

The Anarchist Library
Anti-Copyright



Comments on the communiques from Individualists Tending toward the Wild

Último Reducto – Some comments in reference to the
communiques from Individualists Tending toward the
Wild

Último Reducto

2015

Último Reducto
Comments on the communiques from Individualists Tending
toward the Wild

Último Reducto – Some comments in reference to the
communiques from Individualists Tending toward the Wild
2015

<https://waronsociety.noblogs.org/?p=9238>

theanarchistlibrary.org

After reading the five communiques that the Individualists Tending toward the Wild¹ (ITS) have published on <http://liberaciontotal.lahaine.org>, Último Reducto (UR) wish to make some comments about these texts:²

We are not going to go into the worn and generally sterile debate here about whether or not the use of violence as a means

¹From 27 April 2011, 22 May 2011, 9 August 2011, 21 September 2011, and 19 December 2011, respectively.

²What we say in most of these commentaries generally also goes for the communique from the Terrorist Cells for the Direct Attack – Anti-civilization Faction (CTPAD-FA).

for combating the techno-industrial system is appropriate. Our critiques will go in other directions:

1. It is unfortunate what an overwhelming number of spelling mistakes, syntax errors, failures of grammatical concordance, stylistic defects, punctuation mistakes, etc., appear in ITS' first four communiques, since it makes reading them much more difficult and less attractive for those who might want to do so.

Some probably think this critique is rather superficial, that the content of the communiques is what matters, not their form. And, in a certain way, they are partly right. But, without denying that what they say is what is fundamental, and how they say it is secondary, we must point out that it is also important to take care of form, even though it may only be for purely practical reasons. Terrible grammar and poor style in expressing oneself makes it difficult not only because fewer readers correctly interpret the text, but also because fewer even go through the annoyance of reading it to the end. If almost every line makes you have to stop, forcing you to go back and/or mentally correct the spelling mistakes or reread the sentences over and over trying to imagine the true meaning of what you're reading because of the stylistic and syntax failures, the function of the text as a means of expression and diffusion becomes greatly reduced. Moreover, the fact that ITS uses Spanish so badly in these communiques could make it easier for certain technophiles (and other people who are scandalized by the attacks, verbal or non-verbal, against modern technology, leftist values and civilization) to pass the buck, making superficial critiques of the form and avoiding going deeper into the content of the communiques. For many it will be easier to dismiss ITS as a gang of uneducated people because of their bad grammar and preemptively reject the validity of everything ITS says than to force themselves to understand it and work on a serious response to their ideas. If those who position themselves against the techno-industrial system and

On the other hand, the majority of the classical supposed anarcho-individualists, like the contemporary individualists who take them as a reference point, are very contaminated by positions that come from socialism (for example, identification with and defense of groups of supposed victims—the oppressed, the working class, the excluded, the marginal, etc.). Even the most recalcitrant anarcho-individualists, like Stirner, who could not be so easily categorized as leftists, leave much to be desired as ideological references, since much of their work is infested with pseudo-rebellious attitudes like relativism or irrationalism.

In light of the situation, referring to oneself as anarchist not only doesn't contribute anything practical to the fight against the techno-industrial system, it suggests the existence of a series of awful ideological references and affinities. And this is something that it is better to avoid.

civilization want their ideas and/or actions to be taken seriously, by their possible allies as well as by their enemies (and this supposes they therefore make their ideas public through texts), they should make clear that they are not a bunch of irrational, ignorant and/or negligent nobodies, forcing themselves to carry out their work in the most competent way possible (even though this implies going to the trouble of learning or exercising certain linguistic skills and adequately revising and correcting their texts before making them public; as well as forming, documenting, etc., in other non-linguistic aspects).

It must be pointed out, in any case, that in their fifth communique (from December 19, 2011, which claimed the attack on Greenpeace), a notable improvement could be noted in this aspect.

2. Also in relation to the use of language, it is worth pointing out that the excessively insulting and contemptuous tone that ITS use not only to refer to technophiles but also to leftists, to the defenders of other versions of anti-civilization theory, and to people in general, is overboard. It is overboard, not because many of them do not deserve contempt, but because expressing it such an exaggerated way does not contribute anything to the rational comprehension of the text and can give the impression (true or not, the practical effects are the same), that the members of ITS suffer a lack of self-control over their emotions and that the hidden aim of their communiques is, after all, to vent.³ And this could also subtract respectability from their communiques.

3. And, continuing with the practical critique of form, it must be pointed out that ITS' communiques tend to be excessively

³There is certainly reason, in looking at ITS' communiques, to doubt the deep motivation of ITS' actions (or to put it differently: is love of the wild, and the discourse developed based on that value, the real cause of ITS' actions, or only their justification?). But, lacking conclusive facts, drawing conclusions would mean entering into the realm of speculation, so at least for the moment UR will leave this important question open.

long and contain redundancies, digressions and unnecessary fragments (for example, Último Reducto are still asking ourselves what the supposed mathematical formula on the principle of causality in their fourth communique was all about). One could say the fundamentals in many fewer words, and that would improve the reading and the readers' comprehension of it.

In fact, mere common sense should have dictated to ITS the convenience of measuring their words and being brief and concise when claiming their actions, even if only so as not to unnecessarily leave a trail.

That is all regarding the practical importance of taking care of form. Below UR will make some critiques about the content of ITS' communiques.

4. It is obvious that ITS have drawn upon on the work of Ted Kaczynski (alias Unabomber or Freedom Club–FC for short) and UR, among others, in expressing themselves.⁴ But it must be pointed out that, in UR's opinion⁵, ITS have misinterpreted

⁴Much of the discourse and terminology used in their communiques is taken from the writings of Kaczynski and/or UR (although in the cases in which they take UR as a reference, ITS do not say it explicitly). For example, expressions like "surrogate activity" or "power process" are taken from Industrial Society and Its Future (The Unabomber Manifesto) and expression like "System of Domination" or "psychocultural" are characteristic of much of UR's written work.

⁵UR want to clarify that we will draw upon on our own interpretation of Kaczynski's ideas here in order to critique ITS' misinterpretations. The ideal would be for Ted Kaczynski himself to address these points directly, but given the restrictions imposed by his confinement, it is unlikely this will happen. Nevertheless, it is also unlikely that our interpretation of Kaczynski's ideas deviates greatly from the author's original ideas. After more than eight years of exchanging correspondence with Kaczynski and numerous translations of his original texts to Spanish (approved by Ted Kaczynski himself—see Technological Slavery, Feral House, 2010, page 13), UR believe we are capable enough to be able to point out and critique ITS' misinterpretations. In any case, UR are the only ones responsible for any error or deviation there might be in our interpretations with respect to the original meaning of Kaczynski's ideas.

seriously and effectively combat the techno-industrial system should firstly be very clear about what leftism is and learn to identify it (in all of its facets and versions, including the forms of leftism that present themselves as critiques of leftism); and, secondly should very clearly mark their distance from leftism and keep away from it and, vice versa, should keep leftism away from their ideas, discourse, close circle and ranks. Declaring war on leftism is a tactical error because leftism is not worth capturing the attention of those who intend to fight the techno-industrial system beyond the mere critique necessary to keep away from it. The objective that those who really love wild Nature and hate the techno-industrial system and civilization have to focus their limited energies, time and resource on is fighting against the techno-industrial system, not against leftism. All serious opposition to the techno-industrial system has to have the rejection of leftism as a prerequisite and has to keep separated from it if it wants to stay healthy, well-directed and effective, in the same way that it is necessary to also keep away from individuals who are vague, irrational, pusillanimous, lacking in self-control, etc.. But it would be a mistake and a waste to declare war on them. As in the case of relativism, it is one thing to take care not to fall into it and another to dedicate yourself to combating it.

Here this critique ends for now.

Much less do we now believe that the struggle against techno-industrial society could or should be carried out through the education of the people, the rational, generalized spreading and argumentation of ideas against techno-industrial society or civilization, the development of ways of life and social models consistent with those ideas, etc.

Therefore, whenever readers find contradictions between what is said in different works by UR, they should consider that the position expressed in the most recent writing is the one that UR presently defends (or at least the closest to this).

chists or libertarians, and they, almost without exception, are what they are: leftists and/or brainless.

Another detail, although much less important (if ITS' left-ist contamination were reduced to just this it would hardly be a problem), is the use of "x" to try to avoid the masculine gender in certain words. Putting aside that this ridiculous custom comes from certain ludicrous feminist (and therefore left-ist) theories about the macho nature of language and that it is typical of much of leftism, one must note that attempting to eliminate the masculine gender from words denotes a concern with machismo (and therefore inequality, oppression and injustice in general), which is not typical of those who have really broken with leftism and have realized what is really important, what is it worth fighting for (and/or against) and what is only a decoy for keeping rebellion in good hands. Someone who really cares about wild Nature and really rejects techno-industrial society shouldn't give a damn about combating supposed social ills like machismo (especially imaginary "linguistic machismo"). That is not to mention that ITS, consistent with their deficient use of the rules of traditional Spanish grammar, aren't even able to use the "x" adequately (often they do not place it where one supposedly should place it according to this "anti-sexist grammar", and other times they place it where it shouldn't be placed—for example, "lxs individuos").

11. In relation to the topic of leftism, in their 5th communique ITS say that "the war against academics and technologists is declared (that is more than clear and we have shown it) but also the war against leftism". UR is very much in agreement that leftism is a serious threat for those who want to really damage the techno-industrial system, since the true function of leftism is serving that system as a mechanism of self-defense, self-repair and self-perpetuation. Nevertheless, declaring war on leftism, that is, taking combating leftism as an aim, is a tactical error. And it is an error not because leftism does not deserve to be exposed and rejected. In fact, those who really want to

some aspects of Kaczynski's ideas, despite it being obvious that ITS have understood them for the most part (something that cannot be said for most of those who believe themselves in affinity with him, nor for the majority of his critics).

So, in the 2nd communique, ITS lead one to believe that Ted Kaczynski defends the position of "educating people about the technology that will carry us to our destruction," when Kaczynski has defended no such thing. In fact, he has instead expressed that those who try to combat the techno-industrial system should not waste time or energy trying to convince the majority of people that they are right or to join their side (see, for example, *Industrial Society and Its Future*, paragraph 189⁶).

Also in the 2nd communique, ITS say that "[Kaczynski] also says that a change of values must come from an education taught from now on; [and that] Kaczynski has based his ideas on the French "Revolution" in order to make the example of that during the Renaissance many values began to flourish in Europe in many people's minds and just then the uprising in France arose," and again they are wrong. In the first place, when Kaczynski speaks of a change of values as the prelude of a revolution, he is not referring to educating the masses so that they accept the new values, but rather that a prerequisite for revolutions to happen is that some new values and ideas arise which defy the old ones. He does not in any way speak of "educating" the people, nor that such values should be extended to all of society first or simultaneously through education.⁷ And secondly, Kaczynski is educated enough to know that between the Renaissance and the French Revolution several centuries passed

⁶Due to the poor quality of the great majority of the Spanish editions of this work that circulate around here, UR recommend the following edition: *La Sociedad Industrial y Su Futuro*, Editorial Isumatag, Valladolid, 2011. Specifically paragraph 189 is on page 131 of this edition.

⁷See, for example, "The Road to Revolution," in *Technological Slavery*, pg. 222-231, and "The Coming Revolution," in *Textos de Ted Kaczynski*, Último Reducto (Ed.), Reedición Corregida, 2005, pg. 70-80. Idem.

(“just then”??). The Enlightenment (which is what Kaczynski spoke of⁸) is one thing, and the Renaissance is another. If one does not know the difference, how do they expect to be taken seriously?

In the same communique, ITS, err in saying that Kaczynski has said that “now many people is [sic] questioning the use of technology, that they are thinking seriously about abandoning it.” What Kaczynski has said is that there are ever more intelligent people who seriously question technological progress⁹, which is not at all the same. The individuals who are sufficiently intelligent to be able to seriously question technological progress are and will always be a small minority. It is just that, within that minority, there are more and more doing it.

ITS, in their communiques, critique Kaczynski for defending the concept of revolution. UR will leave until later the discussion of what is correct about this critique and here will only focus on pointing out that ITS appear to not be very clear on what the concept of revolution¹⁰ that Ted Kaczynski defends is, since, for example, they explain that all revolutions seek not only to destroy the preexisting society, but also to build a new one. But in *Industrial Society and Its Future*, paragraphs 104 (Fourth Principle of History)¹¹ and 182¹², without going further, FC makes clear that one should not try to create a new society, but only to destroy the preexisting one.¹³

⁸Idem.

⁹Idem.

¹⁰Or however one wants to refer to the hypothetical process by which the collapse of the techno-industrial system would be hastened thanks at least in part to the work of a movement against that system.

¹¹Page 76 of the edition mentioned in footnote 6 of this text.

¹²Page 127 of the edition mentioned in footnote 6 of this text.

¹³In reaching some of these false conclusions, ITS have probably based themselves at least in part on the critical commentaries published by UR in “Writings of Ted Kaczynski”. Nevertheless, it must be pointed out that the interpretation and critique that UR made of some of Kaczynski’s ideas in certain parts of that work (especially in the “critical commentaries”) were in

non-leftists), but one detail or another makes one suspect that in some concrete aspects related to this topic (as well as in other matters like the rejection of relativism, grammar and the use of language, the

understanding of some of Kaczynski’s ideas, the understanding of the concept of revolution, etc.), ITS are, in any case, still too green.

Perhaps the most significant detail of their incomplete rejection of leftism is their “wager on insurrectionalist immediatism” (2nd communique). ITS seem to not be aware that insurrectionalism, like almost any other kind of anarchism, is leftism, however much many insurrectionalists may rant against the “leftists.” Insurrectionalism has not absolutely broken with its historical origins. The insurrectional theoretical basis, terminology and methods are the inheritance of certain branches of anarchism from past ages (and anarchism has almost always been leftism¹⁶). This, which is obvious in “pure” insurrectionalism, continues to be evident also in green or anti-industrial insurrectionalism.¹⁷ And going into terminological and conceptual subtleties such as differentiating between “anarchy” and “anarchism” (something very proper to insurrectionalist discourse, to be sure) does not invalidate it. The discussion over the two terms/concepts doesn’t interest anyone except anar-

¹⁶And even in the rare cases in which it hasn’t been, as may be in the case of Stirner and perhaps some of his followers (and only some), the fact of referring to these ideas with the term “anarchism” has not exactly favored their being recognized as something apart from and completely alien to the majoritarian anarchist currents always based on different libertarian versions of socialism. Normally one puts one (individualists) and the other (collectivists) into the same bag, and takes as given that a minimal affinity exists between any two currents that refer to themselves as anarchists.

¹⁷The CTPAD-FA show that they are more realistic and honest in this sense by also rejecting insurrectionalism and recognizing that they are making their communique public on an insurrectionalist web page only because there isn’t a really non-leftist infrastructure of affinity that they can turn to to do this.

least for some centuries).

9. ITS end their 3rd communique with the phrase: “Nature is good, civilization is bad,” and in their 4th communique they try to explain what they mean. This, like the matter of relativism, is another example of the philosophical tangles that theory and discussions really against techno-industrial society should avoid falling into. Discussing whether Nature is good, whether the techno-industrial system is bad, what is good and what is bad, whether there are absolute or intrinsic values, etc., is completely futile in effectively combating the techno-industrial system. Of course those who really love wild Nature and reject the techno-industrial system and civilization have a morality or ethic, that is, they have some values. They think—consciously or not—that some things are more important or valuable than everything else,¹⁵ and that some other things are incompatible with the important ones—that is, they are bad. And they think that at least some of the bad things are bad in themselves, always and independently from everything else (that is, they are intrinsically and absolutely bad). And their ideological positions arise, obviously, from this moral basis. But it is one thing to have a moral and non-relativist opposition to civilization and it is another to go from there to unnecessarily provoke discussions about morality and get tangled up in them. The first is indispensable and inevitable, the second is superfluous and hardly effective in advancing the struggle against the techno-industrial system.

10. From what one can infer from their communiqués, ITS have demonstrated a fairly good understanding of what leftism consists of in broad strokes (which is much more than can be said of the majority of radicals who believe themselves to be

¹⁵UR does not believe in the concept of good, and we prefer not to use the term “good” and its derivatives. To look somewhat deeper into the reasons for this rejection of the concept of good and UR’s moral basis, see “El mito de la superioridad e inferioridad absolutas como justificación de la dominación,” *Último Reducto* issue 1 B, note 21, page 103.

ITS also say, in the 2nd communique, that “... Kaczynski is in a maximum security prison, isolated from the world that surrounds him since 1996; surely

if he left the prison in this very moment, he would realize the error he has made in writing such a vague declaration...” It seems that some of those who speak publicly about Kaczynski without having tried beforehand to even really have contact with him, believe and try to make others believe that Kaczynski is completely incommunicado, totally isolated from the outside. It is necessary to explain that Ted Kaczynski has not only

some cases not totally correct. Time and deeper knowledge of Kaczynski’s ideas have made our understanding of them rather more exact at the present than six months ago. It also seems that ITS has probably taken Writings of Ted Kaczynski and some other old texts by UR (for example, *Último Reducto* issue 1, spring 2002) as a reference for their critiques of the individuals and groups that are against the techno-industrial system and defend the concept of revolution. But we must point out that, even though we still think the fundamental values and ideas (dealing with the autonomy of the wild, rejection of the techno-industrial society and civilization and disdain for leftism and hippie-ism) expressed in our texts prior to *Leftism: A Function of Pseudo-critique and Pseudo-revolution in Techno-industrial Society* (2007) are correct, we no longer identify with many of the other ideas expressed in those texts, so it could be that ITS are, at least in reference to UR, criticizing obsolete positions. For example, today UR continue to believe that it is necessary to construct a serious movement that can aspire to effectively oppose the techno-industrial system when the time comes (a point that, as we have said, will be discussed later on), but we no longer believe that movement should refer to itself “revolutionary” (nor that it should call that fight a “revolution”), for purely practical reasons: the term “revolutionary”, due to the use it has been given across history and by those who have used it, inevitably carries a semantic cargo that will always bear more problems than benefits for a movement contrary to techno-industrial society that really intends to be effective. The world and history are full of self-denominated “revolutionaries” and of “revolutions” of every kind, and practically none of them is really compatible with a serious and effective opposition to the techno-industrial system. Calling the struggle against the techno-industrial system a “revolution” means favoring the principles and ends of those who seriously oppose the techno-industrial system being misinterpreted and many undesirable self-proclaimed revolutionaries feeling affinity with them when in reality they should be kept at a distance.

kept correspondence with people from different countries from the beginning of his incarceration, he also has access to various publications from the written press and the prison's library. And, at least for several years, he has had contact with other prisoners and received visitors. If he was misinformed it would not be primarily due to his seclusion. In fact, in his writing and correspondence he has frequently shown himself to be much better informed of how industrial society functions than many of those who erroneously believe that he is isolated from the world.

5. The scientific rigor of ITS' arguments often leaves much to be desired.

The most obvious, though not the only, example of this is that ITS leads one to understand in their 2nd communique that earthquakes are the product of disequilibrium produced in the Earth by the techno-industrial system, without supporting this idea with empirical data, nor even citing references to research that can point in that direction.

In fact, on many occasions, references to serious works and studies are left lacking in ITS' communiqués.

6. Even though going deeply into philosophical discussions is not usually very useful or practical in effectively combating the techno-industrial system, it is necessary to develop and have a minimally solid philosophical basis on which to construct an ideology and an appropriate discourse. And logical contradictions in one's discourse are not exactly a sign of solidity.

For example, ITS should make clear what their real position is toward "absolute truth" (or, what is the same, their position toward relativism) rather than expound on it in such an obviously sloppy and contradictory way as they did in their second and forth communiqués. In their second communique (22 May 2011), ITS wield the extremely worn-out relativist cliché that consists of accusing others of believing they "have the absolute truth" in order to criticize the "anti-civilizationists" and

rious than when they fight without hope. And as we have seen, there is hope even, though it is remote.

As for non-industrial and/or uncivilized utopia, it must be pointed out that utopia and the design or creation of a new society (or world) prior to the destruction of the pre-existing society (or world) is completely naive. It never goes as expected. To dream that after the fall of techno-industrial society a new world without civilization or domination will arise is to not absolutely understand how the world, societies and human nature work. It is not likely that techno-industrial society will at some point collapse (in a way that leaves a habitable environment for the human beings who would probably survive), but it is possible. It is completely impossible that civilization and domination would disappear if human beings survived after that collapse. Wherever ecosystems permit, great and complex new societies would again arise over time (if they did disappear completely in the collapse), and human beings would continue to be human and behave as such in any kind of society, level of technological development, or ecological environment. To a greater or lesser extent, while the world is the world and human beings are human, there will continue to be injustices and abuses, there will continue to be hierarchies, there will continue to be at least certain kinds of imposition and submission, etc. Forever. And even so, that is not a reason to not take as a reference certain forms of society, certain forms of life and certain levels of technological development that have been the least harmful to the autonomy of wild Nature (including human nature). We know that human nature is the product of the evolutionary adaptation produced over hundreds of millennia of hunter-gatherer nomadic existence. That is the form of life we are biologically programmed for. It is not a matter of dreaming that the world will go back to being populated solely by hunter-gatherer nomads again. But we have to keep in mind that, if techno-industrial society collapses at some point, some human beings would be able to return to living in that way (at

It is probable that this crisis will happen sooner or later, since the system is presently faced with various serious threats to its survival (from global ecological problems to problems of maintaining its internal functioning and structure) and it is not clear that it will be able to overcome them all easily and without weakening itself. But a movement against the techno-industrial system that is organized and capable enough will not fall from the sky the day this crisis happens (if it does happen), instead it is something that needs to be created beforehand by means of a patient and laborious process of recruitment and organization. This movement, if it manages to constitute and fortify itself enough, could even assist in the arrival of the crisis. In fact, it must try to do this, since the later this crisis arrives, the less likely it will be for something wild to survive the demolition.

Of course, all of this is only a possibility. It could be that a serious crisis will never happen. It could be that, although this crisis happens, the collapse of the techno-industrial society does not arrive and this society overcomes. It could be that a movement is never created that is organized and strong enough to annihilate the techno-industrial system when the opportunity arrives... But also, there also exists the possibility for these things to happen and for the techno-industrial system to be destroyed in time. And this possibility should not be discarded lightly. Not only because it could be the only opportunity to manage to end with the techno-industrial system, but because it is not absurd. It could happen. And whether this possibility happens depends in part on the attitude toward it (defeatism or hope) adopted by those who today declare themselves against the techno-industrial system.

On the other hand, between fighting without hope of victory, just to not surrender, and fighting with the hope of achieving victory (as small as the possibility of this happening may be), there is a great difference. Human beings normally try much harder, and with greater tenacity, when they hope to be victo-

“primitivists” who defend the concept of revolution, while in their fourth communique (21 September 2011) ITS try to criticize relativism and admit that they consider “Wild Nature and Individual Autonomy as an absolute and objective truth.” That is, ITS, in their second communique, brazenly fall into what they criticize in the fourth. And vice-versa: in the second communique they criticize what they defend in the fourth. This inconsistency does not reflect well on ITS’ capacity for logical reasoning, or at least their capacity for correctly and logically expressing their ideas.

But there is something more to say about this whole matter of the defense or denial of the existence of absolute truths. It is a useless and impractical debate when it comes to effectively combating the techno-industrial system. All the time and energy invested in this debate are a waste. Obviously, those who are really against techno-industrial society and civilization and who really love wild Nature do not believe that everything is relative (and, however they call it and whether or not they recognize it, they always take certain things as absolute truths). But not being relativist and knowing that relativism is a sign of pseudo-intelligence, pseudo-rebellion and/or lack of honesty are one thing, and it is another to go around explicitly and spontaneously declaring that absolute truths exist. The first is indispensable, the second superfluous (it only leads us to unproductive digressions and debates). The aim is not to combat relativism. It is enough to not fall into it.

7. Even though one cannot rule out that nanotechnology may manage to pose a serious threat (because of the risk of the so-called “grey goo” or something similar), the distance that exists between the nanotubes and similar nanostructures of the present and those invasive, intelligent nanomachines that are completely autonomous and capable of self-replicating directly by means of the materials of their surroundings—the ones presented to us in science fiction novels or the futuristic speculations of some technophiles—is enormous and will probably be

much delayed in being traveled, if it ever manages to be. There are much more imminent threats such as the progressive hybridization of artificial systems with non-artificial systems (for example, the gradual hybridization between human beings and informatic and robotic systems which, in a certain way and degree, is already happening at present: cerebral implants, the implantation of limbs with artificial intelligence, growing psychological and physical dependence on the Internet and mobile phone, etc.), or the mere substitution or elimination of the latter by the former (something that has been increasingly happening over thousands of years and is extending and worsening with every new technological advance. It could be that to a certain point some branches of nanotechnology (those applied to genetic engineering, for example) form an active part in these imminent threats along with many other modern technologies, but they do not constitute the principal core of the threats, and perhaps they are not essential for those threats to be made reality. If one takes all of this into account, perhaps ITS should have better chosen the immediate target for some of their attacks.

8. In their communiques, ITS say they are not defeatist. If by “defeatist” we understand the attitude of abandoning struggle because one considers it already lost, ITS are not defeatist, since they have not abandoned their struggle. But if we understand “defeatist” to mean the attitude that denies in advance all possibility of victory when in reality it isn’t clear that no possibility exists, ITS are defeatist, as indicated by their way of understanding the concept of anti-technology revolution (or whatever one wants to call the hypothetical process of demolishing the techno-industrial system, assisted at least in part by a movement). Let us analyze ITS’ way of understanding the anti-technology struggle. It would seem that for ITS there are only two general possibilities of thinking about the struggle against the techno-industrial system: the illusory, or “revolutionary,” consists, according to ITS, of believing that a move-

ment against techno-industrial society must be created that is capable of destroying that society through its mere activity (also, according to ITS, of constructing a utopian new society that isn’t industrial or civilized) and the realist one, also according to them, consists of attacking the techno-industrial system with the available means without hoping or pursuing its destruction and without organizing any movement. The second strategy, to call it something, would be the one that ITS follows; the first, according to ITS, is the one followed by all those individuals and groups that are against the techno-industrial system and are the target of ITS’ critiques in their communiques. UR will not deny that many of those who declare themselves against the techno-industrial system defend¹⁴ proposals that are extremely naive, inefficient and unrealistic about how to carry out the struggle against that system and about what is worth hoping for and pursuing and what isn’t as regards that struggle. Even so, ITS seem not to realize the extreme simplicity of the dichotomy they propose. Between fighting without hope, only to never give an inch and to die with our feet planted (launching attacks like ITS’), and fighting for a chimera, overestimating our own abilities (believing in the future arrival of non-industrial or even uncivilized utopias and/or believing that the mere activity of a movement against the techno-industrial society will result in its demolition), there is room for other possibilities that ITS completely passes over.

To begin with, the techno-industrial system at present is certainly too strong to be destroyed solely or principally through the activity of those who fight against it. But in other circumstances, the situation could be different. In the future, the techno-industrial system could suffer a serious crisis, a great enough weakening to cause its own collapse, or at least as to make it susceptible to being successfully destroyed by a movement that was strong and well-organized enough at that time.

¹⁴Here it is worth saying, “we have defended.” See footnote 8.