

**A letter from Ted Kaczynski
discussing the publishing of other
people's anti-tech writings**

February 2, 2016

TED KACZYNSKI
to
[CENSORED]

February 2, 2016
Groundhog Day

Dear [CENSORED]

Thanks for your card & letter dated 12/24/15 ...

You write, [CENSORED] has "has asked me to seek out other authors involved in the anti-tech movement whose work he and I may publish." ...

One thing [CENSORED] could publish would be the history of environmentalism that I suggested to you some time ago. I now have a group of new people who are interested in taking up that project. [CENSORED] could also publish things that have no specific connection with anti-tech but may serve to undermine people's confidence in the system. For example, see the Senate report cited in Note 162 to Chapter 4 of Anti-Tech Revolution. This report most likely is not protected by copyright and could be republished freely. No doubt it contains a lot of tedious technical stuff that would be of no interest to the general reader, so you and Alex would have to edit out all of the tedious stuff to produce a greatly abridged version that would nevertheless reveal a lot of the slimy tricks that the system uses. Such a book would probably be of considerable interest to many people and might well be used in college classrooms. Another possible book for [CENSORED] to publish would be an expose of the utter dishonesty of our mass media – about which more in a moment.

You ask how I'm doing. I'm OK except that I'm suffering from chronic exhaustion. Too much work, too many problems to struggle with. At the age of 73 I can't keep up the pace any longer. I have high hopes, though, that the new group I mentioned in the preceding paragraph may be able to take some of the burden off me.

Now your letter of 1/26/16. Yeah, I'm not surprised by the fact that Yahoo News is doing something like that. On 12/21/15 I received a letter dated 12/8/15 from a Holly Bailey who described herself as a reporter for Yahoo News. Holly implied that most journalists were dishonest but that [CENSORED] was one of the few remaining journalists who were honest and only wanted to report the truth. She said favorable things about my letters that she had found in the Labadie Collection, as if her article about me were going to be sympathetic. Of course, I wasn't taken in and I didn't answer her letter. Again and again I've received letters from journalists, and they all take the same line: "We're not like all those other journalists ..."

Actually, in a way, the Yahoo articles about me could be considered a compliment. Stop and think — my trial was concluded 18 years ago, yet, year after year, right down to the present, the media keep bringing out these articles, TV programs, etc, that portray me as a madman, and a monster. The news about me should long since have gone stale, so why do they bother with it any more? I can think of only one

TED KACZYNSKI
to

February 2, 2016
Groundhog Day

Dear

Thanks for your card & letter dated 12/24/15 and for your letter of 1/26/16. I received them on 12/30/15 and 2/1/16, respectively.

To answer your card & letter of 12/24/15, yes, I'm in touch with attorney _____, who has been and continues to be very helpful. He has a favorable opinion of _____. As I think you know by now, I am proceeding with _____ toward publication of the book. Yesterday for the first time I spoke with _____ on the telephone (problems with the phone system here prevented me from calling him earlier), and he made a very favorable impression on me. So far so good.

You write, _____ "was asked me to seek out other authors involved in the anti-tech movement whose work he and I may publish." If _____ publishes just any author whose work could be described as generally "anti-tech" (say _____, for example) that's OK, but if he wants to maximize his effectiveness as a revolutionary publisher, he'll have to be more discriminating. Years ago I used to believe in free-ranging discussion of all ideas and all shades of opinion, but over the years, in studying and wrestling with the problems involved in creating a revolutionary movement, I've come to understand why most if not all successful movements demand a considerable degree of orthodoxy within their own ranks: It is usually a prerequisite for success. See Tech Slavery, pages 265-66, and the new book, section 18 of Chapter Four. So for maximum effectiveness, _____ should refrain from publishing any anti-tech literature that is inconsistent with the point of view of our group. This doesn't mean that there can be no disagreement, but it does mean that Alex should publish only what is consistent with our basic principles and our general approach to the problem of technology. This would exclude, for example, _____, _____, and _____.

One thing _____ could publish would be the history of environmentalism that I suggested to you some time ago. I now have

a group of new people who are interested in taking up that project. ... could also publish things that have no specific connection with anti-tech but may serve to undermine people's confidence in the system. For example, see the Senate report cited in Note 162 to Chapter Four of Anti-Tech Revolution. This report most likely is not protected by copyright and could be republished freely. No doubt it contains a lot of tedious technical stuff that would be of no interest to the general reader, so you and Alex would have to edit out all of the tedious stuff to produce a greatly abridged version that would nevertheless reveal a lot of the slimy tricks that the system uses. Such a book would probably be of considerable interest to many people and might well be used in college classrooms. Another possible book for to publish would be an exposé of the utter dishonesty of our mass media-- about which more in a moment.

You ask how I'm doing. I'm OK except that I'm suffering from chronic exhaustion. Too much work, too many problems to struggle with. At the age of 73 I can't keep up the pace any longer. I have high hopes, though, that the new group I mentioned in the preceding paragraph may be able to take some of the burden off me.

Now your letter of 1/26/16. Yeah, I'm not surprised by the fact that Yahoo News is doing something like that. On 12/21/15 I received a letter dated 12/8/15 from a who described herself as a reporter for Yahoo News. implied that most journalists were dishonest but that was one of the few remaining journalists who were honest and only wanted to report the truth. She said favorable things about my letters that she had found in the Labadie Collection, as if her article about me were going to be sympathetic. Of course, I wasn't taken in and I didn't answer her letter. Again and again I've received letters from journalists, and they all take the same line: "We're not like all those other journalists. We're different."

we only want to report the facts objectively," and they imply that their article is going to be sympathetic. But then what they actually write is a vicious hit-piece, and in many cases they tell outright lies. This is a standard technique that journalists use: They lead their victim to believe that they are going to write something sympathetic, and then they turn right around and write something vicious. These people are totally unscrupulous. I wrote a book on this subject, The Murderer and the Journalist, which opens with the words, "Every journalist who isn't too stupid or too full of himself to notice what is going on knows that what he does is morally indefensible."

Actually, in a way, the Yahoo articles about me could be considered a compliment. Stop and think -- my trial was concluded 18 years ago, yet, year after year, right down to the present, the media keep bringing out these articles, TV programs, etc., that portray me as a madman and a monster. The news about me should long since have gone stale, so why do they bother with it any more? I can think of only one explanation: They are afraid of the ideas and of the fact that more and more people keep finding merit in those ideas. So they want to portray the ideas as the ravings of a lunatic.

I think my best policy is to ~~ignore~~ ignore all this crap, rather than dignify it with a response. One thing that does seriously irritate me, though, is that as you say they are publishing some of my correspondence. If they are publishing only brief excerpts from my letters they may be protected by the "fair use" doctrine of copyright laws, but if they are publishing entire letters or major parts of letters, then they are clearly infringing my copyright. I'm getting thoroughly tired of the fact that so many people just ignore my copyrights, so I will appreciate it if you will send the relevant parts of those Yahoo articles, ask him whether they infringe my copyright, and if they do, ask him what can be done about it. I'll write to about this myself in

TJK to

2/2/16

e course-

But the rot that afflicts our news media goes a lot deeper than the kind of thing I've just been discussing. People don't realize that a lot of what is reported to them as news is wholly fiction. But those who've had extensive opportunities to compare what they've personally witnessed with what is reported by the media know that a great deal of "news" is pure bullsh*t. Describing his experiences with the media in his book Awing Life, Unabom victim wrote (p. 51?): "It must be the very first thing you learn in journalism schools: don't do research when you can make things up?" To take more among many examples, when I was in the Lewis & Clark County Jail a couple of weeks after my arrest in 1996, during a conversation with a jail officer named [redacted] I remarked, "I hope you guys don't believe all that stuff that the media say about me." He laughed and said, "Oh, we know enough not to believe that! Sometimes something will happen at the jail here and the next day you read about it in the paper and you say, 'Jeez! This just didn't happen!'"

That's why I say that a book about the dishonesty of our news media would be a good one for [redacted] to publish. But such a book would require a lot of very challenging research.

Please email a copy of this letter to [redacted] Mail pickup will be soon, so I have to close here. I hope that all continues to go well with you & your family.

Best regards,

Tad

explanation: They are afraid of the ideas and of the fact that more and more people keep finding merit in those ideas. So they want to portray the ideas as the ravings of a lunatic.

I think the best policy is to ignore all this crap, rather than dignify it with a response. One thing that does seriously irritate me, though, is that as you say they are publishing some of my correspondence... I'm getting thoroughly tired of the fact that so many people just ignore my copyrights, so I will appreciate it if you will send [CENSORED] the relevant parts of those Yahoo articles ...

... Describing his experiences with the media in his book *Drawing Life*, Unabom victim David Gelernter wrote (p.51?): "It must be the very first thing you learn in journalism schools why do research when you can make things up?" ...

That's why I say that a book about the dishonesty of our media would be a good one for [CENSORED] to publish. But such a book would require a lot of very challenging research.

Please email a copy of this letter to [CENOSRED]. Mail pickup will be soon, so I have to close here. I hope that all continues to be well with you & your family.

Best regards,
Ted

The Ted K Archive

A letter from Ted Kaczynski discussing the publishing of other people's anti-tech writings

February 2, 2016

supernaught.com/product-page/ted-kaczynski-correspondence

The Senate report that was mentioned can be found here: Intelligence Activities and the Rights of Americans. Plus, David Gelernter's book that was mentioned can be found here: Drawing Life

www.thetedkarchive.com