Kaczynski. Could have done it.

They would all say no, that he seemed like a perfectly nice guy, Ted, for the most part, kept to himself. But whenever he interacted with people, he gave off this preset. That's of a timid, shy person. He had a high pitched voice, a bit of an almost stutter around people, and for the most part would just say please and thank you and go about his way. That guy whose lumber mill he set on fire he had previously helped him build a small building. Several of his neighbors would later say that they just thought he was some guy who maybe got out of Vietnam. Or had a falling out with his family and now just wanted to be left to his own devices and given his presence, everyone assumed he was harmless. So even with all this destruction happening around him, no one was the wiser. But it seems like for Ted around this. Point random acts of vandalism weren't enough in his journals around this time 1977, he begins to say that while he is only doing a small part to destroy technological society that he plans to make a much greater impact, so he decides to scheme. He decides that he will perform acts of terrorism. That will halt technology for good, or at least that's the plan. But to do? That he's going to need some. Money again. At this point he had been living off of his parents. Allowance and didn't want to raise any eyebrows when he needed more cash, so he asked his brother David for a job back in Illinois and David got him a job at the Anaconda Company where David worked as a supervisor. So Ted moved back with his family in Illinois for a short amount of time and began to work at what is effectively a smelting. Facility while there, Ted began to develop feelings for one of his coworkers, and surprisingly even got her to go out on a couple of dates. David describes Ted as being almost childlike during this period of time, David would remark that one day Ted burst into his room and happily exclaimed she. Missed me, which for Ted might have been the first time he ever got a kiss. And while talking to this. Woman Ted seemed very happy. However, after a couple of dates, she decided that the relationship wasn't going to continue, but told Ted they could still be friends. As you could imagine from someone that hates people as much as Ted does and was just opening up. A little bit of a sliver of himself for this opportunity to have that shot made him very upset, so upset. In fact that. He began to go around work and. I'm not kidding. Ripe limericks about how much he hated her, according to David.

There were just poems on sticky notes all over the company that would have jokes about how she smelled bad or how she was an awful person, or jokes relating. To the feminine. Figure that I'm not going to repeat, like literally middle school behavior, David being Ted's boss, ripped all of them down and told Ted if he keeps putting them up, he's going to have to fire him. So sure enough, Ted keeps putting them up and David fires Ted shortly after this happens, Ted writes in his journal that he fantasy. About hiding away in that woman's car while she was at work waiting for her to get off work to come to her vehicle, to which Ted would then kidnap her, take her away and dismember her, and he goes into vivid detail about how much he would enjoy cutting her up and what he would do to her body parts. But that. Course he doesn't want

to get caught. Now, as mentioned, this isn't the first time Ted has fantasized about murder. It began with the psychiatrist we mentioned earlier, and there were several instances of murder that he fantasized about in between. Of course, he thought about killing the guys who drove dirt bikes around, or the guy who owned the lumberyard. As you could imagine. But perhaps one of the most egregious. Is Ted wanted to kill the three-year old daughter of the guy who ran the sawmill going so far, according to his journal, to wait for her to get alone by herself out in the pine trees to which Ted aimed a rifle at her and almost pulled the trigger. Only being stopped because he saw her mother further down the hill and knew that if he killed her, he would then have to take care of the mom as well. So before the Unabomber campaign even begin, he had fantasized about killing dozens of. People, including a woman he had dated and a three-year old child, and I think this is important to emphasize not to virtue signal and be like, oh, killing children is bad. Who would? Have thought but to lay. Out what? The psychology of the Unabomber was before the bombings even began.

There's a lot of debate around.

The morality or the goals of Ted? Linski and a lot of people believe him to be a pure altruist, which we'll talk about later, but several see his crusade as righteous as he was planning to destroy the worst parts of society, and he saw bloodshed as necessary to accomplish that goal. But before he had any plans or cares. For the greater society around him, he was thinking about killing a kid just because she annoyed him. And well, sure, you could view it in tandem as his hatred for humanity. Was because of or at the same time as his love of nature and his despising of technology. I believe it was the other way around. I believe he hated humanity so much that he loved nature because that's just where humans aren't, or at least not as much. And any who are. He wants to get rid of immediately, but we'll get more into that. Later on in the video, so his time at the company and when David fired him was in 1978, and while at this point he was already planning to begin his bombing campaign. It is worth mentioning this is the last significant event in his life before the bombs began in 1972, he had thought about killing a scientist in the parking lot of the university because he saw the scientist as impeding nature and society itself. But he had decided against it because he didn't want to get caught. Well, it seems that between 1972 and 1978 he found a way to get that job. Done without putting himself at risk. So in his cabin in the backwoods of Montana, Ted would begin to build contraptions of pipe, bomb and wood disguised within a mail package. So after picking his target on May the 25th of 1978, the Unabomber campaign began. It seems that Ted had grown to despise. Owners of education and technology, as he saw these establishments as instrumental in societies downfall. So his first target was Northwestern University on May the 25th of 1978, someone in the parking lot of northwestern. Noticed a mail package lying out front of a mailbox. A security guard walked over to pick the package up and as he moved it, the bomb exploded.

The construction of the bomb itself seemed to be a basic pipe bomb and the explosive was not pressurized enough to do any real damage, only dealing minor burns and

scratches to the security guard. Later, investigators would reconstruct what the bomb looked like and they determined that the reason it was just sitting in front of a mailbox is because the package was too big to fit through the mail shoe. So it seems that Ted had pieced it together, not taking into account how big the opening on the mailbox is. And with no other option, just set it on the ground.

The only riding on the package was a return address to one of the professors at Northwestern, and despite combing over the remains of the bomb for forensics, the fact that it exploded as well as Ted's consideration to evidence meant that they weren't able to get a lead. But considering that this was just one explosion. And it wasn't that serious. Investigators considered it a one off. That was until nearly a year later, on May the 9th of 1979, when another bomb showed up at Northwestern University, a graduate student, thought that the bomb was strange, walked over to pick it up, and as he did, the bomb exploded, similar to the last explosive. It wasn't powerful enough to cause a lot of damage, and thankfully the student only received minor cuts and burns. However, this is now 2 bomb attacks on Northwestern University, so the investigators launched into an investigation. Looking for anyone who may be looking to destroy Northwestern now. It should also be mentioned that a lot of the reason that Ted was able to elude authorities for as long as he did, like sure he took into. Out, you know, forensics or maintaining a low profile where you live, trying to not associate himself with things that could be related to the Unabomber. For example, there were various eco groups that Ted was a fan of, like Earth 1st. And despite enjoying their readings, Ted made an effort to never subscribe to their magazine or to let other people see him. Reading the magazine so that no one would associate him with this eco terrorist so sure, while Ted put in some work to. Not get caught.

The majority of the reason that he. Was able to. Get away with it was because it was 1979. That bomb that was lying on the table of Northwestern. He just walked into the college and set it down on a table and walked out and in a society that didn't have the surveillance or security as our society today, it was possible to get away with something like that. While in most modern colleges. Ted wouldn't have been able to get through the front door. Just keep the time period in mind as we talk about some of the difficulties these investigators faced. But in 1979 they were looking for someone who was trying to target Northwestern. However, all of that would change in November of that year. On November the 15th of 1970. 9 American Airlines Flight 444 would be the next victim of Ted's bombing campaign, similar to the first explosive this bomb was put through the mail system. Ted, knowing that the package would be transferred through a passenger jet, something that the Postal Service doesn't really do anymore, rigged to this explosive to go off using an altimeter.

The previous explosives were designed that after a certain. Amount of time. If anyone violently shook the package or opened it, it would blow, but an altimeter is a measurement of something's altitude, so the bomb was designed that after the timer goes off, once the altimeter reaches a certain altitude, the bomb would explode,

meaning that tent's plan was to blow up an entire passenger jet. While it was in the air, thankfully for all of those involved, the bomb malfunctioned.

The bomb's timer went off, which ignited The detonator, but not the explosive charge, meaning that it caused the package to produce. A lot of smoke and spark off, but thankfully not explode.

The plane was evacuated and 12 people sought medical attention for smoke inhalation. But other than. That everyone was fine. Now, to those familiar with the Unabomber case, obviously this story isn't surprising. You've heard it before, but for those of you who are just familiar with the reputation of Ted Kaczynski, this probably sounds. Out of character, what was a guy who was so concerned with destroying technological society? Or those super corporation leaders who are harming nature. What is that guy doing trying to blow up a passenger jet? Sure, jets are an effect of technological society, but the people on the plane don't have anything to do with that. I mean, you could argue they're participating in it, but that's a stretch. What does killing the nearly hundred people? On the jet. To to reignite society's true meaning. Also, I'm going to have to cover that it looks like God is about to jump through the window. Actually, you know what? On second thought, it's kind of pretty. Yeah. We're gonna run with it. Furthermore, think about the second explosive. At northwestern, sure.

The first one was supposed to wind up in a professor's office, even though it didn't get there, so you can argue that. Explosive was directional, but for that second one he just left it on a table a a janitor. Anyone could have opened that and the person who did was just a graduate student. What does killing a random graduate student do again to benefit society or to benefit nature? Intense journals during this time there is no level of. Morse, or even dissatisfaction with the fact that he's killing random people? There's only frustration that he hasn't actually killed anyone yet. All he says is that he needs to get better at making bombs that he can't believe the altimeter didn't go off and he really wanted to blow up a jet full of people. Ted Kaczynski is often considered not as bad as. Other terrorists, at least in United States history, because of his relatively low body count. But the only reason his body count was relatively low is because he wasn't able to do everything that he. Tried to do because if those bombs were as effective as he wanted them to be, there would have been a lot more bloodshed. Well, part of the bomb. Was destroyed because. Again, the igniter went off, more of it was intact than with the other examples. This allowed investigators to take a closer look at the device and eventually connect, connect it, connect it. Connected and eventually connect. Connect it. What what? Why is that? Connect it and eventually connect it back to the two northwestern bombings there we. Go finally there. Were a few details that gave away the connect. For one, all three explosives had an unusually large amount of wood in them.

The casings of the explosives themselves were made out of wood. Initially, investigators thought that maybe the wood was some kind of potential shrapnel device, which it was, but you can also use like metal for that and get better results.

The mechanics of the explosives.

Themselves were especially cheap, like the wires and timers would be salvage from old car parts, and several of the brackets and braces within the explosive were hand fashioned out of wood. This is weird for what the authorities assume is a guy who lives near Chicago. Ago and is making explosives in his garage, but of course it makes more sense with the hindsight that we have now that Ted Kaczynski was cutting wood. And I mean, he had nothing else better to do, hand fashioning pieces to fit into these packages as well as going to nearby salvage and scrap yards and just stealing. Stuff from random junk cars investigators would later wonder during the case why there were such long periods of time between bombings like there was a year between the 1st and 2nd. Bomb and like 5 months between the 2nd and 3rd and again with the hindsight we have now, it's because the dude had to individually piece these bombs together literally piece by piece. But at this point the FBI dedicated full attention to this case previously it was someone trying to attack Northwestern with these non lethal explosives, but now it was someone. Trying to take down an entire passenger jet. Out of the Chicago airport, so the FBI made it into a huge case and assigned a lot of manpower to track this guy down. And because his current targets were universities and airlines, the FBI gave him the designation of the university and airline bomber. Or as it was abbreviated the Unabomber, as the FBI are trying to build a profile on who this bomber. May be and track down any leads they can on June the 10th of nine. In 80, Ted sends out his fourth bomb. This package was sent to Lake Forest, IL, meaning that all four. Of his explosives. Were within Illinois, the package arrived at the doorstep of a man named Percy Wood. Percy Wood was the president of United Airlines. When Percy would open the package, it was the famous novel Ice Brothers.

There was an anonymous note. Attached to the book. That said, Ice brothers was a. Great read and that the sender encourages Percy Wood to check the book out himself. When Percy opened the book, the Inside of it had been hollowed out and a bomb was in its place.

The bomb detonated, and unlike the previous three, this time caused major injury. Percy Wood didn't die, but he received extreme burns. And cuts that nearly caused him to bleed out. Had it not been for emergency services, Percy Wood would have died. And in Ted's own writings, he expresses elation. For this, he's excited that one of his moms went off the way it was supposed to. It made it all the way to his target and then exploded with extreme results. However, he remarks that he wishes Percy Wood would have been blinded. Or, you know, died, even if it hadn't happened yet, it is clear that Ted's intent was to kill the authorities are tracking down anyone who has a criminal record or a grudge with airplane. Around the Chicago area, because again, all four of these bombings take place in Illinois, so it makes sense that the investigators would think the bomber is in Illinois, when in reality it's most likely that Ted was just performing these attacks around Illinois because it was people and. Areas that he was familiar with. Universities and airports that he grew up around, Ted would make bus trips from Lincoln all the way to Chicago and either drop off or mail his packages by hand. As you can imagine, considering that no one knows Ted and the few people

that do have no idea that he could be capable of this, the authorities aren't able to follow any real leads. Even the people around Lincoln, Montana, as if at this point, people in Lincoln would be on the lookout for the Chicago bomber around their neck of the woods. But even if they were residents of the area would later remark that Ted would time his trips to the store. Implying that he's going to be in the region for a while, right before he would go on these bus trips to drop off these packages. So even if someone did for some reason suspect Ted Kaczynski at this point he was manipulating his visits out to town to prove otherwise. So over a year passes since the 4th explosion. And the authorities are none the wiser when, on October the 8th of 1981, a fifth bomb is delivered. However, this one doesn't go off, and it's also not in Illinois. This bomb is found at the University of Utah, and considering universities are kind of on the edge from the whole unabomb thing someone at the university reports a suspicious package.

The police show up and diffuse it. You can tell a lot more about an explosive if you get the explosive. Before it explodes. So now the investigators had their first unused explosive and were able to use that. To better grab information about this Unabomber. For one, it's from this unused explosives that they were able to determine things I mentioned earlier, like it was old car parts used for the actual wiring of the device, or wooden pieces where typically metal ones would be used, which prove things that were previously just suspicions about the previous explosives.

The other way they were able to tell that. This Utah bomb was connected to the Illinois Bomb. Other than the construction of the bomb itself, like the wood and old parts, was the presence of a small engraving on the metal of the explosive itself. That said FC, now for a long, long time, authorities didn't know what FC meant, but in hindsight we know that FC stood for the Freedom Club the Freedom Club would be a focus for authorities for decades trying to determine what this FC meant. However, what we know now is that the FC was a red herring. Ted was trying to make it appear that a group of people were responsible for this series of bombings instead of just himself again to further avoid suspicion, he would strategically place these engravings on parts of the explosive he knew weren't going to blow up, like the in caps to the pipe bomb itself.

There would be more misdirection Ted would add with his later explosives, but FC was the first one to really stump authorities. But despite having a now intact bomb still, there wasn't a lot the police could do with it.

There was no forensic evidence that pointed to anyone, let alone a guy who lives in the middle of the Montana wilderness.

The one thing that it did show is that while they previously thought just targets in Illinois were in danger, now that a bomb arrived at a university in Utah. Everyone's in danger, or at least anyone who's ever been to a college or been on a plane.

There's a lot of pressure on the FBI to solve this case because in the news it was clear that people were afraid to travel at this point, and given these long periods of time between bombings, it created this sense of paranoia that no one knew when he was going to strike. Next, however, those fears would become a reality when, on May

the 5th of 1982, his next bomb was sent to the University of Vanderbilt in Nashville, TN. This package, similar to previous. Horns was intended for professor at Vanderbilt. However, it was not the professor who was in range of the blast, but instead his young secretary, the secretary at the desk in front of the Professors office, received the package, and upon moving it, the bomb exploded, similar to the bomb at Lake Forest, it caused extreme injury. A young Janet Smith was horribly. Mutilated by burns and deep cuts she received from the bomb. So now Ted's had an effective bomb that didn't hit his intended target. Ted's reaction to this in his journal was frustration. Not that it got the wrong person, but that the bomb still wasn't lethal. And of course, the package at Tennessee further expands the possible targets.

The Unabomber could be aiming at, as authorities continue to scramble to try to find something to lead them to who may be responsible only two months later, on July the second of 1982, Ted sends out another explosive. This bomb was sent to the University of California at Berkeley. Now this target does make some sense to us because, as we know. Berkeley is where Ted worked as a professor, but to investigators, this seems to be just a random college. This bomb went to an engineering professor named Diogenes Angelakos. And he was hit by the explosive. However, similar to the previous two victims, he wasn't fatally injured, just significantly physically injured. I should also mention that at this point, it seems to be an act of divine intervention that these people are surviving.

These bombs are certainly powerful enough and have the required amount of shrapnel in the packaging. Of the device itself to kill someone who's close enough to be holding. And they're receiving injuries that if at the right places in the body would prove fatal. But thankfully no one's died yet. However, Ted is getting more and more frustrated that he hasn't got a kill in his writings. Ted says that he is more determined to make these things effective to more tightly pack the elements so that the combustion. Is larger and to increase the size of the packages if need be to put more accelerant. Keep in mind. As all this is happening, Ted is maintaining his local visits to the library and the general stores around Lincoln.

The FBI during this time was growing increasingly frustrated with what little clues they had see. After the bombings in Chicago and the one that got onto an airplane, the leading theory the FBI had initially is that perhaps this person. Person is a previous flight mechanic. Maybe that's why they tried to target an American Airlines flight, and perhaps he attended some form of engineering school at one of the universities in Illinois. That would explain things like for one, his targets, but also his technical know how of how to assemble these explosives.

But now there's targets at Utah, Tennessee, California. Some of the theories they had turned out to be kind of close, even if incidental, like for one, the presence of wood in an explosive is rare. So maybe they thought there was some kind of nature or forest element to the crimes.

The President of United Airlines was named Percy Wood. So. Wood. Maybe that has something to do with it. And while it's most likely Ted was using wood partially as a statement about trees itself, but also because that's just what he had available.

They were correct in the assumption that these crimes were related to nature, but they couldn't establish a solid MO as to why he's picking the targets that he is. Because even if his goal is to. Save nature or to commit these crimes in the name of. Nature. He's not. Attacking people who are leading deforestation efforts or who are, you know, tearing up terrain to build new factories or what have you. He was doing that stuff locally and people were none the wiser. Like, you know, he was vandalizing equipment around Lincoln. But of course, the feds. Don't know about that. So they just see someone who's really got a problem with college. Is in planes for some reason. Also remember how Ted would leave initials like FC on the sides of pieces of the explosive he knew would be intact? Well, this point he had added a few more red herrings to the equation. On one bomb he had ridden in a piece that was not destroyed in the blast.

The phrase. Ooh, it works, implying that in building the bomb he was speaking, or whoever was writing this. Was speaking to a companion named Wu to inform Wu that the explosive is working correctly again, further propagating the idea that this is some large group rather than just head himself, so all the authorities are chasing their tails on that. Ted takes three years before he releases another explosive. In hindsight, we know that this three-year gap. Was for him to amass a lot of material because in 1985. If Ted would send out four bombs, it seems that Ted was fed up with not getting lethal results, so he was going to do everything in his power to change that. On May 15th of 1985, he sent his first of this batch of five explosives again to Berkeley. Again, these bombs were designed with a sort of timer that, after the timer went off the bomb. Would be armed and then significant motion or opening the package would cause it to blow. This is how the bombs are able to do things like pass through the mail system and not blow up until they hit their target. However, the first person to make contact with this bomb. Berkeley was not a professor, but instead a graduate student. Now Air Force captain named John Hauser because while John didn't die, he did lose 4 fingers, lost vision in his left eye, and severed an artery in his arm. Had it not been for John's know how of how to stop the bleed and nearby emergency services? He would have bled out. Authorities now see that two explosives have been sent to Berkeley. This hadn't happened. Since the two to northwestern at the beginning of the bombing campaign, so they began to look for connections of people who had problems with Berkeley. And while they were on to something. That there was never any tangible evidence or even colloquial evidence between people at Berkeley that Ted Kaczynski would have a problem with them. I mean, sure, he quit his job, but just cause someone quits their job. I mean, they're gonna try to blow up the school one month later on June the 13th, another bomb would be sent, this one to the Boeing. Company office in Auburn, WA. However, thankfully. This bomb was successfully defused. Anyone who worked at an airline or college was paranoid of packages around this time, so someone reported a suspicious package and the authorities were able to defuse it. And from what? They

found from this intact bomb it had seen that Ted was getting more precise with his experiments. Previously unsealed sides of the package itself. Were coated with a sort of epoxy instead of individual timers or detonators, there were now fail safe systems built in to ensure that the package would explode. His pipe bombs were larger and with a more solid. Construction, meaning that in combination with the sealed chamber that the bomb would have detonated in would cause larger blasts.

The FBI also began to find forensic evidence in the explosives, but similar to the ridings like FC and Woo.

These would also turn out to be a dead end and the reason they were a dead end is because for one, Ted was very meticulous to not leave. Any hairs or any residue on the devices themselves as to not get caught, but now he was adding purposefully false DNA. See the way Ted would go about these bombs. Breeze is he would load up his explosives. At least this series of explosives of 1985 into a backpack and just take a bus. So Ted was loading up on explosives, taking a bus out West, and then delivering them at local post offices. And it turns out on the bus trip there, he would stop at like gas station. And pick up a bunch of random hairs he found on the floor and sprinkle them inside of the explosive so that if the FBI finds a hair and then does a whole analysis on it, it will be of just some random guy who was at a gas station in Utah. At this point, Ted's effectively playing with authorities because he knows he can get away with it. On November the 15th of 1985, his next package would be delivered to the University of Michigan. This package was intended for a psychology professor named James McConnell. However, McConnell's research assistant, Nicholas Suino, was holding the bomb at the moment of detonation. McConnell only experienced temporary hearing. Gross and was a bit shaken from the blast, but Serena received significant burns and scratches, but once again, thankfully, no one was killed. Ted became furious by this. He was so mad that despite his efforts, no one was dying. So it seems that with his next explosive, he wanted to ensure first hand that someone was. Going to die and sadly. Only this time he got what he wanted on December 11th of 1985, Ted Kaczynski traveled to Sacramento, CA. He had attached the explosive itself to a piece of lumber. To anyone who has done the wiser, it would just look like. Junk. So Ted went. Out front of a computer store in the region and set the package. In the parking lot, the owner of the computer store, a man named Hugh Scrutton, stepped outside to remove this piece of debris from the parking lot of his store, and after he began to move the. Explosive detonated and Hugh Scrutton was killed. Not only was the explosion itself significant, but the device was loaded with so much wood and debris that it caused severe cuts and gouging all over his body. Hugh Scrutton had died and for the first time Ted Kaczynski had killed someone in his journal at this time. His reaction to finally taking a life after years of. Thinking of killing women that he knew or just people he didn't seem to get along with, his reaction was simply success. And I can't stress this enough. Hugh Scrutton was just a family man who owned his own computer shop outside of the weird, hazy connection that this guy sold computers. He has no association to technological society. He was just a guy trying

to make a living and to have killed him. For him. This also immediately changes the direction the FBI had been work. With up until this point, it seems that whoever this killer is, he's got a problem with colleges and airlines, but. Now he killed. A guy who effectively owned a RadioShack. Why would someone who supposedly is doing what he's doing for the benefit of humanity and for the preservation of nature? Keep picking such obscure targets. And I mean, Ted didn't even know. That you would step outside to remove it. It could have been a kid. It could have been someone just shopping at the store. I guess as far as he considers any targets an acceptable 1. Not only was he elated to have finally killed someone within his own writings, but he seemed to be so elated with the results that for his next bombing he picked effectively the exact same target. On February the 20th of 1987, he would travel to Salt Lake City, UT and while there he would target. Yet again, another computer store. This time he set a package in the front parking lot of the store at the previous one that Hugh Scrutton was. I know that if I recall correctly, the explosive was placed near a dumpster near a dumpster in the parking lot behind the store, but for this one in 1987, in the middle of a sunny. Busy day he. Sets it in the front parking lot next to a vehicle after he leaves, similar to Hugh Scrutton, the owner of the store, a man named Gary Wright stepped outside. To clean up whatever this package was. Thankfully for Gary at the moment of the explosion, the bomb was angled away from his body and again, despite being very significant, Gary Wright didn't die. He did receive extreme nerve damage to his left arm. Gary would later remark that. But he was in a haze coming out of it, and his arm was mangled and he looked down at his clothes and he said it looked like tiny needles were all over him. It turns out these needles was shrapnel from the explosive itself. However, this bombing marks a very significant moment in the case because for the first time. As Ted was doing all of this, somebody saw. Him a lady who worked at the computer. Store looked out into the. Parking lot and saw Ted set the package down next to a vehicle. She had even remarked to her boss that some guy just came and sat that down in the parking lot.

The boss went out to check and then that's when it blew up. This means for the first time someone actually had eyes on kazinski while he was in the act, and from her description that she gave to the police. We get the now iconic sketch of Kaczynski wearing a hoodie and aviators, while. This didn't give. Authorities a lot to go on. It certainly gave them something to go on because now they know that he's a white guy.

They know his relative height and build famously one of the details. That, it turns out the lady at the computer store got wrong was the color of Kaczynski's hair. Ted Kaczynski's hair is kind of a brownish black, but she remarked to the police that it seemed to be a kind of reddish blonde, and they and all the descriptions they gave out to the public, they said, be on the lookout for someone with reddish blonde hair. She could only see a sort of tuft of hair of his that was coming out from underneath the hoodie, and there's a lot of debate as to why she got this wrong, but I don't think it's that hard to explain. I mean, it was a sunny. Say if someone's got brown hair and the sun's striking it from a distance, it will probably appear as a sort of reddish blonde.

But regardless of this, it seemed to do enough to scare Kaczynski into hiding, at least for a while, because after this it would be over six years before Kaczynski acted again. During this time, he just kind of laid low. Stuck to life as usual and waited for the heat to die down. Given the six year gap between crimes, the FBI thought this may have been.

The last they ever see of. Die and maybe he will have gotten away for good. And if Ted had never acted again, he probably would have gotten away with it. At this point, he had sent out 12 explosives, injured over a dozen people, and killed Hugh Scrutton. But this wasn't good enough for Ted. Ted had something to prove as he said he despised industrial society and all those who have managed to build it up. Even if to him that someone as remedial as a computer store owner, but he wasn't going to go away in silence, he was going to bide his time, and when he could act again and during this time Ted would continue life as usual, the way he was finding out about the effects of these crimes if he was getting fatal result. Or not is when he would go out to visit the town or the library nearby, because the one thing he would do often is he would read, so he would often stock up on books. He would try to get a copy of the local paper and those who lived in the town again remarked that he was just an average guy who kept to himself, would stop in and be friendly when you would meet him. But always sort of strange opinions of him would vary from the nice guy who would. Help you out. If you needed but for the most part didn't want to, he didn't go out of his way to interact with people. Any social event he was invited to, he would immediately decline, while others remarked that he was just outright rude and seemed to. Avoid and disdain people at every turn. But again, a guy who's just living out in the woods, on a cabin, in a piece of property that no one cares about. Would it be your first pick for the Unabomber, or I mean with hindsight? Sure. But at the time, there was no reason the people in Lincoln NE had reason to believe Ted might be involved. During this time, Ted also became more and more withdrawn from his family. At one point, Ted's brother David married a woman named Linda. Ted had never met Linda. But sent a very strongly worded letter to both David and Linda declaring that he hated her, saying that she was a nasty woman, saying that David shouldn't marry her because he didn't like her. And keep in mind, Ted had never met Linda. He just hated the fact that there. As a woman getting in the way of the one relationship, Ted could still manipulate Ted and David's parents weren't rich and Ted's meager yet entirely relied on them. Way of living was beginning to exhaust their resources, so Ted would often manipulate his brother to get what he wants. But after David got married, Ted almost entirely. Communication with his family. It was likely for this reason that when Ted and David's father, also Theodore Kaczynski. Was diagnosed with lung cancer in 1990.

The Kaczynski family had a meeting to discuss their future and didn't invite Ted. Now the exact details of this meeting are not known for sure publicly, and I don't want to speculate, but for whatever reason, shortly after this meeting, Theodore Kaczynski. Took his own life and well again. I don't want to speculate. I don't think that it is

outside of the realm of reason to say that a lot of their finances going towards. Head and Theodore, now having an expensive disease to take care of, probably didn't help that final. I don't know at what point, if ever, before his capture, Ted was told about what his father had done, but if he was, he didn't seem to care and didn't seem to take much notice of it in his writings. So for six years, Ted continued life as normal in Montana and to David and his new wife Linda Ted. Was just the weird guy who hung out in the woods. Who? Linda didn't like it all for.

These reasons, but David still felt sort of longing for after all, that was his Big Brother. But after six years, the heat had died down. So Ted decided to start bombing again on June the 22nd of 1993, Ted mailed an explosive to the home of Charles Epstein, A geneticist who lived in California. Before the authorities. We even had time to. Was this two days later another bomb showed up on June the 24th at the Office of David Goerner, a computer science professor at Yale University, Galerna received a lot of burns and cuts and lost the use of his right hand, but thankfully once again didn't die. This immediately complicates things because you have one bombing in California and the other in Connecticut. Opposite ends of the country. So whoever this Unabomber is, there's perhaps several of them, or it was sent out from an unrelated mailing location. And it seems that now the bombings have gone from computer. Stores back to colleges and professors. For one, the public thought that maybe the Unabomber was gone forever. And now he's. Back and the FBI are still none the wiser.

There was also this little. Thing going on around the same time you may. Have heard of it? It was. This thing called the Waco siege, just little footnote, and it made the. FBI's reputation absolutely abysmal. And on top of that, they can't catch some random wacko who's blowing up college professors. So the FBI dedicates thousands of agents to working this case with millions and millions of dollars in resources. Not only was there added pressure, because now the Unabomber was back. But now his game changed as well. In that six year time period he had upgraded from using pipe bombs and was now using a sort of chlorate chemical mixture that was for one more reliable and two could store the same punch in a smaller device, making it less likely for the packages to be noticed during transportation. And on top of all of that. Brazinski did something shortly after these two back-to-back bombings. That he had never done before, he contacted the press directly. Kaczynski sent a short one paragraph page that was typed using a typewriter to the New York Times. In the short paragraph, he identifies himself as we and that this we is the FC.

The FC was something that was kept out of the public eye up until now. So the New York Times took notice of this, that this might actually be the Unabomber. So they contacted the FBI.

The FBI did a full forensic sweep up the letter to. See if they could turn up. Anything, and in hindsight there was nothing. But there was one clue that they thought might go somewhere, but it was just another troll by 10 indented on the top of the envelope, so there wasn't actually any riding, but it looked like someone had laid a piece of paper over the envelope and then written on it.

The indentation read. Call Nathan or Wednesday at 7:00 PM this was Kaczynski, purposeful. He sending the FBI on another goose chase because he thought it was funny, but the FBI thought maybe the Unabomber messed up. Maybe he didn't think about setting a piece of paper on top of the envelope. Or maybe he just didn't notice it. So the FBI contacted literally thousands of people named Nathan are dedicating hundreds and thousands of hours of resources. To finding this random. Nathan and then showing up at their house and then figuring out that they don't know the Unabomber. And then just doing that again, the most important thing that Ted did with this first letter is he gave the New York Times an authentication code. In other words, anyone can mail the news and take credit for whatever crime they want. But in this first letter, Ted set aside a code saying. Any future letters from the true Unabomber or FC would contain that code as well. So now the Unabomber is active again. He's using more advanced bombs, and he's talking to the press correctly. So while the FBI is out trying to chase down anyone in the country named Nathan R, Ted makes his next move on November the 10th of 19. 2410 Cent a package to the home of a man named Thomas Moser. Moser was an advertising executive who was on the radar of a lot of ecoterrorist groups. That's because after the Exxon oil spill, Moser had represented Exxon in order to win over favorability in the public eye. Basically, Moser had helped run a PR campaign for Exxon. After Exxon had caused a lot of environmental destruction, Moser had received the package that morning at his home at North Cobwell, New Jersey. He was in the kitchen with his wife and daughter when he saw the pan. Stepped into his office. To open it and as soon as he did, the bomb exploded and upon opening the package, Thomas Moser was killed. It seems that. At this point, perhaps Kaczynski was getting frustrated with public sentiment regarding his bombings. I mean, the initial theory was maybe this guy's an airline mechanic who doesn't like planes. And then it was like, maybe he's just a guy who has gripes with colleges, so perhaps he targeted. A computer store to further increase the idea. He just doesn't like technology, but then the public theory became maybe the Unabomber just doesn't like people of education or things related to education. So now he's coming out of the woodwork. He's sending letters to the New York Times, he's establishing contact, and now he is directly targeting people who have a public image. Regarding conservation, this would be confirmed as shortly after killing Mosser in April of 1995, Ted would send another letter to the New York Times and by shortly thereafter I mean four months. But four months is short in the Ted Kaczynski timeline. I mean, this guy would take like a year and a half to build one bomb. In this letter to the New York Times, Kaczynski says again under the alias of a group known as The Freedom Club, that they will end their bombing campaign if the New York Times publishes A manifesto of beliefs. Held by the FC now, of course, despite knowing that this letter is coming from the Unabomber because of the authentication code, the New York Times was not going to immediately agree to whatever the terrorist is demanding. For those that don't really get the whole rule about, we don't negotiate with terrorists, it's typically. A bad idea. To show the public that terrorism is successful, that if you cause enough noise and blow enough stuff up,

eventually people will listen to you because that can inspire like minded thinkers and two. Believe it or. Not terrorists have a habit of lying. So just because the Unabomber says. That they'll quit. Pulling stuff up if the New York Times publishes a manifesto. So that doesn't mean that they're actually going to stop blowing stuff up while the FBI is combing over this letter for forensic clues shortly there after on April the 24th, Ted Kaczynski would send out his 16th and final bomb. This bomb was addressed to the former President of the California Forestry Association, the California Forestry Association is effectively a timber industry lobbying group, so they speak on the behalf. Of companies that want to come in and begin harvesting timber and wood from local land, Kaczynski had addressed the package to the former president, most likely not knowing that the president had recently retired. Nevertheless, the package winded up at the Forestry Association's office and was opened by a lobbyist who was working there at that time. Named Gilbert Murray upon opening the package, a massive explosion occurred and Gilbert Murray was killed.

The explosion went off in the office building in downtown Sacramento, CA, and not only terrified everyone in the building itself, but people from the surrounding streets who could hear the blast.

The Unabomber was getting a lot scary. Scared the Unabomber was getting scary. Not only had his past two explosives proved lethal. That he was getting really good at killing the packages were so discreet that as long as mail carriers were running, there was a chance that the Unabomber could slip in.

The bombs were getting bigger and more violent, moving from parking lots to downtown office complexes.

The tension was high, as it had ever been, and it was about to get a lot worse just over a month later. In June of 1995, because in June of 1995, Ted sends another letter to the New York Times stating this time that he was going to blow up a random flight that would be leaving the Los Angeles International Airport sometime around the 4th of July weekend. Now, Ted had absolutely no intentions of doing this in his journal, he said he didn't have intentions of doing this and in interviews later, he said he didn't have intentions of doing this. Ted's goal was to try to incite as much panic as possible to get what he wants and a pretty easy way to cause panic is to threaten to blow up a random passenger jet during a holiday weekend. And keep in mind. This guy had put a bomb on a plane before. It's not out of his MO to do this, to give you an idea of how scared people were during this time during negotiations between the FBI, New York time. Times and with the LA International Airport as to what to do, the United States Post Office service suggested what if we just stop mailing packages or at least stop mailing packages by air? Like could you imagine that now? Like if the post office just decided it was too risky? To send packages by plane, the FBI and local law enforcement combed over everything and the LAX airport for a couple. 12 weeks watching every package that came through, watching every individual, but sure enough, the 4th of July weekend came and went, and no one blew up, but it represented the amount of control that Kaczynski had on the general public. He could just say that he was going

to do something, and an offhanded letter to the news. And it's like time stopped for a couple of weeks. It had been apparent. Before, but it was especially apparent now that the Unabomber was one of the greatest threats plaguing the mind of the General American public. You can't travel, and you can't even open your mail without fear of what this madman might do. So after this airport scare, when this man. Bestow arrives at the New York Times doorstep.

The answer isn't as clear as they previously thought it was Kaczynski. Had typed out. 5 versions of this manifesto and mailed them out to different news agencies, again maintaining his claim that if he was to be published he would stop the bombing campaign. Now I'm going to talk in a different segment later. About the specifics of what's in the manifesto itself, but all you need to know for now is that a lot of it was rather inflammatory, like there was a lot of sort of call to action a lot. Of sort of negotiating with the public as to why violence is needed and why you should be violent right now. So on top of the typical fear of, you know, letting the terrorists get it way, there's now the compounded fear that this may spur new people to act.

The story was also all over the news at this point.

The public knew that this freedom. Club or Unabomber, as the press were calling him, Secretary Janet Reno told the FBI to come to an internal decision and then report back to her with what they thought was best. You basically have to throw the promise that the bombings will stop out the window because you can't take the word of a terrorist at face value. But.

The one thing that. Might happen is if you take this manifesto. Which everyone at the department had breaded at this point. Everyone you know, high-ranking enough to make a decision at least. If you take the specific. Phrasing and wording and conviction that is used in a lot of the speech and you show that at the front of every newspaper and news station in America. Surely someone will recognize it, because there's not that many people out there in the world who would be willing to commit these acts and also rights and sounds like this. After a lot of deliberation and a lot of back and forth, the FBI eventually decided that on the chance that someone may read this and it will lead to the. Capture of the Unabomber. It's worth it. I should also mention during this time period of deliberation where the New York Times. Times didn't know if they wanted to, you know, publish the manifesto or not. Hustler had mentioned that they will publish it if it will keep the Unabomber from causing any future bombings, a weird sort of martyr perspective of ohh I'll be the controversial 1 release the Unabombers manifesto, as if that's the issue, as if the New York Times. Doesn't want to. Publish it because it may be taboo or tacky.

The reason they're not publishing it is because.

The FBI is. Going to give them their word on if they think it's the right move or not, but anyway, Hustler volunteered to put. Inski responded that if Hustler again, this is all through letter, anonymous. If Hustler publishes it, Freedom Club reserves the right to place one more ball, like as if the cost of hustler because it's not as reputable. Is one more death, one more explosive? It's it's not funny. Like we're talking about

human lives and stuff like that. But you you gotta laugh at something. So in late 1995, the New York Times publishes the Unabombers manifesto.

The Manifesto Industrial Society and its future is a total of 33. Changes that goes over everything from the reason technology is bad to the problems with current modern day politics, and particularly leftism.

There's like 10 pages dedicated to Kaczynski's despal of leftists, as well as how technology. Steps away, societies understanding of self and it takes our self actualization from us again. We'll talk about it more later. But when you hear. People in modern age talk about. Oh well, it's. Crazy how much of a four thinker he was, or how smart this guy was? Mostly what they're referring to is causing Skip's ideas that technology will eventually take away our social capabilities, or it will take away our bonds that. That, that make life so valuable in the 1st place, which for one is big talk coming from a guy who isolated himself in a cabin for 20 years. But whatever again, we'll get to all that in a minute, but what it does show the. Public is that whoever is. Saying this isn't just some crazy person, like sure, you can assume there was some level of technical know how that this one person or that they of the Freedom Club might have to actually assemble the bombs.

But it removed any doubt that this person knows what they're doing, at least to some degree, and for a while the FBI just had to hold their breath. And hope that they made the right decision, that they didn't throw, that they didn't negotiate with the terrorists. Throw out what he wanted to be said into the world, possibly inspire other terrorists.

The FBI just had to hope they did what was right. And as it would turn out they did because the publication of the manifesto directly led to Ted Kaczynski's arrest.

David Kaczynski

Let's backtrack. A little bit and think about David and Linda Kaczynski. Again, Linda didn't. Care for Ted? She had never met him and her one interaction was a very mean letter, but David still looked up to his brother. He hadn't seen him in a really long time, but he still aspired to gain his love and affection. Linda did not have such desire. She always thought of Ted as David's weird and annoying. Other and left it at that. However, David had told Linda about a lot of the things Ted would talk about while they were growing up, things about how society. Roots away the things that make us human and how industry and industrial society as a whole will ultimately be our downfall. Now. David and Linda never really watched the TV.

They didn't keep up with the news. Neither of them had ever even heard the word Unabomber until Ted Kaczynski reappeared back in like. 93 and only then, because it was on the front page of the paper, they would read. So they didn't really care for it, just kind of kept it in the back of their mind until Ted sent that first letter to the New York Times. In it, the Freedom Club identified. By their self as a group who was

invested in preserving nature and again hated technological society. In that second letter, Ted had further expanded on his ideas or the freedom clubs ideas of why society needs to suffer and why this level of action is necessary. And Linda. Heard these things and started to think about it. And began to put two and two together. David has a brother who is harshly violent, anyone he doesn't know. And the only thing I do know about him is that he hates technology and he hates society. And now there is this person sending bombs in the mail that no one can identify who hates technology and hates society. So initially Linda brings it up to David. That she thinks Ted might be the Unabomber. David immediately brushes her off and says that Ted wouldn't do that. What are you saying? You don't know him like I. Do et cetera. But over several weeks, Linda keeps bringing it up. But David keeps shutting her down. Eventually, Linda. Convinces David that. When the Unabomber's Manifesto is published, if it's published that David needs to read it and David agrees to this simply to appease Linda, the day it's published, David goes to get a newspaper. But it had sold out because everyone wanted to read the manifesto. So. He goes to.

The library to get their copy of it, but someone had pulled out the pages containing the manifesto. And right before David calls it quits and just tells Linda, I don't want to read it. This is stupid. Whatever he decides to go to the library and try out their computer, a thing which David had never used before, there's kind of like a poetic irony to. Ted's brother had never touched a computer until Ted's manifesto made him go to a computer anyway. So David and Linda go to the local library and they pull up the manifesto and David starts to read it. And as he begins to read it, he starts to realize I think my brother might be the Unabomber. He gets to the end of the manifesto. And he doesn't know anything for sure yet. He just has a suspicion. So David goes home to see his mom and discuss it with her. And while there, he asks his mom if she has any of Ted's old writings. Sure enough, Ted's mom had kept boxes on top of boxes of letters and papers and journals that Ted had written all the way from high school till his time in college. And sure enough, in this stack of writings, David finds letters that Ted had written to local. News establishments to journals that he had kept for himself to almost dissertations. About why Ted despises technological society and some of those were almost word for word, the manifesto now in the New York Times, and I don't think enough people who talk about this whole story emphasize this point, which I mean it's a lot of people take the story. Unabomber and just kind of portray it as a series of events, right? That's what a lot of true crime stuff is. It's just like this happened here. This did that and I've. Done that for. Most of this video, but one thing I want to emphasize. Is I have seen hours and hours of interviews with this guy to listening to his writings, to listening to how he's treated people through his life. And I I just want to say I think David Kaczynski is a really good guy because he had a loyalty to his brother for years and years and he knew that his brother was always kind of strange. He didn't. Get along with. People he didn't know the extent of it. Like he. He knew Ted was mean to women and. He fired him for it. But he didn't. Know that Ted was thinking about murdering that woman, for example, but he always

maintained. A respect for. His brother, he always. Stood up for his brother because he felt like his brother couldn't do it himself. He always talked about how smart Ted was, how much he wanted to. Be like Ted. But that never stood in the way of David doing the right thing again, like back when Ted worked for him. At the job. He told him that he's his brother, he loves him, but he can't talk to women that way and he fired him. And here David's now confronted with the reality that his brother, the guy he's looked. Up to for years and years. Is responsible for the murders of three people and the attempted murder of a whole lot more. So David goes to Linda and says I love my brother, but I think he's a Unabomber. And we have to stop him before he hurts anyone else. So David hired a private investigator named Susan Swanson to check up on Ted's activities to further confirm his suspicions. And they also got an attorney. To deliver a message to the FBI on their behalf at this point, by the way, there was a hotline that you were to call. Well, if you suspected, you may know someone related to the Unabomber. Specifically, after the manifesto went out, because, again, the FBI's hope was someone could identify the Unabomber. Based on that manifesto. And there was also a \$1 million reward. So there were thousands and 10s of thousands of people calling. Every day. Me to say, hey, I think my ex-husband might be the Unabomber. Probably. Check that out. Hey, I met this guy in second grade who broke a laptop once. I I think that's a solid lead. And David and Linda knew that it would be hard to get the FBI's attention, but they're pretty sure that Ted's the Unabomber. So they had the attorney do it to make. It seem more official to give you an idea.

There were over 2400 formal legitimate suspects on the FBI's docket to work through before they added Ted Kaczynski to that list to get a second opinion.

They had a former FBI analyst. Analyzed the manifesto along with the letters that David had found and this former FBI agent said that these things were a near identical match and he needs to go to the FBI immediately, which again, further up Ted on the level of suspects. Eventually an FBI profiler working the case named James. That Gerald took a look at the riding side by side and said they were almost certainly made by the same person. Another reason that David wanted to go through an attorney is he was afraid this would turn into a Waco or Ruby Ridge situation where the FBI. Go up and just shoot Ted, which given their track record, I mean makes sense. Initially David wanted to remain anonymous. He wanted to pass it off, give the information and stay as far back from the case as he could. But then his name leaked somewhere within the FBI. So the FBI shows up to his house. Ask more questions, gets more information. And David agrees. As long as the FBI keeps the tip. So in other words, if this leads to an arrest, don't let the news know. That David was the one who gave.

The tip so as the. FBI are trying to gather more information to get a search warrant. Again, everyone at the department is pretty sure this Ted Kaczynski is likely their Unabomber. Given the writings, that's not a ton to work off of for a search warrant. But everything gets kicked into hyperdrive when, in April of 1996, someone leaks.

The story to CBS News keep in mind the public is super afraid of the Unabomber. All the time. Constantly. That's what the news is about. Just 24/7, so it makes sense

that CBS would want to immediately publish the story saying who the Unabomber is. But if Ted Kaczynski gets word of that before the FBI shows up, he could go on the run. So the FBI request 24 hours before it hits the new circuit so they can be in place to arrest him before Ted can find out. In 24 hours, the FBI mobilizes an entire task force to go out to the hills of Montana and find a Montana judge to sign the search warrant. Now the FBI had. Already made some forays into the area around Lincoln at this time.

Their plan was to get a full mapping of the land of the area because they didn't know what Kaczynski was capable of. He could have explosives lined over that entire mountainside. For all they know, they had had local neighbors of Ted's walk through the woods around Ted's property and take pictures to get back to the FBI. So effectively they were trying to do. Everything slowly and methodically to make sure no one got hurt. But then when CBS has the story, they've got one day, a local sheriff's deputy and two FBI agents dressed in plain clothes and approached Kaczynski's cabin in the woods surrounding the cabin.

There were dozens of fully kitted out FBI. But the three? Agents who or two agents and the sheriff's deputy who approached the cabin directly were dressed in regular clothes.

They knocked on Kaczynski's cabin, and when Kaczynski cracked open the door to answer, they said that they were from the Nordic Drilling Company and that they were having a dispute regarding property lines. Kozinski was apprehensive at 1st and told them to just go. Check the property themselves, but then they said a few of the markers were down and they need Kaczynski to come. Show them where his property line is. As Kaczynski begins to take a step out of the cabin, the officers grabbed him, throw him on the ground, and finally on April the 3rd of 1996, the Unabomber. Arrested in the small cabin, among the effects that I mentioned earlier in this video, the police find the LC Smith Corona that Kaczynski had used to write all of the letters he would send to the New York Times, as well as over 40,000 journal pages written in everything from English to Spanish to code.

These journals being the source of information that I've referenced throughout this. Video however the most. Alarming thing they found in the. Cabin was a small square sort of silver wrapped. Package and it. Didn't take long for the investigators in the cabin to read. Ties that that is a bomb. And sure enough, after pulling it out and diffusing it, Ted Kaczynski had fully put together another bomb. It had the battery in it, ready to go. It was not yet in a mailing package, or have a label, and Kaczynski never said where it was supposed to go. But thankfully, David told the FBI when he did, because otherwise someone else. Or perhaps more people likely would have. Died that also further prove.

The point that it seems Kaczynski was lying about his whole ohh, I won't blow anyone up anymore. I'll be good. I promise. It was now the end of the longest and most expensive at that time. Case in FBI history totaling over 16 years and \$50 million. So

CBS ran the story and as soon as it broke the news. Immediately, Ted Kaczynski was known the public could rest easy.

The Unabomber had been captured. But the detail that David was the one who ratted him out also got leaked. So that day, dozens of reporters and. Just onlookers showed up at David's house, all wanting the story on how he ratted out his brother, which to David, who was already dealing with a lot of emotions considering the fact he turned his brother in, has never set right with him, and from all the interviews I've seen, he is still troubled about to this day. Not that he feels he may have not made the right decision, just that he hates. He had to make that decision in the first place.

The first thing. David put to. Mind, as soon as Ted got arrested was. He immediately decided Ted could not get the death penalty for whatever he could help. He was going to keep his brother alive. Ted wanted absolutely nothing to do with his brother. He was already distant from David, you know, regarding his marriage and all that from years prior. But shortly after getting arrested, Ted asked his attorney, you know, how they found me. And the attorney said that his brother turned him in, to which Ted replied. No, that couldn't be David loves me, and while David hears that as a point of sorrow of like, oh, you betrayed your brother or the Ted. Thanks. Ohh you. Me, I see that as a point of manipulation. Like, oh, David loves me. So even if he knew I did it well, the question wasn't ohh David found out. It's no, David wouldn't do that because he knows better. It's it's always felt more bitter to me than I think David or a lot of people ascribe it. Ted was initially indicted on 10 counts. Of illegally mailing, transporting and using bombs, of course, they added the murders and whatnot. Later on, Ted's initial lawyers wanted to use the insanity defense, but Ted immediately shut it down. Ted's plan was to use legal loopholes. To say, Oh well, how are you going to connect those random pieces of wood and what not? To me, all you have is circumstantial evidence. Even if the world knew that Ted was the Unabomber, he was going to use legal loopholes to get out of a conviction. His legal team thought that this would not work, and against his wishes, began to. Chase the insanity. Behind his back. See, Ted didn't want the insanity plea because for one, that would wind up with a sentence in an institution, or I mean, even if the institution is not a prison, it is still somewhere away from nature, which is not what Ted wants. So to him, institution or prison doesn't really make any difference. And. Two, even if the world knows he's the Unabomber, which? Either way Ted knows there's no getting out of that. He will forever be associated as the Unabomber. Ted does not want those ideas to be discredited because he's crazy or because he's insane. He wants to maintain that he was proven a point upon hearing that his legal defense. Was still trying to chase an insanity plea. Ted asked if he could just represent himself and fire them.

The judge turned this idea down. This was also after Ted had tried to get another attorney who said that he would represent Ted based on his anti technology belief. Chiefs and the judge also turned that down, so for one feeling that he'll never be in nature again, which is, you know, unlikely at this point and fearing that everything he had worked so hard for would be discredited in court that night after having his

appeal denied, Ted tried to hang himself. He was stopped by the prison guards and. For a while. His defense team tried to have him declared incompetent to stand trial.

They brought up things like the Harvard experiment that I mentioned earlier, as well as his intense antisocial personality, but eventually. Again, after everyone read the manifesto and saw that this guy is clearly not crazy, he was declared competent to stand trial and the prosecution was looking for the death penalty. So on January the 22nd. Of 1990. 8 Ted Kaczynski pled guilty to all charges being sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole. He was sent. To the ADX. Florence Supermax prison during his time in prison, he ran into all sorts. Of 90 serial bombers and serial killers like Ramsey Yousef or Timothy McVeigh, initially, he was apprehensive about giving interviews to anybody. That was until people that he politically aligned with began to ask for his words or his advice. One of the first interviews he gave was to Earth first the. Publication I mentioned earlier that he found himself aligning with and from there through several of the stories and accounts that he would give while in prison is how a lot of the clues or pieces of the story or of his childhood became known, and most of the information I've presented to you in this video and. About his life of things that wasn't explicitly written down, and most of the information I've given you throughout this video was either from his journal or those interviews, so take them for what they're worth, as his interpretation of events in 2006, most of the items from his cabin were sold at auction and the earnings were given as restitution to the victims. Families David Kaczynski began various programs to give financial compensation to the victims and victim. Families and through this David became very close friends with Gary Wright, one of Ted's victims, and to this day the two seemed to be very close and remain in touch during his time in prison, Ted would write hundreds and hundreds of letters he didn't like to talk to a lot of investigators or news reporters who wanted to speak to him. He would often remark that. He was busy, funny enough, but the one thing he would do is he would write to people who wanted to write to him. This has gone a long way in portraying the Uncle Ted mindset that he now holds as his legacy. As several people see him as a guy who just wanted to save.

The Earth and right to everyone who wanted to hear from him. When only one of those things is really true, one interviewer, when asking Kaczynski about his time in prison, said I asked if he was afraid of losing his mind if the circumstances he found himself in now would break his spirit. He answered no. What worries me is that I might in a sense. Adapt to this environment and come to be comfortable here and not resent it anymore. And I'm afraid that as the years go by then I may forget I may begin to lose my memories of the mountains and the. Woods and that's what really worries me and I might lose those memories and lose that sense of contact with wild nature in general. And I'm not afraid they are going to break my spirit. He would end the interview by saying anyone who shares his minds. That should continue the good fight and never lose hope because one day they might win. Ted Kaczynski would live for decades and decades within his prison cell. It seems he was just transferred from 1:00. 10 by 14 foot. Room to another a few years ago, he was diagnosed with a form

of bowel cancer and refused treatment. I mean, as you could imagine, it's not like the guy had a lot to live for. And then finally in June of this year, Ted Kaczynski died. Funny enough, as I began research on this video. I got the notification that he was now dead. Reports say that his death was self-inflicted, but the reports also say that at the end of his life he was in a ton of pain and it was pretty much just a matter of time. Of when the cancer would take him, so it's likely that he put himself out of his own misery. So on June the 10th, 2023, Ted Kaczynski died at the age of 81 years old and the legacy of the Unabomber has now become a pretty fickle thing. For one, it can be hard with stories of killers or terrorists to understand exactly what they were thinking. But lucky for us, we've got 33 pages. Of it, and we'll get to that in a minute. But the thing I want to emphasize. Now is Ted Kaczynski as the title of this video implies, is held very differently in the cultural eye than most, you know, terrorists.

There is an altruism.

There is a purpose absorbed to him that isn't afforded to most people who, you know, kill other people for some political or religious agenda. He is uniquely favored and looked upon in a way. That most serial killers aren't again outside of weird like Ted Bundy, TikTok accounts, this description of an uncle Ted, A guy who just wanted to take care of the trees and, you know, had to kill. A few people. To do it seems in stark contrast to the man we just talked about. And if you don't believe me, or if you're unfamiliar with the Internet's belief. Or the idea that the Internet zeitgeist has around who Ted Kaczynski. He was just look at the memes. So as most of you are probably aware, at least those of you who are familiar with my channel, Ted Kaczynski has lived on in modern culture as almost an idea that is often separate from the man himself.

The aspects of the actual bombing campaign, as well as his personal beliefs. Regarding people and whatnot, those. Have I won't say forgotten, but been largely ignored by modern culture.

The part that modern culture does remember is his belief regarding technology and his love and obsession with nature. Literally just the image of Ted's face, either his mug shot or the sketch of him with the hoodie. And sunglasses. Is now synonymous with anti technology sentiment or not even anti technology really. More so anti corporate oligarchies or anti technology overriding the human condition and to accurately portray what I mean by that.

Ted memes

When I made this video or before I made this video when I was in research. I sent out a tweet that said reply with all your Ted Kaczynski uncle Ted Slash Unabomber names. I need the best for the next video. And you all did not disappoint with memes like this that say my friends, toddler babbled, don't forget to subscribe as. He was put to bed. Kid watches so much YouTube, he thought it means goodbye with the picture

of Ted Kaczynski talking about how technology is influencing children, even in ways we may not realize. Girl on the bus, I let my intrusive thoughts win and dyed my hair blue. Me if I let my intrusive thoughts win Ted Kaczynski because all of our intrusive thoughts are about. How technology is becoming too powerful and something must be done. As well as various memes that are just poking fun at the whole mail bomber concept like my opponent in postal chest when I. Opened the Kaczynski game bin. Or this mean a trade offer where you receive mail, nothing more? Several images of Ted's face with the Ted talk logo and the phrase ideas worth spreading were all in the replies of this tweet. You know, I'm something of an environmentalist myself. Self I don't want a job or a career. I want a nap and a small kiss on the forehead again because Ted disagreed with the current structure of society, saying that we should resent to ourselves and small community someone said that their wife did a watercolor of Ted's cabin and I should put it in the video. So here that is it's. It's very nice. Also to all of you who are upset because I'm not including your names on this public video where you sent me funny jokes regarding a terrorist, you're welcome. Check your mail Santa tonight. Here. This one of 10. Out front of the cabin with My Little Pony. OK, this unsuspecting postal worker.

There were so many things like this that. I can't.

There is so much cultural. Trauma to this image. That I'm just going to. I can't even start to explain it. Just there it is. I am beginning to feel extremely hateful towards the world. I live in. That's not even a meme. That's just a threat. Ted Kaczynski at Home Depot. I wonder what he'll make. Hey, you have just won a contest to get a free iPhone 11. Go check your mail right now. Do it. Of course we have our lovely Valentine's Day cards. Memes of Soulja Boy being radicalized. Again, a lot, a lot. To unpack here. Wow, this is your room. It's so cool.

This is an actual picture from inside the cabin, by the way, T-shirt that says White Boy summer vote by mail. Fitting for those who are wondering why I'm laughing at this. If you're not familiar with like the the Lord Kaczynski. It may seem insane. Live to laugh at things related to, you know, tear someone who took people's lives and you're probably correct. But I am laughing at the absurdity of it, that this is what culture has made this figure into. Because again, people don't really focus on Ted Kaczynski, the person they focused on, Ted Kaczynski, the Zeitgeist. Ted Kaczynski, the idea.

The idea or the image of anti technological belief, it's not the terrorists that they're proliferating, it's the idea that society isn't working the way it's supposed to. Or perhaps that society is working too much in the way that it's supposed to when the restaurant has a QR code for the menu.

There's so many times that. People replace Ted with Garfield. Again, this is too deep. This this is it's. One more video just y'all. Watch the Super Eye Patch Wolf video about it. Swallowable robotic pills will dispense antidepressants, according to wirelessly broadcast schedules, helping workers receive medicine when they are under the most stress. It's also, if you haven't figured out, common to just. Have an image of Ted Kaczynski when society is doing something that is morally or. Just in general

questionable because just the image of Ted Kaczynski invokes the feeling that society has gone too far that.

There is some kind of stoppage that needs to occur to prevent this from continuing. During the 1994 Blackout, LA residents called 911 when they saw the Milky Way for the first time. Self-explanatory. A tweet from shoe on head that says have to download an app to control the thermostat in our apartment. Wouldn't vlogger play? Set so that kids can pretend to. Be an influencer again. Just copy paste 50% opacity, Ted Kaczynski Japanese men marry anime characters in a VR wedding. New advertising concept would turn the night sky into ads. People would see brands instead of seeing stars when they look up. Roll the clip of me. Saying the thing. If I look up into the sky at night and see like a a McDonald's ad, I'm becoming a terrorist. So I have done the exact same thing. When one time I tweeted our HP printer hasn't been working for a month and every manner of troubleshooting resets changing ink cartridges. Seemed to work. After calling HP they said the debit card on file had expired so they manually disabled our printer and unrelated news. I'm now radicalized and of course I kept it off with a picture of Uncle Ted because people don't focus on the murders or the violence of Ted Kaczynski.

They focus on the idea, or at least the. We framed him within that. He was just someone who hated technology and. To that regard, who could blame him? Obviously I don't consider all of technology illegal. I'm talking to you on a camera in the Internet, in front of a PC setup that I use for everything from entertainment to. Work if we. Could call it that and I enjoy. It I don't disregard. That part of technology, or consider it to be evil. But Ted Kaczynski did so. Where is my alignment with this idea of what Ted was? Well, it's no question that society is getting more and more reclusive and more and more invested or religiously tied almost to technology each and every day, there are children who cannot go to school. Or cannot function normally unless they're holding an iPad.

There are people whose entire understanding of social. Is through online chats and they consider that more important than the world that's actually around us.

They're completely engrossed within the technological sphere. Science seems constantly concerned with degenerating the human condition to a triviality. I saw a tweet a while back about this new technology that was being made in prosthetic. That it hooks a neurochip effectively to your brain. And as your brain thinks something, it causes another piece of technology to move, kind of like a wireless remote control that could be used to operate a computer by simply looking at it and thinking what you want the computer to do. And.

The reason this was being invented was for the use of prosthetics. Imagine how amazing it would be if someone who. Hostile leg could have a robotic leg attached that their brain could control.

The movement of it is as close to a completely augmented recreation of a leg that we could probably think of, but as soon as that news got announced, it was immediately. Filled with tech investors talking about how cool it would be if. We could use this.

To better advertise to individuals, or if we could use this technology to make even more entertainment readily available at our fingertips, I mean, there's talk every day of being able to control one's dreams. And of course, if that becomes a commodity, there's going to be advertisements placed within it.

There's going to be different forms of entertainment placed within it. So we never have to have a moment of a natural thought or meditation to ourselves. And at the same time, I'm someone who gets violent if I see someone throw a water bottle. Out of a car window it makes. Me so mad to see. People litter and destroy the. Around us, meanwhile, there's these multi billion dollar corporations who pump molten plastic into the oceans. If I love people and if I love the planet, of course I'm gonna be mad. Who would it be? And in a time period of people being mad of people being so upset with what the technological world? Is doing around us and there is a fear like I believe in God. I believe in, you know that there is a greater promise of eternity and things like that, but I still believe that man's evils and consequences can be felt by other people. It's natural to be afraid of what some of these nut jobs and power are going to do, and at a time when that is such a common fear when so many people feel powerless. To stop the enrichment of humanity in favor for technology. This guy shows up and claims to be fighting for exactly what they're saying. So because of that, people kind of shed the ideas of what he actually did, or even the ideas of what he said. And instead they just focus on the idea of someone who's just as mad as they are. So then the question persists.

The Manifesto

Is that what Ted Kaczynski was? Was he a person who despised technology in all its aspects because he wanted what was best for the human race because he loves nature so much? And he wanted us to be secure in our humanity for millennia to come. Well, thankfully, we don't have to do that much speculation, because, like other criminal cases where we kind of just have to guess what the motives were. Ted Kaczynski gave us a 33 page dissertation explaining just that. So without further ado. Let's talk about that manifesto. So originally I was going to record this segment outdoors because, you know, you know, bomber nature all that. But then I thought it would be a lot more funny and ironic to record it in front of a green screen of nature because, you know. Technology replacing. Trees. You get it with a lot of criminal or serial killer cases, which I guess you could qualify Ted Kaczynski as it's rare that we get a spelled out or in this case, an actual cited record of what the killer was thinking and the perpetrators, true motives and beliefs are left up to the debate of courtrooms and psychologists. But in this case. We got a whole dissertation, so if we're going to talk about the Unabomber and Ted's objectives and legacy, then it only feels fitting that we go over what he claimed his objectives and legacy to be. Originally, I had a whole typed out pseudo

intellectual, political and social analysis of the themes. He brings up where his politics stand, how it relates to politics at the time, blah, blah blah. But frankly, I'm not a political commentator and am terrified of being mistaken for. One, if you couldn't tell by the Unabomber costume. So while I will mention the politics and beliefs of the manifesto, I'm mostly going to brush over them for the sake of discussing his actual objectives and reasoning for why he committed the actions that he did. I should also highly stress for any YouTube moderators. Or federal agents that are watching this, I do. Not in any. Way support the beliefs or ideas that are mentioned in this manifesto. I am simply going over them for educational slash entertainment purposes. If the hoodies and sunglasses suggest otherwise. No, they don't. So with that out of the way, let's get into industrial society and its future.

The first thing to note about it is I was not joking when I said that this is a doctoral dissertation. Not only is it formatted as one with an introduction that lays out the papers, thesis as well as all of the. Supporting beliefs and narratives that are going to be discussed throughout the document. But each of the paragraphs are individually numbered, and the last three pages of the. Document or a bibliography that has work cited throughout the entire article as a matter of fact, this was part of the reason that David was able to identify his brother as the Unabomber because David knew that Ted had done a doctoral dissertation. So Ted lays out the thesis for this. So Ted lays out the thesis. For this. So Ted lays out the thesis for this manifesto in the opening paragraph, which is also undoubtedly the most famous part of the entire work, the Industrial Revolution and its consequences have been a disaster for the human race.

They have greatly increased the life expectancy of those of us who live in advanced countries. But they have destabilized society, have made life unfulfilling, have subjected human beings to indignities, have led to widespread psychological suffering in the third world to physical suffering as well, and have inflicted severe damage on the natural world.

The continued development of technology will worsen the situation. It will certainly subject human beings to greater indignities and inflict greater damage on the natural world. It will probably lead to greater social disruption and psychological suffering, and it may lead to increased physical suffering even in. Advanced countries, through the rest of the introduction, Ted expands. On this saying that technology will ultimately lead to society and humanity's downfall, and that it is humanity's job to ensure that technology is destroyed before we ourselves are, and that his specific reasons for this will be discussed throughout the document. However, and this is the first part about the manifesto. That no one brings up. Anytime you hear someone talk about it, they mentioned the Industrial society opening and the fact that Ted predicted a lot of what society and technology is today, despite this being written in 1995. But there is an absurd amount of this. Dedicated to describing the problem with current society and politics, which Ted mostly pins on leftist, the name of the second section of the manifesto is the psychology of modern leftism, which begins in paragraph six, with almost everyone will agree that we live in a deeply troubled society. One of the most

widespread manifestations of the craziness of our world is left. Prism, so a discussion of the psychology of leftism can serve as an introduction to the discussion of the problems of modern society in. General through the 1st. Few pages Ted just describes how leftism is a manifestation of societies, issues that, because they have no real problems, they constantly. Ally themselves with those that they perceive have real problems. Ted describes this as a sort of minor. Party worship of how leftists always want to find a group of people that they may not be connected to but want to represent in the society that they hold so near and dear. He even goes as far as to say that those leftists that seem to be rebellious or punk against the system are actually just taking moral values. That the majority of society has and then broadcasting them loudly, claiming to be the counterculture, when in reality they're just the culture. If dressed and behaving differently, saying that leftists project themselves onto quote UN quote losers. Because according to Ted inside, they feel like a loser. And that this can be seen in a lot of their protest and demonstrations. It is always a form of martyrdom. It is always a laying down on the spear rather than fighting back.

They want to be the first to get ran over. Now I want to point out once again just cause I'm reading it off the page does not mean that I subscribe to any of this. I also know.

There's going to be a lot of. Either leftists who see this. And get mad that these are his opinions or there's going to be a lot of right wingers that see this and be cheering on agreeing with everything Ted's saying to both sides. I want to emphasize that these are the words of a serial bomber who killed a lot of. People so I. Would have put a lot of stock in what he has to say one way or the other. Ted says that one of the primary causes of leftism in modern culture is something known as over socialization, and this is the first step that kind of points us towards the actual objective of the manifesto he describes over socialization in paragraph 24. And he says psychologists use the term socialization to designate the process by which children are trained to think and act as society demands. A person is said to be well socialized if he believes and and obeys the moral code of his society and fits in well as a functioning part of that society. It may seem sense. To say that many leftists are over socialized since the leftist is perceived as a rebel. Nevertheless, the position can be defended. Many leftist are not such rebels as they seem. From there, he leads into what I discussed saying that they are actually part of the culture they claim to be countering. He spends a while talking about how this can be seen through the way that leftist. Take minorities is the examples that. To use and wants them to be rapidly integrated into white society. In other words, Ted is saying that leftists don't actually care about other people's cultures or beliefs, they just want everyone to be integrated into their own beliefs. So why all this conversation about politics and a document he sent to the New York Times that is supposed to explain? While he's sending mail bombs, well, he starts to tie leftists back in to his greater point in paragraph 32, when he says.

The problems of the leftists are indicative of the problems of our society as whole. Low self esteem, depressive tendencies and defeatism are not restricted to the left, though they are especially noticeable in the left.

They are widespread in our society and today society tries to socialize us to a greater extent than any previous society. We are even told by experts how to eat, how to exercise, how to Make Love, how to raise our kids, and so forth. Effectively, Ted is saying that trying to integrate people into a flawed system is a flawed within itself. So why is the system flawed? Why doesn't the system work? According to Ted, and he begins to explain that in his next section. Which goes over something that Ted calls the power process. Ted states that it is a fundamental need of humanity to work for the objectives they obtain. Otherwise, human beings develop a sense of worthlessness. He gives an example of this in paragraph 34 when he says. Consider the hypothetical case of a man who can have anything he wants just by wishing for it. Such a man has power, but he will develop serious psychological problems. At first he will have a lot of fun, but. By and by. He will become acutely bored and demoralized. Eventually. He may become clinically depressed. History shows that leisured aristocracies tend to become decent. This is not true of fighting aristocracies that have to struggle to maintain their power. But leisure, secure aristocracies that have no need to exert themselves, usually become bored, hedonistic and demoralized, even though they have power. This shows that power is not enough. One must have goals. Toward which to exercise one's power. Fundamentally, this is. A point that we can probably all agree with. If you were to work for something you want, let's say a car, for example, if you were to work for a car, then there would be more satisfaction at the purchasing of it as well as more careful upkeep and investment in the car as time goes on. But on the other hand, if you were just given a car. That you had never sought after and had never really thought about obtaining to any particular. Degree then it would just be a thing that you have. It's significantly more satisfying and important as Ted lays out, if you work for what you get. So what happens when people don't work for the things that they receive? Will they begin to create what Ted refers to as surrogate activities, in other words. If you don't need to work to achieve something. And then you're going to invent something that you need to work for if your fundamental needs, like food and shelter are met, then you'll move into needs like love and family. And then if those are met, you'll move into needs like status and possessions. Basic Maslow hierarchy of needs stuff. But what happens when pretty much everything's met? And it can all be obtained with relative ease. That's when, according to Ted, we begin to create surrogate activities of which he lays out in paragraph 40. In modern industrial society, only minimal effort is necessary to satisfy one's physical needs. It is enough to go through a training program to acquire some petty technical skill, then come to work on time and exert the very modest effort needed. To hold the job.

The only requirements are a moderate amount of intelligence. And most of all, simple obedience. If one has those, the society takes care of 1 from cradle to grave. Yes, there is an underclass that cannot take the physical necessities for granted, but we are

speaking here of mainstream society. Thus, it is not surprising that modern society is full of surrogate activities.

These include scientific work, athletic achievement, humanitarian work, artistic and literary creation, climbing the corporate ladder, acquisition of money and material goods far beyond the point at which they cease to give any additional physical satisfaction. And social activism when it addresses issues that are not important for the activists personally, he ends the section by saying many people who pursue surrogate activities will say that they get far more fulfillment from these activities than they do from the mundane business of satisfying their biological. Needs, but that is because in our society, the effort needed to satisfy the biological needs has been reduced to triviality. More importantly, in our society people do not satisfy their biological needs autonomously, but by functioning as parts of an immense social machine. In contrast, people generally. Have a great deal of autonomy in pursuing their surrogate activities effectively because we don't take up a great deal of concern or it doesn't take up a lot of our time, at least 90% of the population where our food comes from. From where our housing comes from and these are things we sort of take for granted, the things that we actually do work and strive for are things that would otherwise be meaningless, like fulfillment of the arts, playing an instrument or betting on a sports team or politics, things that we ourselves invest importance in, but intrinsically. Have no value. I also want to make something clear right now, so a lot of people will get this far in the manifesto or they'll read this much and it begins to cultivate this idea that Ted is some kind of great philosopher or some kind of great voice when it comes to morality in society and what. Have you and as someone? I'm not saying this to sound cool or smarter than you or whatever, but just objectively.

If you've read other political works. What Ted's doing here is nothing special.

There hasn't been a point yet where he describes any solutions or. Any abstractions that he has made from how society works, he's simply pointing at things out on the board. People get bored, so they invest time into things that don't matter to.

Their biological well. But there's nothing wrong with this. In essence, he's establishing groundwork for points that he will later make. But just because he's using big words and talking about society as if he is some arbiter of it doesn't mean he's actually saying anything that impressive. Right now he's just laying out bullet points. From there he describes. Autonomy and how some people need to have more autonomy in their environment than others. Some people are comfortable just going with the flow and existing as society or those around them intend, and others need to be in control. Of every possible aspect of their lives and that kind of exists on a spectrum, with most people falling somewhere in.

The middle the 1st. Inference that Ted makes is that the reason society exists this way that a lot of people follow meaningless activities that, as Ted sees, have no real satisfaction, is of course, because of industrial society. He highlights this at the beginning of paragraph 45, when. He says any. Of the foregoing, symptoms can occur in any society, but in a modern industrial society they are present on a massive scale.

We aren't the first to mention that the world today seems to be going crazy. This sort of thing is not normal for human societies.

There is good reason to believe that primitive man. Suffered from less stress. And frustration and was better satisfied with his way of life than modern man is in the next paragraph, he adds. We attribute ohh. Also I should mention Ted is writing this as if he is Freedom Club again, the group of radicals, so there's no eyes in here. He's referring to we as in FC just so let you know in case you get confused by the. We attribute the social and psychological problems of modern society to the fact that society requires people to live under conditions radically different from those under which the human race evolved and to behave in ways that conflict with the patterns of behavior that the human race developed while living under the earlier conditions. So the reason that these problems as Ted has identified them as persist in modern society is because technology has paved the way for it. Effectively, our core values are eroded away because we don't need them as much when so much is provided for us. And of course, as Ted sees it, this is a detriment. Also, in paragraph 50, he mentions conservatives for one of the only I believe two times in the entire manifesto when he simply states the Conservatives are fools.

They whine about the decay of traditional values, yet they enthusiastically support technological process and economic growth. Apparently it never occurs to them that you can't make rapid, drastic changes in the technology and the economy of the. Hiding without causing rapid changes in all other aspects of the society. As well, and that such rapid changes inevitably breakdown traditional values, basically saying that the right is stupid for caring about traditional values and then implementing technologies that do away with him while he harps on the left a whole lot more in this piece than he does the right here. He clarifies that. His own politics do not lie in the right at all. Instead, he sees all sides as the issue because they all build up technological society, which is the real villain. In paragraph 51, he says that technology ruins every small community that would otherwise exist out of necessity. Beyond that, a technological society has to weaken family ties and local communities if it is to function efficiently in modern society, and individuals loyalty must be first to the system and only secondarily to a small scale community, because if the internal loyalties of small scale communities were stronger than loyalty to the system. Such communities would pursue their own advantage at the expense of the. System. So in other words, if your personal group or community religion, what have you does not align with the overarching goals of technological society, then it can't be allowed to exist because loyalty to the system is paramount. If the system is to succeed, he goes on to speak about how this power process has been eroded through the years. How the life and values of someone from, say, the frontiers age is drastically different than they are today, because fundamentally The Pioneers knew that what they were doing had some end. It was a satisfaction of their need to work to obtain some. Whereas nowadays any work that we do is mostly trivial. Again, for the vast majority of the population, he then goes into a lot of the details about how social systems have different types of autonomy we can maintain

from kind of groups that we insert ourselves into to things like relationships that we have more autonomy in. But effectively that the more important a function is, the less we're allowed to act on it. Basically that the majority of people nowadays are more concerned about their social status or.

Their achievement in a sport or political realm, rather than where their food comes from or how their shelter was built, which according to Ted, this is again a detriment to the human condition. In paragraph 66, he summarizes this by saying today people live more by virtue of what the system does for them or to them. And by virtue of what they do for themselves and what they do for themselves is done more and more along channels laid down by the system, opportunities tend to be those that the system provides.

The opportunities must be exploited in accord with rules and. And techniques prescribed by experts must be followed if there is to be a chance of. Success, in other words, society has regulated us into channels that we are allowed to climb the ranks in. But if we want to do anything outside of those channels, good luck. He really double s down on this in paragraph 69 when he says. John, 69, when he says it is true that primitive man is powerless against some of the things that threaten him, disease, for example. But he can accept the risk of disease stoically, it is part of the nature of things. It is no one's fault unless it is the fault of some imaginary impersonal demon. But threats to the modern individual tend to be man made.

They are not the result of chance, but are imposed on him by other persons whose decisions. He as an individual is unable to influence. Consequently, he feels frustrated, humiliated and angry. For one, I think it's wild that he's like, yeah, you know what? Before technology, people died of diseases, but. That's on them, he argues. This is better than the alternative when most of the issues we face are done by people that we otherwise have no control over.

The examples he uses are things like war or nuclear annihilation, or losing one's job at a corporation that the bosses are so big that you never communicate with them. Of economy collapsing, etc, Ted argues it would be better for us to suffer through everything else than to deal with problems created by men that we will never contact. So, so far in the manifesto, Ted has mostly.

The things that aren't really opinions, so to speak like, sure, the way he labels things is an opinion like for example right there when he implies that primitive man could face death stoically, like that's of course an opinion. But the overall framework of that statement can't be argued with in the modern age. We don't worry about disease. But we do worry about things that other people. Will create and it is true that before technology, they didn't really have to worry about that, but they did have to worry about like diseases and animals attacking a lot more than we do in the modern age and with the other statements. He's made so. Far that you know, obviously in today's age, we don't care that much or don't put as much effort into where food comes from. We're not cultivating the ground. Or scavenging every day. Instead, most of that is through channels that are relatively easy to work our way through society has set itself up in

such a way that we can obtain these things. Now, while myself and most people would argue this is a good thing, because it means that society is catered towards a higher survival rate and whatnot, Ted is saying the opposite. That because these things are so easy to obtain, we take them for granted and ultimately lose a part of ourselves while that construction. Of the narrative, you can certainly disagree. With you can't disagree with the assertion that it is easier to get things nowadays than it was several 100 years ago, or that generally in the modern age we concern ourselves with more surrogate activities than a peasant farmer would have in the Middle Ages. All of these are objective truths that Ted is just framing and to assert. Narrative. However, in paragraph 72, we get his first real inference that, in my opinion differentiates with the beliefs of a lot of common day people. But Ted is construing it to be an objective truth along with the other things he has mentioned. And 72 he says modern society is, in certain respects extremely permit. In matters that are irrelevant to the functioning of the system, we can generally do what we please. We can believe in any religion as long as it does not encourage behavior that is dangerous to the system. We can go to bed with anyone we like, as long as we practice safe sex, we can do anything we like as long as it is. And important, but in all important matters.

The system tends. Increasingly, to regulate our behavior, and again, this is framed like everything up until this point. Has that. Oh well, society just cares about the things that matter. And you know the elite or what have you are the ones who are controlling our daily lives. And we can only concern ourselves with the unimportant things like religion or as you phrase it, phrases it who you go to bed with. And this is the first matter. That I can wholesale. Deny I am infinitely more concerned with my God and my wife than I am about what bureaucrat is currently sitting in office, or if Red team or Blue Team is winning whatever debate or election it is this year. Now is part of that because. All of my memories exist in a post 9/11 America when. Regardless. Of what promise? Or virtues are held by people in office. Inevitably, all that happens is government gets more constraining, and money that is paid in in good faith to the government ultimately goes towards the establishment of more power and the murder of people who. I have never met in countries that I will. Never go to. Perhaps I understand that I myself am especially nihilistic to several of the things that Ted is implying to be important here. I mean, again, look at what I'm wearing, and yes, his definition of important here is in reference to what is important to the system. Obviously, the system that the governments, the powers that be, or whatever. Don't care about. You know what I believe in or who I marry, but I certainly do so therefore. Even if I was given free reign that I had full agency in every aspect, I would still concern myself more with things like religion and marriage. But Ted doesn't frame it that way. This is the first instance of him projecting his opinion as the truth, and even if you agree with this notion of importance, he's going to do it more. That's the manifesto. Continue. He goes on to describe how life is a succession of stages, how we are supposed to go from a time of learning to a time of strength of a time, of building to a time of family and eventually a time of overlook or a time of being a mentor before our life

ends. But that in the modern age. People, because they are not satisfied with the lives that they have lived because they have not fulfilled that power. Process. Everyone is obsessed with staying in the phase of their life that they're currently in. This is what things like midlife crisis develop from people not feeling that their life has been enough, so they have to hold on to every inch of life they have. For example, people constantly trying to look younger, people constantly staving off, getting married, settling down. Or things that are supposed to come later in life. Etcetera. He goes on to say that a lot of people adjust to this lack of a power process through things like consumerism, that in modern culture we subscribe so much wealth or so much status to our wealth that people value the vehicle they drive or the clothes that they wear more than they do. Actual merit or virtue? He says that these people aren't necessarily wrong or evil by any means.

They are just a victim of the society that has taken away their agency and instead given them shiny toys to play with. He also says, aside from consumerism, another way that people cope with the lack of autonomy. Is tying themselves in to greater agencies or bodies that they actually have no control in. He outlines this in paragraph 83 when he says some people partly satisfied their need for power by identifying themselves with a powerful organization or mass movement. An individual lacking goals or power. Points of movement or an organization adopts its goals as his own, then works towards those goals. When some of the goals are attained, the individual, even though his personal efforts have played only an insignificant part in the attainment of the goals, feels through his identification with the movement or organization as if he had gone through the power process. This phenomenon was exploited by the fascists. Nazis and comma. Our society uses it too, though less crudely.

The example he uses for this is the attack of Manuel Noriega and how the United States people supported the invasion of Panama because they allied themselves with the goals of the United States government. So when the government got what it wanted, Americans felt like they got. What they wanted, even though it was a belief that was impressed upon them according to Ted. And in reality they didn't do anything to achieve it. However, the cracks with this ideology start to show in paragraph 86. But even if most people in industrial technology society were well satisfied, we, the Freedom Club, would still be opposed to that form of society because, among other reasons, we consider it demeaning to fulfill one's need for the power process through surrogate activities or through identification with an organization. Rather than through pursuit of real goals here, Ted outright admits that. If the satisfaction people get is not in line with what he thinks, satisfaction to be that it's pointless and he doesn't care. Ted defines real goals here as things that matter to society, and therefore we should care about. But what if, frankly, we just don't care about it? What if religion or relationships are more important to us? That again, society's greater workings. Ted says that what it mattered to him, because he still considers it demeaning. But who is he to say what is demeaning to me? Of course, his counter argument to that would be,

I don't know what I find demeaning because I'm so brainwashed by modern society. But this has existed outside of modern society.

There have been plenty groups of people in, you know, pre industrial times who have been more interested with either again their religion or their relationships then monarchies or trade or economy of wanting to do something outside of the greater working of society isn't something that's just. Indicative to a post Industrial revolution war world, Ted is once again presenting his opinion as the authority on the matter. He then spends a while discussing how scientists in the modern age, even though they claim to be working for the greater good of humanity, often are just working for their paycheck, their status, or their legacy, and aren't actually concerned with what humanities future is, or for any crusade of righteousness there. That scientists don't actually care how humanity does.

They care how they themselves do, which again, is Ted imposing his beliefs of what he thinks they're doing on to the entire system. And sure, while this can be true in several cases and. I think we can all agree that not every scientist in the world is working for the benefit of humanity as a whole. We can also agree that the entirety of scientists are not some evil overlord looking to maintain humanity's current course. As more and more reliant on technology as some kind of hive mind. But hearing Ted describe it that way does make a lot of sense as to why he picked the targets he did, random geneticist and engineers in paragraph 94, Ted qualifies. What this freedom that he is so concerned with actually means to him. Is by freedom we mean the opportunity to go through the power process with real goals, not the artificial goals of surrogate activities and without interference, manipulation or supervision from anyone, especially from any large organization. Freedom means being in control, either as an individual or as a member of a small group. Group of the life and death issues of one's existence, food, clothing, shelter, and defense against whatever threats there may be in one's environment. Freedom means having power, not the power to control other people, but the power to control the circumstances of one's own life. One does not have freedom if anyone else. Especially a large organization has power over one, no matter how benevolently tolerantly or permissively that power may be exercised. It is important not to confuse freedom with mere permissiveness. So effectively. He's saying that freedom is the. Freedom, I guess, to control the necessary functions for your life. Again, things like food, shelter. What have you. And that's what this is all about. That's what freedom means to him being responsible for the things that make your life necessary in a very literal sense. I would argue as a counter to. That what if? You were to say that we have no freedom in that scenario because we are a slave to those things like. Sure, it may be natural part of the physical process, but one of the cool things about other people is that we can get together to give ourselves more freedom because we take those activities that are otherwise super time consuming. And we relegate them in a fashion that makes it easier for all parties involved. What if the surrogate activities are more to us than surrogate activities? What if things like relationship? Matter more to me than growing potatoes. Ted simply doesn't want to hear it because

the Ted Freedom is agency in one's own literal existence. And while I can sympathize with that to some degree, I cannot sympathize with it as the justification for why everything else has to go. And for the first time in paragraph 96, he finally mentions, you know, the point. Of this whole thing. When he says. To make an impression on society with words is therefore almost impossible for most individuals, and small groups take us the Freedom Club. For example, if we had never done anything violent and had submitted the present writings to a publisher, they probably would not have been accepted. If they had been accepted. And published they probably would not have attracted many readers because it's more fun to watch the entertainment put out by the media than to read a sober. Even if these writings had many readers, most of these readers would soon have forgotten what they had read, as their minds were flooded by the mass of material to which the media exposes them in order to get our message before the public with some chance of making a lasting impression, we've had to kill people. And look at the paragraph. 9612 pages under the essay, he finally. Tensions blowing stuff up. Yes, obviously your message is more loud if you kill a bunch of people before you deliver it. Duh, right. But what also incidentally happens when you do that is most people who would otherwise be sympathetic of what you have to say don't care anymore. Like I said, if this was a conversation with a friend who's discussing why he feels that society has stripped away a lot of his individual. Values and instead he has decided to depart from society in order to become more autonomous in order to take care of more of his biological needs himself. I'd be interested in hearing that I might even apply some of what he says to my own life, but if that's the justification for blowing up the secretary at Vanderbilt University. Or just a bunch of guys in their houses then I don't care anymore. Ted is assuming that the message, at least to the parties he's concerned with, which we'll talk about later, he assumes that the message will supersede the actions needed to make the message loud. But. That that's not that doesn't pan out. He'll clarify later that the killings are more than just blowing a whistle to get people to look at him. But in this paragraph in that one mentioned in paragraph 96, he says that one of the main reasons they've had to kill people is to get people to pay attention. But what he didn't take into? Account is that it shut out. A lot of people who otherwise would have paid. Attention, he then listed out five basic principles of society, which we're not going to get into because again, I'm not a sociologist even though I pretend to be one on the Internet.

The main point he makes is that. That society will only let you make small changes and big changes rarely happen. But if you do make a big change, then there's other factors of society you're not going to be able to account for. This is basically setting up a fail safe for later in the document when he clarifies that. If all of this works, and if technological society is to. Boy, he doesn't know what's going to happen next, and he sets that up back here saying, well, how could I know what happens? All I need to know is that technology should go away. So who am I to imagine what the world would look like after that? That's for, you know, our grandkids, to figure out. I know someone in the comments is going to be like. Man, he was really. Harsh to you know, Ted's writings.

And it's it. It's going to be someone who's upset that I was too mean to the. Unabomber. He begins to talk about the differences between reform and revolution. That reform is just fixing the system you currently do have, whereas a revolution is a complete bucking. Off of the system in favor of a new one, the reason he brings all this up is he clarifies that technological society cannot be reformed. It is not enough to fix the problems within it, because the problems will always get worse. That's what technology does. It advances, it doesn't regress. So therefore reform. Is unnecessary. What we need is a revolution. He then begins to discuss how freedom has to be driven away for a modern technological society to exist. He discusses how society needs things like scientists and mathematicians in order to function. So therefore children are pushed towards those fields because society. Needs them to be workers in order to operate in paragraph 116. It says because of the constant pressure that the system exerts to modify human behavior, there is a gradual increase in the number of people who cannot or will not adjust to societies, requirements, welfare leeches, youth gang members, cultists, anti government rebels, radical environmentalists, saboteurs, dropouts and resistors of various kinds. In other words, these people are outliers to the system because they do not actively benefit the system. Again, the system being this kind of ethereal conglomeration of governments. Corporations, technologies, people going to work, all of it. It's all one unanimous entity that does not support people who fall out of it. Again, this isn't really a commentary or a deeper look at something. This is just pointing out that the wall is red. He is saying that a society that is made to serve the members within it does not serve the members that are not within it. Duh. He really makes his point clear with this in paragraph 119 when he says the system does not and cannot exist to satisfy human needs. Instead, it is human behavior that has to be modified to fit the needs of the system. This has nothing to do with the political or social ideology that may pretend to guide the technological. System. It is not the fault of capitalism and it is not the fault of socialism. It is the fault of technology because the system is guided not by ideology but by technical necessity. Of course, the system does satisfy many human needs, but generally speaking, it does this only to the extent that it is. To that it is to. Sorry these. Words are small. I apologize. That it is to the advantage of the system to do it. It is the needs of the system that are paramount, not those of the human being. For example, the system provides people with food because the system couldn't function if everyone starved. It attends to people's psychological needs whenever it can conveniently do so. Because it couldn't function if too many people became depressed or rebellious. But the system for good, solid, practical reasons must exert constant pressure on people to mold their behavior to the needs. Of the system. And then he finishes up this thought at the end of the paragraph when he says the concept of mental health in our society is defined largely by the extent to which an individual behaves in accord with the needs of the system, and does so without showing signs of stress. And again, this is a point a lot of people agree with. This is a common critique of modern society. That it is. Built around cultivating workers instead of cultivating. Especially

that line at the end. That mental health just means how well you can function within the system within your own environment.

There are people who are perfectly capable individuals and aren't in their own endeavors or what have you, but because they can't fit into the system like everyone else. And they are deemed mentally ill. This is kind of getting into the area of people who view the manifesto as a sort of prophetic work. People who say wow Ted was so right about the modern age, it's typically points like this that they mentioned and that's not to. I'm acting like I'm the arbiter for this. I'm just a guy on YouTube who am I to be, you know, talking about the social politics or whatever to take this however you want. But I see so much in this manifesto of him kind of framing the world the way to speak, that when I read something like this again, to me it's just him pointing out that the wall is. It's not unique. But for people who haven't really thought. About these things before, who then reads it in this manifesto and they kind of realize it. If this is the place they first realize it, then it does sound important. It does sound like a big deal. Again, I don't think he's doing anything that's special, but I understand why some people do and the things he is mentioning. Our concerns and our things. That are debated a lot. But throughout modern society, especially in the modern age and by modern age, I mean post 1995. So at this point you may be looking at this and thinking that maybe Ted is working from a kind of humanitarian perspective. I mean, everything he's talked about so far has implied that, you know. He's talked about. How the biggest problem with technology is? It takes away. Human self worth it takes away the power. Process and ultimately causes dissatisfaction and humanity, and with what he just said, saying that, people who have a mental illness just because they can't fit into society, you may be thinking ohh well, he's just looking out for the little guy he's looking out for people paramount and most of all. And he goes a little mask off a little bit towards his true intentions with the things he says on page 15.

I'm going to cheat and take the sunglasses and the hoodie off for a minute because like I'm inside and these keep sliding down every time I'm trying to read and it's becoming like a whole thing here, we'll put them. We'll put them here for. You still get the effect. Right. I'll put them back on in a minute. But just just let me let me endure my own way.

On Page 15, Ted clarifies the bad parts of technology cannot be separated from the good parts. A further reason why industrial society cannot be reformed in favor of freedom is that modern technology is a unified system in which. All parts are dependent on one another. You can't get rid of the bad parts of technology and retain only the good parts. Take modern medicine for example. Progress in medical science depends on progress in chemistry, physics, biology, computer science and.

The fields advanced medical treatments require expensive high tech equipment that can be made available only by a technologically progressive, economically rich society. Clearly, you can't have much progress in medicine without the whole technological system and everything that goes with it. OK, so he's saying that things like medicine,

things that. On their own, in a vacuum, we can all objectively say our good people who are sick shouldn't. High, you know, controversial, I know.

But he's saying that these good parts do not justify the bad parts and that if technology is to go every bit of it has to go because there's so many things like academia, like for the actual construction of the medicine itself, the transportation of it.

These are all things that would have to exist in order for medicine to exist, so therefore medicine shouldn't exist.

The example he uses in paragraph 122 is interesting. He says suppose, for example, that a cure for diabetes is discovered. People with a genetic tendency to diabetes will then be able to survive and reproduce as well as anyone else. People with diabetes should reproduce question mark. Natural selection against genes for diabetes will cease, and such genes will spread throughout the population. This may be occurring to some extent already, since diabetes, while not curable, can be controlled through the use of insulin, the same thing will happen with many other diseases susceptibility. With other diseases, susceptibility to which is affected by genetic degradation of the population, the only solution will be some sort of eugenics program or extensive genetic engineering of human beings. So that man in the future will no longer be a creation of nature or of chance, or of God, depending on your religious or philosophical opinions. But a manufactured product, so he is saying that if people with diseases such as diabetes don't die. That they will be allowed to reproduce the the wording on this goes crazy. So he is saying that if medicine eradicates diseases or insulin as he says, at least suppresses them and people with things like the diabetes are allowed to reproduce. That it will prevent natural selection from. Learning, and therefore the gene that carries it, will continue to be passed down through the population.

The issue that he's saying is that this will create a higher population of people who are sickly, who have things like diabetes, which will require more medicine, which will require. More faith and a lean onto the system itself, which is ultimately a bad thing. And why that last sentence? Maybe we can agree with the last sentence that everyone's needing the system is not good the alternative. Is that they just die.

The part about eugenics. He's saying that the only way we could prevent this from happening is with the eugenics program. And he clarifies in the next little bit, he's like, that's not what I want. I'm not saying that we should have a eugenics program to prevent people from being like a dependent on medicine. I'm just saying that they should die right now, which I don't know if you know this, but that's the same thing. Even outright says it at the end of paragraph 124, when he says the only code of ethics that would truly protect freedom would be one that prohibited any genetic engineering of human beings. And you can be sure that no such cold will ever be applied in a technological society.

So they say the only form of morality that we can have is if we just don't let people interact with humanity's biological functions in order to prevent the possibility that one day will be too reliant on things like technology or that one. Say the government might start a eugenics program to get these diseases out of our system. Those things

could be bad in the future, so we should do them right now. He is imposing eugenics through death, natural or otherwise. He's it's still a decision. He's saying that now. We shouldn't medicate those who are ill so that they die out. So that 100 years from now, it doesn't become a problem. Also highlight this part because there's a lot of people who haven't actually read the manifesto, who will say they agree with the manifesto because they hear like.

The Industrial Revolution and its consequences, blah blah blah. And they'll be like, yeah, that Ted guy had. Some great points like. I'm yeah, I'm right there with him, I think.

I think a lot of the stuff you said was really cool. I just want to inform you that you are inadvertently advocating for diabetic. Genocide. And if that's if that's what you're about. You know, more power to you. I I'm not. I'm not your dad. Do what you want. Well, just. Just thought you may want to know that's. In there, why not let the kids have a little genocide as a tree, he talks about the anti freedom of vehicles. This is one of the things that people mentioned is like oh, that guy had some good points and this is an interesting thought experiment. He says that consider a technology. That initially, none of us would consider to be an enroachment on freedom. And again, as Ted describes freedom as actual, like personal autonomy, not freedom. And like a government. Although that does. Factor in but you get the point. So take a vehicle, for example, when vehicles were invented, that has nothing to do with freedom, right? Like, oh, when the car first came out. That is something, if anything, to enhance freedom and lets you go places quicker. It lets you do things more efficiently, right? But as vehicles became more and more predominant as technology and society advanced. According to Ted. Eventually it was not the freedom to have a car. It was the impossibility to not have a car because Rd. structures, travel, businesses, even grocery stores that we go to get our food from those places now require you to have a vehicle in all practicality. Like sure, you could take the bus. Sure, you could walk in some occasions, but society is now built around vehicles, so that's an example of a technology that at first seemed wholly beneficial but now has become so ingrained in our. Of life. It's hard to imagine how our system would even function without vehicles. And you know, it's it's a good turn around from the eugenic stuff.

So it's an interesting thought experiment, so to speak.

The idea that what happens when something that initially was a pure benefit. 1st to take on these negative character. Mystics, this is actually a discourse that started up in recent years. People who can't afford a car, complaining that it is hard to even live in a city because they are so spaced out because it's just assumed that everyone has a car. In many cases, the new technology changes society in such a way that people eventually find themselves forced to use it. He argues that anyone piece of technology typically cannot be. Seen as a part of an enriching system, and can even be seen as a good things like cars or medicine or TV. If you look at any of those one things in isolation, you would say what's the problem with that? But it is the fact that all of them are a part of the whole of technology that they become an issue. At the end

of 1/29, he says. Thus the system can move in only one. Direction toward greater technologies, technologies, technology, whatever technology repeatedly forces freedom to take a step back. That technology can never take a step back short of the overthrow of the whole technological system, which is the point that Ted is advocating for. Once again, revolution, not reform. He clarifies that his current argument is that technology has become so strong it's near impossible to defeat. Unless society is pushed to such a degree that it makes the technological system weak, that it makes the entire system itself weak, and it is then that society's weakest it is the moment to strike. That is, the moment when technology can be revolted against. He goes on to speak about how modern society. Is unable to solve pretty much any social problem. So how can we expect society to fix the great overarching issue of technology and reaching on freedoms when that's such a complex and inevitable issue when society can't even get its own inner workings in order? In other words, the entire system? Is so corrupt. That all of it must be destroyed if any freedom is to be maintained at the beginning of paragraph 140, he says. We hope we have convinced the reader that the system cannot be reformed in such a way as to reconcile freedom with technology.

The only way out is to dispense with the industrial technological system altogether. This implies revolution. Not necessarily an armed uprising, but certainly a radical and fundamental change in the nature of society. He goes on to say that it is much easier to convince a group of people to revolt or to throw off the system they're in rather to fix it because it's a lot easier to erase something than it is to. He then speaks of how modern society controls a lot of aspects of human behavior and how that can be manipulated for the revolutionaries, favor or fun. It's Halloween. I'll commit to the. Bit after this. Ted begins to mention some of the ways that society currently controls human behavior. Example of this is in paragraph. 145 when he says. Imagine a society that subjects people to conditions that make them terribly unhappy, then gives them drugs to take away their unhappiness. Science fiction, it is already happening to some extent in our own society. It is well known that the rate of clinical depression has been greatly increasing in recent decades. We believe that this is due to disruption of the power process. As explained in paragraphs 59 to 76. But even if we are wrong, the increasing rate of depression is certainly the result of some conditions that exist in today's society. Instead of removing the conditions that make people depressed, modern society gives them antidepressant drugs. In effect, antidepressants are a means of modifying an individual's internal state in such a way as to enable him to tolerate social conditions that he would otherwise find intolerable. Alright, so. Sometimes you're just right. Again, I'm not saying that Ted is making any, you know, genius statement here. It's just kind of an observance. Fact. But that is again a common criticism. A lot of people have that society defines mental illness and those who are divergent from what is typically expected and just drugs them until they can fit in with everyone else. Of course, Ted is presenting this as a blanket statement of an absolute wrong. He is not considering the possibility of people wanting to better fit in with society or wanting to be capable of dealing with things like a job or social settings. Without undergoing

stress or depression or what have you, he is assuming that all of them are forced into this scenario by the societal system. Now, is that true of some cases? Absolutely. But Ted is applying it to 100% across the board. At least it's implicative by his wording, one paragraph that really doesn't tie into anything. But I do want to mention. Is at the end of 147. When he says. Many primitive peoples, when they don't have work to do, are quite content to sit for hours at a time, doing nothing at all because they are at peace with themselves and their world. But most modern people must constantly be occupied, entertained, otherwise they get bored, IE they get fidgety, uneasy, irritable.

The reason I want. To mention it. Is again. It's one of those things that people cite in this as being predictive of modern circumstance, but. Really, the fact that Ted is describing himself here, a primitive person who doesn't get bored all day, that's exactly how Ted was living in Lincoln, he continues his point about mental health in the modern age throughout paragraph 148, saying things like mental health programs and invention techniques, psychotherapy and so forth are ostensibly designed to benefit. Individuals. But in practice they usually serve as methods for inducing individuals to think and behave as the system requires, and at the end of the paragraph, he says. Thus, when they go beyond the prevention of obvious senseless cruelty, talking about those who intervene on a child's. F programs for preventing child abuse are directed toward the control of human behavior on behalf of the system, saying that if a parent raises their child in a way that again isn't abject cruelty, but just different than what the system wants, the system still imposes its rule on how one is to raise children.

The example he uses here is spanking. As a form of punishment to children, so the system is continuously enforcing how humans operate, what they think, what they do. It is controlling every aspect of human behavior that it can get its foot in the door on. This is summarized in 151 when he says the social disruption that we see today is certainly not the result of. Your chance. It can only be a result of the conditions of life that the system imposes on people, and then he talks them throughout the paragraph about what this means before concluding in the future. Social systems will not be adjusted to suit the needs of human beings. Instead, human beings will be adjusted to suit the needs of the system and things that otherwise society touts. As good and needed will be used eventually to commit evil acts in the name of the industrial system. Again, the example he. Uses of medication or mental health that it's a good thing, at least in the beginning, to help people get over their anxieties.

Their depression would have you, but eventually it is used as another means of controlling the thought process of society at large. Again, Ted is assuming patients to be victims in this scenario. But I mean, as we've established so far, Ted's assuming a lot of things. And then he says some very interesting things about where this is all leading in paragraph 157. Assuming that industrial society survives, it is likely that technology will eventually acquire something approaching complete control over human behavior. It has been established beyond any rational doubt that human thought and behavior have a largely biological basis, as experiments have demonstrated, feelings such as hunger, pleasure, anger, and fear. Can be turned on and off by electrical stimulation of

appropriate parts of the brain, so he continues this in 158 when he says. It presumably would be impractical for all people to have electrodes inserted in their heads so that they could be controlled by the authorities, but the fact that human thoughts and feelings are so open to biological intervention shows that the problem of controlling human behavior is mainly a technical problem, a problem of neurons, hormones and complex molecules.

The kind of problem that is accessible to scientific attack. Given the outstanding record of our society in solving technical problems, it is overwhelmingly probable that great advances will be made in the control of human behavior. And while this certainly hasn't come to fruition yet, at least not the end state that Kaczynski applies things like this have progressed over the past couple decades. Basically, if the system finds a way to control. Human behavior. It will apply itself in 160, he says. To those who think that all this sounds like science fiction, we point out that yesterday, science fiction is today's fact.

The Industrial Revolution has radically altered man's environment and way of life, and it is only to be expected that as technology is increasingly applied to the human body and mind, man himself will be altered as radically as his environment and way of life have been. So Ted describes where all of this is going, that humanity is currently at a crossroads as he explains it. Between what we can do now or what technology will do if uninterrupted and in paragraph 163, he describes what that interruption might look like. It does not appear that there would be any further obstacle to the development of technology, and it would presumably advance towards its logical conclusion, which is complete control over everything on Earth, including human beings and all other important organisms.

The system may become a unitary, monolithic organization, or it may be more or less fragmented and consist of a large number of organizations. Coexisting in a relationship that includes elements of both cooperation and competition, just as today the government, the corporations and other large organizations both cooperate and compete with one another. Human freedom mostly will have vanish because individuals and small groups will be impotent vis a vis large organizations armed with super technology and an arsenal of advanced psychological and biological tools for manipulating human beings. Besides instruments of surveillance and physical coercion, only a small number of people will have any real. Hour and even these probably will have only very limited freedom because their behavior too will be regulated. Just as today our politicians and corporation executives can retain their positions of power only as long as their behavior remains within, certainly within certain fairly narrow limits, again describing. A form of technology and governance that we see. Of today, you can call it the elite. You can call it the corporate. You can call it whatever you want, but the idea that only a few people actually make the real decisions and then through a trickle down effect, we make decisions under the guise that we have some form of freedom, when in actuality we're just doing as the system allows. Furthermore, they'll do it under the guise that it is for the good of humanity. When in actuality, it is to the detriment of

humanity and one. 65 he states. That while this absolutely has to be. Stopped and we can't know what the effects will be after technology stopped. We can't take the risk of letting it continue, he says. It is impossible to predict what would emerge from such a time of troubles, but at any rate, the human race would be given a new chance.

The greatest danger is that industrial society may begin to reconstitute itself within the first few years after the breakdown. And then he starts to layout his actual thesis, page 21, and we're talking about motive. We're talking about purpose finally. He says in 166 first we must work to hide in the social stresses within the system so as to increase the likelihood that it will breakdown or be weakened sufficiently so that a revolution against it becomes possible. Second, it is necessary to develop and propagate an ideology that opposes technology and the industrial system. Such an ideology can become the basis for a revolution against industrial society if and when the system becomes sufficiently weakened, and such an ideology will help to assure that if and when industrial society breaks down, its remnants will be smashed beyond repair so that the system cannot be reconstituted. Factories should be destroyed, technical books burned. Etcetera. So basically his two step program step one caused so much stress, so much fear and terror throughout the system that the system begins to shake. And then from there promote an ideology that proves why the system is bad. And then after the system gets destroyed, I guess technically. Three steps of two and half destroy anything that can allow the system to rebuild itself. So books, factories, anything that potentially may cause technology to make. To return, I would argue that if you did believe this, it would probably be a good idea to switch the 1st 2 steps, because as mentioned, even if you are trying to radicalize people, it is probably best to start with words and you know hearts and minds or whatever before you start killing people. Because if you start killing people, you immediately shut the doors to new people entering in. Not that I'm trying to give this guy advice or anything. I mean, he's dead, but not that I'm trying to give any sympathizers advice, so to speak. It seems counterintuitive to start with the violence and then work on the propaganda. This also makes more sense as to why the guy would target airliners, right? Or why he would just target various individuals not really caring about who gets hit, just the purpose that the bomb is going in a certain direction. As long as someone gets hit because his whole point is to cause fear to cause a breakdown of the system. Well, sure.

The secretary at Vanderbilt or one of the random students who picked up a bomb in a study room may not have been the target.

They are a person in the system and therefore their death or maiming will cause stress upon the system around them. So it's all a win in his book as long as the bomb. Off he does admit in 167 that this is going. To extract a. Very heavy toll if the breakdown is sudden, many people will die since the world's population has become so overblown that it cannot even feed itself any longer without advanced technology. Even if the breakdown is gradual enough so that reduction of the population can occur more through lowering of the birth rate than through elevation of the death rate, the process of deindustrialization probably will be very chaotic and involve much suffering, he goes

on to say. Is it therefore cruel to work for the breakdown of the system? Because, you know, thousands, millions if not billions, of people would die. Maybe, but maybe not in the 1st place, revolutionaries will not be able to break the system down unless it is already in enough trouble, so that there would be a good chance of it eventually breaking down by itself anyway. And the bigger the system grows, the more disastrous the consequences of its breakdown will be. So it. May be that. Revolutionaries, by hastening the onset of the breakdown. Will be reducing the extent of the disaster. Basically, the longer we let time go on. On the more people will be born that are reliant on the system, so we should kill everyone who's reliant on it now so that more people don't get reliant on it in the future and then need to that event again. Kind of getting back to the weird diabetic eugenics argument. In 168, he. Says something that's very interesting to me that makes this feel more like. In the second place, one has to balance struggle and death against the loss of freedom and dignity to many of us, freedom and dignity are more important than a long life or avoidance of physical pain. Besides, we all have to die sometime, and it may be better to die fighting for survival or for cause than to live alone.

The empty and purposeless life here Ted is outright saying the quiet part out loud. He feels that it is probably more important to die fighting for survival than to live a long but empty and purpose. This life to which the question is who's the judge of that? Who's to judge what is empty or purposeless? Ted's mentioned earlier and as well as his own journal writings that he considers religion meaningless or stupid, so to speak. But someone like me, religion is paramount. What could be more important than eternity? Right. So therefore the things I consider most important. You would consider purposeless, meaningless and I would agree with him in a vacuum about the phrase. It's more important what you do with your life than how long you live or experiencing A painless life like. Sure, that's all well and good, but he is saying because his belief, the belief in which he says. To many of us, freedom and dignity are more important than a long life or avoidance of physical pain. So 10 is effectively saying that because I feel this way about it, because I think it's more important than I'm going to decide that it's more important than whatever you have going on. And if this was a political piece, if. This was, again, some doctoral dissertation where Ted is saying that we as people should take our life into consciousness, make more of an effort with what we do given our time on Earth.

Then I would be interested in hearing him out. But again, this manifesto is after 16 bombs and three people are dead.

He really has that how his argument as foolproof, right? Because he is saying that he knows what. Best and if you have to die to get what's best done, then who are you? You're just one person and I'm trying to save the entirety of the human race, and if you disagree with this point, ohh. Well, then you're just one of the people brainwashed by the system. But lucky for you, I'm here to help.

The language of the manifesto has poised himself. As the arbiter of truth, as the only one who really gets it and can really help out every. Else, when in reality he is

just setting up a narrative that he agrees with and then stating everyone else to be out of the know or not sophisticated enough or not free enough to understand what he's talking about. So he's going to show you he continues to talk about the horrors, the modern weaponry.

The ***** of genetic engineering, all of the awful places. Technology may. And then ends paragraph 170 with the summary that technology has gotten the human race into a fix from which there is not likely to be an easy escape. So again, Ted solution is burn it down. Now there is a section following this where he talks about the future of how people are about to willingly. Turn their systems and ideas over to machines and technology. And again, I've been pretty harsh for obvious reasons to Ted throughout this so far, but this is the one. Like everyone reads sections of this, and though God Ted was right, Ted was right. This is the one segment that I read and I was like, hmm, that's so yeah, that's pretty. That's pretty on the nose. So this is while he's discussing. What humanity might become in the future. And in 173, he says, if the machines are permitted to make all of their own decisions, we can't make any conjectures as to the results because it is impossible to guess how much how such machines might behave. We only point out that the fate of the human race would be at the mercy of the machines. It might be argued that the human race. Could never be foolish enough to hand over all power to the machines. But we are suggesting neither that the human race would voluntarily turn power over to the machines, nor that the machines would willfully seize power. What we do suggest is that the human race might easily permit itself to drift into a position of such dependence on the machines that it would have no practical choice but to accept all of the machines decision. As society and the problems that face it become more and more complex and as machines become more and more intelligent, people will let machines make more and more of their decisions for them simply because machine made decisions will bring better results than man made ones. Now, while this certainly existed to some degree in 1995. It exploded over the past 25 years. Been 2528 years. Yeah. For the past 28 years, eventually a stage may be reached at which the decisions necessary to keep the human system running will be so complex that human beings will be incapable of making them intelligently. At that stage, the machines will be in effective control. People won't be able. To turn the machine off because they will be so dependent on them that turning them off would amount to suicide. Yeah, I mean, yeah. How many systems are currently entirely dictated by machines with just some level of human oversight? And this is a concern a lot. Of people rightfully. Have what happens if the machines turn off one day? Are we even at a point where our systems, our systems of economy, our systems of commerce, and what have you? Are we at a point that we can? Even turn them off or is just the world as we know it, dependent on computers. Again, this problem existed in 1995, but it has exploded. Since then, I am not arguing that this is justification for any of the actions that Ted has mentioned, obviously, but this is one of the points where I see where proponents for this document are coming from. He double s down on this in 174 when he says, on the other hand, it is possible that

human control over the machines may be retained. In that case, the average. And may have control over certain private machines of his own, such as his car or his personal computer, but control over large systems of machines will be in the hands of a tiny elite, just as it is today, but with two different. Due to improved techniques, the elite will have greater control over the masses and because human work will no longer be necessary, the masses will be superfluous, a useless burden on the system. If the elite is ruthless, they may simply decide to exterminate the mass of humanity. If they are humane, they may use propaganda or other psychological or biological. Techniques to reduce the birth rate until the mass of humanity becomes extinct, leaving the world to to the elite. Or if the elite consists of soft hearted liberals, they may decide to play the role of good shepherds to the rest of the human race.

They will see to it that everyone's physical needs are satisfied, that all children are raised under psychologically hygienic conditions, that everyone has a wholesome hobby to keep him busy, and that anyone who may become dissatisfied undergoes treatment to cure his problem. Of course, life will be so purposeless that people will have to be biologically or psychologically. Engineered either to remove their need for the power process or to make them sublimate their drive for power into someone into some harmless hobby.

These engineered human beings may be happy in such a society, but they most certainly will not be free.

They will have been reduced to the status of domesticated animals. Again, this is further justification to Kaczynski that we have to get rid of it. All of it, because if any part of it's allowed to live, all of it will eventually return. He ends page 23, and this entire section. With what is undoubtedly the second most famous phrase from the manifesto, it would be better to dump the whole stinking system and take the. So he spent the entire manifesto up until now, 23 pages of it, explaining why the industrial system is evil, because even the good parts of it will be used for evil. And all of it will eventually become evil and subjugate humanity. So now that he has laid out his beliefs for that, starting at page 24. He talks about the strategy to destroy it and 180, he says the technophiles are taking us all on an utterly reckless ride into the unknown. Many people understand something of what technological progress is doing to us, yet take a passive attitude toward it because they think it is inevitable. But we Freedom Club don't think it is inevitable. We think it can be stopped and we will give here some indications of how to go about stopping it. He mentions revolutions like the French or Russian revolutions and say that they propose something similar, although admittedly this has to be different because rather than a body of government you're rebelling against, you are. Asking now for society to rebel against itself effectively, he clarifies himself, not as. Is a proponent of some new world or of some new system of governance. At the end of 182, he just says we have no illusions about the feasibility of creating a new ideal form of society. Our goal is only to destroy the existing form of society. In other words, Ted isn't concerned with what comes next. He just needs what's now. On or perhaps he's saying there's no way he could know what would come next, and he's

just worried about step one. Currently, he proposes that the masses, or at least the masses that you need on your side to permit revolution, need to be given something to be for and something to be against.

The thing he proposes that they before is nature itself, humanity's natural condition, and the thing that they are against is, of course, technology of which one of the most important parts of this revolution is informing people that they are the victims of it, even if they've yet to realize it. So he's talking about a massive revolution destroying all of technology. Billions must die. Blah blah and then in 185 he gives the most hilarious shrug off I've ever heard to the idea of a global population reset when he says; As for the negative consequences of eliminating industrial society. Well, you can't eat your cake and have it too. To gain one thing, you have to sacrifice another. So because technology may become bad, or because the freedoms that Ted wants are being encroached upon, billions must die. And then if you have a problem with that, you can't eat your cake and have it too. And you're probably looking at that and thinking like isn't the saying have your cake and eat it too? Yes, that's what we all say. But apparently, when the saying began, it was eat your cake and have it too. And then somewhere colloquially we switched it. And Ted is absolutely the type of guy to be so pedantic that he's like, I'm actually the saying is supposed to be. And then flip it back. Brown Ted informs future revolutionaries that it will be impossible to win over the majority. It's not how revolutions are fought. It is instead fought with a powerful minority, which is what revolutionaries must focus on. He goes into a lot of description about how they have no place in politics because politics will never work for this. That revolutionary should not blame the public because the public should instead be treated as victims. And we're. Going to need. Public support later into the revolution that this is not a countrywide issue, and that in order for this to succeed, this must occur over the entire world at once, which good luck getting through the language barriers and whatnot to radicalize the entire. Planet, or at least. Key figures in the entire planet, but his reasoning for this is if just the United States loses this technology, then some other country will step in and simply oppose its technology. That if you effectively take yourself out of the arms race, you automatically lose. He even argues that taking systems of government. That don't work and implying those in other countries might be a good thing because it's a form of accelerationism. Anything we can do right now to breakdown the system. It's good, so, hey, dictatorships don't really work out. See if you can get dictatorships started anywhere because that'll make people more upset, which will make them more ready to throw off the system, which will get what we want. He clarifies that the revolutionaries will need to utilize some forms of technology to eventually be destroyed and that this must only be as a sort of vanguard. Party for a short amount of time, in other words. Sure, we need things like radio and television to get our message out, so use those as need be. Or maybe transportation. But then after enough ground has been made, destroy those as well.

The analogy he gives. Is an alcoholic with a barrel of wine who needs to use the wine for just a little bit to get over some ailment, but the alcoholic needs to know when

to quit, when to destroy the wine altogether. He also clarifies that while the human population needs to be reversed and that we need to go on a downtrend instead. Of an uptrend. He clarifies that revolutionaries should have as many children as possible because they're important and need to reproduce like minded people into the system, and that the offset this places by adding more people to the gene pool will be offset by. All the people who rapidly leave the gene pool, he equates it to after Rome fell. How sure some things were able to be invented by people who were no longer in Rome, in small villages like blacksmithing or whatnot, but things like aqueducts were left to decompose because they no longer have the systems in place. Manage them. That that's effectively how it would be in the modern age. It would be infeasible. For small communities to build things like roads. Or sewer systems but.

They can get away with small technology, things like plows or what have you. This also explains Ted's reasoning behind using bombs or the mail system that some elements of technology must be used in order to destroy itself. You said something strange at the end of. 210. He says even in the absence of an ideology opposed to technology, there is no reason to believe that anyone would be interested in rebuilding industrial society.

The enthusiasm for progress is a phenomenon peculiar to the modern form of society. And it seems to not have existed prior to the 17th century or thereabouts. I have absolutely no idea what he means by this. Is he saying people pre 17th century did not want to progress technology because yes, they did. That's how we got where we're at right now, maybe not as quickly or as pedantically as it is now.

They certainly wanted to progress technology and. What does it mean if we got rid of technology, everyone would just get over it. Like, no, he spent a bunch of this article talking about how we have to engineer people's though. To make them not want technology. So, and he's also saying that a minority would cause the revolution that the majority would still be, you know, upset generally by the things that are going on. So is he thinking after they destroy technology that that majority will just forget that it exists? It's a very convenient framing for him that. After the revolution had. Happens, all those problems will go away. He ends his thought in 212 and said would society eventually develop again towards the industrial technological form? Maybe. But there is no use in worrying about it, since we can't predict or control events 500 or 1000 years in the future. Those problems must be dealt with by the people who will live. At that. Time he then after explaining all this, how we're going to destroy technology and reset.

The world or whatever. He then just spins the rest of the paper talking about leftist again. Specifically, he talks about how it is dangerous to let leftists into the movement because leftists will only oppose technology if they feel technology is impeding the sense of morality. And if at any point the leftist feels that they can take over technology to enforce their morality on others, that they'll do it. In other words, a leftist can't be trusted because their ideas could change on a whim. And then their ultimate goal is to just be in power so they can make everyone live the way that they think. Should

live. So in other words, if you can find a way to recruit 1 to be like super ***** anti technology, that's cool. Otherwise keep them out of the movement, which Ted certainly on an ivory horse and and he can pick and choose revolutionaries alone in his cabin and Lincoln but whatever. And then the last three pages of the article. Or literally notes, it is a bibliography, and with that we have the end of industrial society and its future.

Final Analysis

So what did we get out of all that. What is our final analysis of everything that we read so. So, Ted as mentioned, talks about the dangers of technology, why it has to be destroyed, why we need rid of it, and then talks about some of the groundwork of why it can't be reformed. It has to be destroyed, and also a sort of groundwork or series of steps that explain. How this is to be brought about? Of course, as I mentioned, I don't. I'm not really going to critique it here because I critiqued it throughout. He is framing everything within a very particular view. He is framing everything from the standpoint of someone who has already decided that human life means less than his political goal. And sure, while there were segments where he was right about technology. More about the advancements that it would make again, to me this is once again someone pointing out the color of the wall. He is just stating things as they are not really making inferences or being that smart so to speak. It is simply him absorbing. Why he feels the need to blow up airliners, why he feels the need to attack people. Because those at the top of the system, like scientists, are evil and the whole system needs to go. So might as well shake the table a bit. If I shake the table, I mean, kill innocent people.

The reason I went into such detail with it is people subscribe a sense of worth to this document.

They see the manifesto as the good thing that Ted did. And then the whole killing people is secondary.

They don't want to talk about it and I don't see it as that. I see it as he is a guy who sure is more educated than your common man on the street but is still implying his sense of morality or his viewpoint on the world at large. It is not object. Of truth. And if you're unfamiliar with any of this, you didn't come into this with the preconceived notion you may be asking well, when dagoon it. Isn't this just a manifesto to explain why he wants to kill people? And yes, it's exactly that and not much more. That's the biggest problem with Ted Kaczynski despite. All of his claims and feigning for moral superiority or for trying to do what? He's doing for the betterment of humanity. What did he ultimately do? He killed three people, scared a lot more and sent out 16 bombs through the mail service. That is his legacy. That's what he did. And frankly, all of his talk about social systems or how we're losing our base of society, we're losing our structures, a family and people. I don't buy. It and the reason I don't buy it is because of his practice. Ted in his manifesto speaks so fervently about the purpose of

small communities and a family and how technology is disrupting our connections to one another, which he claims to be the most important connections we can make. But what did the guy do? His life, he abandoned his family. He pushed away his brother for getting married. He despised everyone who was close to him. He plotted the murder of women that rejected him. It doesn't sound to me like a family man. Furthermore, Ted objectively refused small community in every way possible. Sure, he would keep up appearances. Be nice to the occasional librarian. Whatnot. But his practice was spending months and months away from any human contact. So then why does this guy preach so much about the importance of human connection if he himself didn't find it that important? Well, for me to find that answer, we just have to look at his history. He began his life with the disdain of people, didn't have that many friends and didn't trust outsiders. As he got older, he seemed to grow this hatred for people around him that became an outright bloodlust. Eventually he managed to get away from everyone who was ever close to him, including his family, and simply sat in his cabin and mocked the outside world for their connections. And then nearly two decades, into a murder spree. He sends out a paper Speaking of how important family and community can be. It's in my opinion that Ted Kaczynski. Despised people. He despised humanity. He despised social interaction, so he window shopped for an ideology. That fit that. Need he found something that he figured other people could get behind? And he typed it out, but I don't believe that he himself in any way said about his campaign for the good of society or for humanity, because, frankly, I think he. I'm not saying he didn't love nature. I'm sure he did love nature, but I would say the primary reason he loved nature is because it has a particularly sparse lack of people. His hatred for humanity, his desire to kill those around him. All of that came before he decided that the trees were the place to be. So he goes and he builds this Fort. In the middle of the mountains, and he sits among the trees so that he can sit in a bunker of self righteousness and spit on those who don't agree with him. But that's not what the trees are there for. And honestly, I'm not the only person who. And honestly, I'm not the only person who has that opinion. As a matter of fact, Ted had that opinion himself regarding himself in his journal, not the part that he sent to the New York Times, not the part that he sent out to establish some kind of group disorder, some kind of table shaking that would overthrow technological society. Not when he had an objective in mind when he was riding alone in his cabin to himself on April the 6th of 1970. One right at.

The beginning of his bombing campaign, Ted said this. My motive for doing what I'm going to do is simply personal. Pinch I do not expect to accomplish anything by it. Of course, if my crime and my reasons for committing it gets any public attention, it may help to stimulate public interest in the technology question and thereby improve the chances of stopping technology. If it's too late. But on the other hand, most people will probably be repelled by my crime. And the opponents of freedom may use it as a weapon to support their arguments for control over human behavior. I have no way of knowing whether my action will do more good than harm. I certainly don't claim to be an altruist or to be acting for the good, whatever that is, of the human

race. I act merely from a desire for revenge. Of course, I would like to get revenge on the whole scientific and bureaucratic establishment, not to mention. Communists and others who threaten freedom, but that being impossible, I have to content myself. With just a little revenge, that doesn't sound like the words of someone who is looking to invest in humanity. That sounds like someone who really wants to see people die, and he figured out an ideology that may convince some people to get others killed and revenge for what Ted Kaczynski was a brilliant mind. He was a. Loved mathematician. He was making progress in his field. He had people who wanted to be his friend, people to socialize. Do you know how hard David Kaczynski tried to be his brother and Ted kept pushing him away. What was Ted getting revenge for? For the fact that he didn't fit in for the fact that he couldn't understand well, I've got news for you.

A lot of us don't fit in a lot of us don't understand, but also a lot of us don't decide to murder people over it. And when you take all of that into account, that one of the most brilliant minds of our time, as he's been called between his IQ philosophy and his mathematic skills.

When you take into account that that guy threw all of that away to kill a few people because they rejected him because he didn't fit into society. It just makes Ted Kaczynski seem. Pathetic. When I began research for this video, it was early June and I had just spent a couple of days reading over the basics of Ted's early life and my father and I went out on a weekend for a willing trip, and we were at this cool cave. It was like this tunnel in the mountains of Kentucky. That a breezeway was blowing through. It's just really cool moment in nature to where you know, natural passageways, through mountains constantly have an air flow sort of air. Conditioning and we were standing at the mouth of that cave in the beautiful mountains of Appalachia, and my phone got serviced and one of my friends had texted me that Ted Kaczynski had just died. Which was bizarre. I had been reading about this too, guy for days and then he dies in prison. And I remember I had this moment standing.

There because I had you know the opinion, I hadn't researched his life for his story. I knew he was evil. I knew that he I disagreed with his, you know, his actions. But I had.

The opinion a lot of people do that well. While bad he probably had good motives. He probably just love nature the same way I. Do and it was. This bizarre moment I was standing there in front of this cave and all of this greenery thinking about it and I thought to myself, yeah, I I need to make this video about Ted. I need to give it the time it deserves and all that because I think it's fascinating that someone who had. That right of an opinion, or someone who was that correct, would do such evil and terrible things. It's a shame that we lost such a great opinion because he did the evils that he did. But now that I read it and then I looked into his whole story, that's. Not what I. Found I just. Found a bitter man who picked a morality. Something that he knew other people could get behind and dressed his opinion in that in order to justify his hatred and in order to get people to hate others, to destroy these communities that he seems so obsessed with protecting. When it comes to Ted Kaczynski, I don't

think of him as an altruist. I don't think of him as some great. Legend or some great mind that was so tragically lost by the evils or the radicalization, the world committed against him. I think he was just a guy who hated people and he found a way to try to make others hate people too. He tried to bring everyone down to his level when he asked yourself the question was Ted Kaczynski a mad serial killer or a lover of nature? Just ask yourself the question is he remembered for planting trees or building bombs? And it's to that effect.

That there are two different Ted Kaczynski, there's the one that actually exists, the one that I've been speaking on. But then there's the idea.

The image of Ted Kaczynski, the the visage of this person who is so discontent with modern society that he removes himself from it, that he establishes himself as a sort of thorough figure, as someone who just wants to be. Apart from society, someone who set out in the woods in order. To live. And that's not what he was, but at the same time, that's what he was. That's what his legacy was. That's what he will be remembered as. And again, I'm not making this video to correct anyone to say, oh, you should stop talking about Ted Kaczynski because blah blah blah. But it's so. Fascinating to me how the idea of him is almost entirely removed for the man. But that idea has become its own thing. I do agree with the sentiments that perhaps technology has gone too far. Perhaps we do need some level of regression to better establish our own connections to Earth, our own connections to the spiritual and. What have you? Maybe I agree. But even though that is Ted Kaczynski. That's not Ted Kaczynski. But the memes are funny. You should keep doing those. All in all, the purpose of this video isn't to direct your thinking one way or the other. I'm not trying to be some parent and tell you that ohh you're not allowed to make jokes about this guy because I don't like him. I'm still going to make jokes about the guy and I don't like him. I just simply wanted to make a video about the Unabomber, one of America's most famous. And talk about his psychology and why that differs from the opinion a lot of people have of him. This video is in no way meant to guide your thinking one way or the other. It's simply just a look at a legacy and nothing more. And of course, even more so. It's just my opinion of a look at a legacy. So take it for whatever that's worth.

Acknowledgements

But at the end of the day, the most important part of all of this. Is that you're still here and you're still watching. And that means the world to me. And I just want to say. Thank you for watching. I've talked up doing a Ted Kaczynski video forever and it's always been, oh, let me finish this project. Let me finish this. And I finally got the time to sit down and give this subject the focus that it needed. And this I don't want to call it a script because I don't write scripts. It's just like bullet notes. But this script, so to speak, has changed. So many times from me. Talking so intently about the politics of it to just ignoring all of the manifesto stuff and talking about

his life to whatever this eventually became, it's kind of a weird. Amalgamation of my personal ideas around him as well as you know what, what society thinks of him. I don't know if this is going to turn out good at all this may. Just be a total. You know, indiscernible mishmash of different ideas. One up, but hey, that's that's on par for the channel, right? But like I said, the most important part is that you're still here and you're still watching, and that really does mean the world to me. I appreciate it. This crazy kid with a dream. Just started making YouTube videos and now here we are. This month actually makes three years since I began YouTube in earnest that since I started making videos and in three years we've come so far 3.14 million, I didn't think 100,000 was possible. Now look at us over 30 times that right? It's hard to grasp, but the only thing I can really manifest out of that is thank you. You've made this little Tennessee boys your dreams come true, and that means.

The world. So happy Halloween. I hope you have a great one. Tell the federal agents. I hope you liked my costume because it was a costume and nothing. More of course. But yeah, I I hope you guys enjoyed this. I don't know how it's going to turn out. I don't know how reception will be.

There were a lot of people. Whenever I announced I was going to make this video who were like. Oh yeah, he's going to. He's going to talk about Uncle Ted. He's going to talk about how cool and swaggy. Again, I'm. I'm. I'm not discouraging that people should make jokes or talk about Ted like that. Do what you want. But I want to be honest. Like my honest opinion of the guy is that he was a terrorist who justified his own violence using a rationale that fit his narrative and not much else. That being said, the memes are still really funny, and you should keep doing those. So I was honest. I'm sorry if it wasn't cool or based enough for you. I don't know what to tell you. I apologize, but but for real, I'm I'm happy with how this turned out. We'll see. But I want to say thank you all so much for being here. Thank you so much for the time you've committed to watching this. I believe that should do it for now. Everyone. And enjoy your Halloween. Enjoy the rest of the fall season. Beautiful time of the year and hopefully. You enjoyed the video. If you hear this long, I imagine you were either forced to watch it by a loved one, in which case I apologize. But to those who forced him to watch it, good job. Keep it up. But for real. Thank you all so much for being here. It means the. I believe that should do it for now, but I just want to say. Thank you for watching. I hope that you enjoyed and I will see you in the next one.

The Ted K Archive

Wendigoon

The Internet's Favorite T*rrorist

Nov 1, 2023

<youtube.com/watch?v=g5yatQ80GVI>

www.thetedkarchive.com