



Table of Contents

- What does the movement need right now? by...
 - D.B.
 - Nayla Agameya
 - Marshall Sharp
 - Sophia
 - Jorge Clúni
- The Snoqualmie Mill
- Effective Action in Time of Crisis
- In Memoriam of Dave Foreman

What does the movement need right now?

The following is a series of brief responses to the same prompt: What does the anti-tech movement need right now? What are you doing to contribute? What can other people do to contribute?

We encourage readers to submit their own responses to antitechcollective@protonmail.com to be considered for the next newsletter.

by D.B.

What the anti-tech movement needs most right now is simply for interested parties to take seriously and attempt genuinely to answer the question of what the movement needs most (right now). There are a few ways to interpret this question, though namely:

1. “What does the movement need to do in particular to achieve something specific?”; or
2. “What does the movement need in order to do anything at all?”

The difference can be clarified by analogy. The first interpretation is like me asking myself what ingredients I need to make bread as well as what steps I need to follow to successfully bake a loaf of bread. The second interpretation is akin to me asking myself what I, as a living being, need prior to doing anything other than merely being alive, i.e. for my health. It is likewise akin to asking what plants need to grow, or a fire needs to burn. The first question is a practical question; the second is existential, or, perhaps, metaphysical in nature. The first presumes that the second is already answered, that “the movement” is already capable of achieving something.

Assuming that an anti-tech movement exists solely to bring about an anti-tech revolution, I could answer the first interpretation of the original question by listing off concrete tasks and activities that help create the conditions necessary for the revolution (for example, Kaczynski in ISAIF writes that we need to 1) increase social tensions and 2) create and propagate

a revolutionary anti tech ideology). I can answer the second interpretation by saying that in order for the anti-tech movement to exist at all, more than one person needs to believe in the possibility and necessity of an anti-tech revolution, and these people need to organize themselves in such a way as to become effective in bringing about the revolution.

My assumption does not map to reality, however. Not all people nominally a part of “the movement” understand “anti-tech revolution” the same way. This precludes the existence of a movement that exists to bring about a revolution. That is, there can be no anti-tech revolution until there is an anti-tech movement, though there surely exist thoughts and discussions about, or movement towards an actual anti-tech movement. This is the state of the “movement” as of right now as I see it: we have more a diffuse emergent sociological phenomenon than a focused and intentional historical force. There are several or many actual anti-tech sparks, but, as of yet, there is no actual anti-tech fire; this fire can only hope to catch once enough capable and dedicated individuals come together to pave the way to revolution.

Entertaining multiple understandings of “anti-tech revolution” prevents a group from being (truly and effectively) revolutionary because activities of the group will not be dedicated towards one revolutionary end, but multiple ultimately mutually exclusive ones. Individuals within such a group or independently may very well be potential revolutionaries, but talk of movement implies social movement, which further implies cooperation and group effort aimed at larger social influence. The actual movement needs an anti-tech group with a unified understanding of and conviction in the possibility and necessity of an anti-tech revolution. This is the primary “meta-need” of the actual anti tech movement right now with respect to the current “movement”—that is, the loose association of disparate collections of people who find anti-technological thinking persuasive to varying extents.

Then there are secondary meta-needs. For example, in order for this theoretical group to begin, it (logically) needs members. Recruitment is thus something required to achieve the primary meta-need. In the early stages of the actual

movement's life, recruitment will almost certainly resemble networking and communication between those already involved in the extant proto-movement (which includes all relevant and tangentially related groups and individuals) who share the same understanding of anti-tech revolution. Alternatively, recruitment might instead be called "self segregation" or maybe "voluntary association." Whatever it is, radicals with the same revolutionary aims need to come together before looking outwards as in the more traditional sense of "recruitment". This more traditional recruitment would be not a meta-need for the group's very existence, but a practical necessity for achieving larger concrete goals.

Another meta-need would be the need for effective organization. At this stage, the theoretical anti-tech group agrees upon an understanding of revolution, as well as the possibility and necessity of it. So, how do the members of this group communicate? Is there a hierarchy? What is that hierarchy? Do members meet in person? Are there requirements for membership? What are the duties for different types of members? Under this heading we might also emphasize the meta-need for ideological unity, cohesion, concision, purity, and so forth. This might already follow from a unified understanding of revolution, but the justifications for that revolution could have hitherto been overlooked. It is important to a group's strength and effectiveness that members, especially founding and leading members, fervently believe the same things while being able to justify their beliefs.

There are probably other things that could be called "meta-needs" as I've been calling them, but the basic idea is that a group logically needs people, and a revolutionary group further needs people who believe that something contrary to the status quo is possible and necessary to bring about with their efforts as a group. The movement starts existing when the revolutionary group starts existing. The movement needs most right now for that revolutionary group to be born.

For my part during our proto-movement phase, I have persisted in the face of disappointment, I have continually voiced my Kaczynskian alignment, I have been vocal about the need for serious discussion about what "revolution" means to people, and I have tried establishing communications and in person interactions with individuals to whom I've been exposed who are, in my view, similarly radical.

While still in the proto-movement phase, there may yet be some concrete steps or activities "we"—that is, as interested individuals, as groups, and as a loose collection of groups—could take or do that would expedite the creation of the actual anti-tech group and thus movement:

1. Organize a (digital or in-person) gathering of at least representatives from all known anti-tech groups—possibly including those groups who are tangentially related to anti-tech thought—wherein stronger communication and relationships could be established, ideally among the most radical segments of each group;

2. Ask members to define and debate key terminology and ideas, including the nature of the revolution;
3. Ask members to create a list of texts that all serious members should be required to be familiar with;
4. Organize in-person gatherings of members of individual anti-tech groups so as to foster stronger relationships and communications; and
5. Establish some set of requirements to differentiate serious members from casual members, and ensure that serious members across groups are in communication with one another.

It is time for at least some of us to get serious about the threat of the technological system and to start dedicating the time and energy to actually achieve the anti-tech revolution.

* * *

by Nayla Agameya

Wow, It feels like it's been a lifetime since I've conducted an in depth search in my repository of thoughts in regards to what the movement needs the most today. More often than not, you hear the saying 'try less, do better.' But in this case, it couldn't be farther from the truth because the lack of action is actually propelling the beast further, and we as a group need to instill a mindset that encompasses constant movement and action towards the enlightening of others pertaining to the slippery slope we are currently saddling on. People are ignorant, they might not be fully aware of the shortcomings of everyday interactions they have with technology, and each single transaction contributes more to the ever growing beast that is technology. There is no shame in not knowing, but there is indeed a shame in not finding out. We need to be this voice that further educates the masses on how the factors influencing their lives have ill intentions are single handedly curating human demise. Once they are utterly aware of this bleak intention, they can then help aid in this movement, because alas, there is strength in numbers.

I think vocalism is essential in this stage of the process, for people to profess their concerns and speak what's in their heart, is where real change comes to fruition. If people are reluctant to speak and engage, it will make it all the harder to enact palpable change. Thus, I suggest dire engagement on any and all platforms that unite like minded individuals with a single purpose.

Secondly, I strongly recommend people block out time in their busy schedules to enlighten themselves further on the illdoings of technology, and how day in and day out this antagonist is haunting their every move, quite implicitly. People often are ignorant to understand the fact that each and everyday that technology reigns supreme, is a day lost in the name of restoring nature to its original and virgin state.

Lastly, supplementary to vocalization and enlightenment I believe that action on an independent basis should be fully exercised, irrespective of how group action is pursued. Gargantuan action is preceded by micro action. Alas,

as the saying goes, people are so concerned with changing the world, that they sometimes neglect the fact that to change the world, they have to change themselves.

* * *

by Marshall Sharp

As of now, the anti-tech movement seems to desperately require communication, trust and accountability, in this precise order. To carry out this revolution we need a higher level of organization and commitment which can only be obtained by building our nucleus of members and beginning to hash out the details of direct, legal action. Time is of the essence. The technological-industrial system is quickly approaching a crossroads at which it will experience a critical moment that will likely determine if it will begin to rapidly collapse or slowly adapt and survive. Anti-tech revolutionaries must be prepared to take advantage of this moment and attempt to sway the system toward a state of collapse.

Our first of these tasks is to open up more secure and personal lines of communication. Many pockets of aspiring revolutionaries have met each other by way of the internet (especially in recent years), but have neglected to use more personal and secure methods of communication as they develop relationships with their fellows. Pockets of legal anti-tech resistance ought to actively work towards establishing regular in-person communications, as this type of communication is most secure and fosters trust if carried out appropriately. There are obvious difficulties with this, but these ought to be resolved because the effort is worth the trouble. A secondary but less ideal form of communication is using postal services to send letters amongst ourselves. Online/telephone communication may in some cases be too convenient to pass up because of how rapid it is, but this method should be limited only to what is deemed absolutely necessary and all possible security measures should be taken.

These suggestions on how to approach revolutionary communications are primarily designed to build trust between individuals and groups that are committed to dismantling the technological system. A prominent lack of trust exists among revolutionary-minded individuals and groups due to the fact that there are agents of the system who actively work to disrupt our movement. As this movement continues to organize itself and flourish, these attempts at disruption will become increasingly persistent and sneaky. They do not want us to trust each other and so they encourage paranoia, doubt and fear. We must fight these feelings inside of ourselves; otherwise they system will be at an advantage.

What can simultaneously build trust and come out of this trust is to hold each other accountable. The rudimentary level of communication and trust that we already have should be used to build out values and ways of living that match up with what many of us verbally claim to believe in. This does not mean that we should shun everyone who is unable or unwilling to drop everything and go live in a cabin in the

woods; this is not feasible for the purposes of the revolution. However, a certain level of "walking the walk" ought to be expected of any serious revolutionary. The methods of holding one another accountable can be more thoroughly discussed elsewhere, but a simple method for this could be observing how involved in surrogate activities (as described in ISAIF para. 38-41) any particular individual or group may be and deciding how to address this behavior. We all have our vices and weaknesses, especially considering that most of us have been significantly influenced by the system since birth. But if it is observed by a group of revolutionaries that one or more members is not actively striving to fulfill real goals (personal and revolutionary) and are not responding well to constructive criticism, then they should be expelled from participation either permanently (if the case is sufficiently severe) or until they are willing to behave according to the established revolutionary values.

Many other things are needed as well, but in my opinion most of these things will likely fall into place from the preceding suggestions. I encourage these thoughts to be scrutinized and criticized, because I may have said something false along the way and I am open to my ideas being refined. My plan is to expound about these ideas further, but in considering some of the factors at play (such as what secure online communication really looks like), it may be best to leave some of these details in hands more capable.

* * *

by Sophia

While I believe that the most important thing for the nascent anti-tech movement to be doing right now is to start organizing itself, I'm sure this will be touched on extensively by other ATC members. To avoid redundancy, I will revisit a concept that Kaczynski briefly touches on in *Technological Slavery* (pg. 361-363): the potential usefulness of creating a revolutionary myth once the rational foundation of the movement has been established.

As the anti-tech movement grows, it is worth considering the utility of developing what Kaczynski terms a revolutionary "myth", which might be better understood as a set of ideals and values (i.e., an ideology). Kaczynski posits that anti-tech revolutionaries could strategically construct a set of values that would appeal to those who are frustrated by their dissatisfactions caused by the techno-industrial system. While revolutionaries should not be focusing their efforts on changing society's superstructure - that is, it's predominant beliefs and ideals, which are instilled in individuals through a vast amount of propaganda and indoctrination that revolutionaries will never feasibly have the resources to counter - they should not outright dismiss the idea of developing a strong revolutionary "myth" of their own. A concrete set of values is of importance when hoping to draw in the appropriate individuals to a revolutionary movement. The correct "myth" would ideally spur a deep emotional investment that, when paired with a rational

underlying ideological framework, would keep revolutionaries loyal and determined. Although wild Nature as a main ideal has already taken shape among the most prominent anti-tech thinkers today, there is still room for the anti-tech movement to further define their ideals and play into the more fantastical aspects of wild Nature. Albeit perhaps not the most pressing concern at the moment, the more spiritual or sublime side of wild Nature seems sidelined in anti-tech theory almost entirely. Most theoretical work around the subject of wild Nature as an ideal is hyper-rational, only ever briefly acknowledging the more mystical aspects of wild Nature that already have rather broad appeal among the general public. While the existing body of anti-tech work appeals to rational-minded individuals that will ideally be forming the core of a movement against techno-industrial society, it is necessary to keep in mind that there is an aspect of human psychology that needs, or at the very least, benefits from, a belief in the "irrational". This could potentially be mended by making room for a more simplistic and black-and-white view of the nature vs. machine dichotomy we are facing, with wild Nature being "good" (or at least, of having intrinsic or absolute value) and technology being "evil" (an autonomous force that seeks to expand indefinitely until wild Nature is no longer left). Since discussion around such topics is woefully lacking, this is an area to which the incipient anti-tech movement may want to give some attention to, especially when taking into account how common it is to see individuals deride the "spiritual emptiness" of modern life (i.e., life under the techno-industrial system, separate from wild Nature). Anti-tech revolutionaries could use the spiritual emptiness and cultural homogeneity that results from living under the techno-industrial system to their advantage by providing a sort of belief system for these disaffected individuals.

Like many issues surrounding the steps that a proposed revolutionary movement to destroy techno-industrial society could (or should) take, there isn't any single concrete way to approach this issue. Revolutionaries should keep in mind that there is a very real possibility that the movement against the techno-industrial system does not grow into a "mass" movement, but instead remains a small core of committed individuals. In such a case, a revolutionary "myth" (understood here as propaganda that appeals to emotions and aesthetics, and takes advantage of mass dissatisfaction with modern life) may not be of any significant importance strategically. In addition to this, care should also be taken so as to keep the committed core of anti-tech thinkers more rational-minded rather than letting them get carried away by the more whimsical elements of nature and spirituality, though we don't seem to be in grave danger of this becoming a serious issue anytime soon.

Broadly speaking, what I would encourage others to do at the moment is to familiarize themselves with anti-tech theory, not just through reading and analyzing the existing literature but also through developing their own voice. Taking time to practice articulating your ideas will help not only in expressing your position to others, but also in developing a

stronger conviction in your beliefs. Understand that you will get much further working with other individuals than by working alone; reach out to other anti-tech individuals and start forming connections now. Due to the instability of the techno-industrial system, there will be serious crises of the system. When these future crises arrive the anti-tech movement will need to already be cohesive and strong so as to take advantage of them. If a strong enough movement is created soon enough, then such a movement could also bring about such crises, therefore ending the techno-industrial system's subjugation of wild Nature sooner rather than later.

As for what I am doing now, it's mostly the same as what I outlined above: organizing and seeking out sensible anti-tech individuals. In addition, I'm keeping informed on conservation projects near me, aiding when I can and trying to form connections there.

* * *

by Jorge Clúni

Motivated to liberate wild Nature and restore (the potential for) human freedom, a serious anti-tech movement will set out to achieve a worldwide revolution to eliminate the modern technologies enabling techno-industrial society. To this end, several components are required for creating a group worthy of gaining quality members. A non-comprehensive list includes:

Definition of purpose

Without ambiguity or dissension, the group must firmly know what constitutes the enemy that is Technology; with that agreed, a clear route to success can be cemented.

Develop a flag, and an anthem

Both can touch primal elements within people, motivating beyond mere words to solidify a member's commitment, dedication, loyalty, and sacrifice for and to the cause. Both should be memorable, distinctive, and inspiring.

Create a guiding myth

Firmly establish in the simplest terms possible a defensible concept which cannot be reconciled within the system, and which explains the causes of the prevailing turmoil and unhappiness within techno-industrial society.

Produce effective propaganda

Unable to out-compete the system's immense propaganda, anti-tech propagandists must decide on and prioritize targets, and strategize the most useful avenues for delivering influence to them.

Form a group structure

Some hierarchy is essential, and should be comprised of respected people overseeing tasks and volunteers under their direction, not persons imposed upon but accepted by dedicated members who trust in the commitment and ability of those above them.

Meet others in-person

Humans connect and bond best in proximity, face-to-face, able to look in one another's eyes; charisma and affection and trust are often greatly dampened (or indiscernible) in long-distance communications.

Make a show of commitment

Any group taking risks to transform society needs members to demonstrate loyalty with an oath (at minimum), or other greater (perhaps physical) pledge displaying dedication to the group.

Deliver exemplary leadership

Assume responsibilities for subordinates, issue assignments, enforce accountability and be accountable. Great leaders, knowing their group's (and their own) limitations and strengths, can motivate others to perform as needed, guiding and conducting their groups; not maintaining power so much as being maintained in their roles.

Work toward recruitment

The leadership core will be numerically limited, formed of people with excellent temperament and capabilities. With this committed cadre established, propagating the simplified ideology to the wider public may include recruitment of "soldiers".

Begin public-facing action

Members acting in the name of the group must be approved to represent the group; leadership will know not only all actions undertaken but the goal(s) of each.

The foregoing includes tasks to be completed in order to mark a group's existence, achievements which signal its first steps, and others which let the group run after walking. Some tasks are best done by one person or a very limited collaborative effort, while others require multiple people to be realized.

As systemic crises loom on the horizon for the worldwide technological system, the list above should provide direction toward creating foundational requisites for seeing a serious revolutionary movement advance the uncompromising, revolutionary anti-tech cause.

* * *

The Snoqualmie Mill

by Sophia

From 1917 up until the early 1990s, the Snoqualmie Mill site was home to a lively lumber mill. Developed on what was previously an ecologically diverse wetland area, the mill was a record-breaking site that showed no concern for the environment surrounding it, with a lake carved out from part of the Snoqualmie River (to store lumber and other materials) and mill workers that would dump hazardous materials directly onto the land beneath their feet. These discarded contaminants would then collect in the artificial lake, creating a heavily toxic catchment. Visiting the Snoqualmie

Mill site today, however, you would find that the site has come full circle. What was once a hub of industrial activity, and a classic example of the techno-industrial system's overreach into nature, has slowly recovered and exists now as a wetland habitat that houses a growing number of osprey, loons, cormorants, and many at-risk species. Most strikingly, trumpeter swans - a threatened species that had a worldwide population of less than 70 birds in 1932 - have been documented at this site as soon as 18 years after the lumber mill halted their operations. These swans are largely considered to be an "indicator species"; since these birds only settle in high-quality wetland habitats, this means that their presence in a wetland area serves as an indication that the area is healthy and thriving. As of today, the Snoqualmie Mill site stands as a testament to the resilience of wild Nature, the ecological recovery of this area serving as an inspiring tale of how life can thrive even after tremendous techno-industrial disruption.

While the Mill site currently exists as the largest undeveloped land in unincorporated King county, it is now being threatened by a proposed industrial development. Snoqualmie Mill Ventures is aggressively pushing for an approximately 1.85 million square ft development of this area that would have far-reaching consequences for the wildlife of Snoqualmie Valley. Components of the Commercial Industrial Plan propose transforming a large portion of the area into a collection of offices, shops, apartments, and light industrial buildings. While the devastation of nature that this development would entail is concerning enough on its own, there is also a proven track record of this company failing to comply with environmental and ethical standards regarding their developments. As of July 2020, the company proposing to develop this site received over fifty reported violations for failing to comply with the Department of Ecology standards¹. As of 2021, the Waste Action Project of Seattle filed a lawsuit against the Mill site's owners for numerous mishandlings of stormwater discharge that resulted in toxic materials seeping directly toward the Snoqualmie River². Since the developers have not suitably dealt with the pollution on their own, the Waste Action Project is suing in an attempt to force the developers to deal with the pollution.

Although the ecosystem may have recovered significantly since the early 1990s, the contamination put into the environment by the lumber mill remains. A Site Hazard Assessment conducted in August of 2021 by the Department of Ecology found documentation of numerous hazardous contaminants, declaring the site to have "one of the highest risks of hazards to human and environmental health in the State of Washington"³.

Some areas of this site are so highly toxic that they are even fenced off so as to prevent people from going into them. The contaminants alone are not the only environmental issue surrounding this site: the development of the Mill site would result in the displacement of (on top of toxicity to) wildlife, as well as increasing noise and light pollution. There are also

potential negative environmental effects involving flood risks, stormwater storage, and water availability. The proximity of the site to the Snoqualmie river poses a grave threat not only to the river, but may endanger all connecting waterways as well, from the Snoqualmie river to the Salish Sea. With the history of environmental recklessness that this company has exhibited, it raises the question of whether or not they would handle the toxicity of this site at all appropriately.

Snoqualmie Community Action Network (SCAN) came together in 2017 to discuss their concerns regarding this development, and have been diligently working since to halt this proposal. Their work has resulted in major changes to the proposed development plan that eliminated a portion of the more disruptive elements of this proposal, such as a proposed 5,000 person amphitheater. Unfortunately, however, the development is currently pressing forward with strong support from the City Council. Without further fundraising, pursuing further legal action against the developers of this proposed site will not be feasible.

If you would like to support SCAN in their fight to keep the Mill site wild, we encourage you to donate to their cause at the following link: <https://savesnoqualmiemill.com/donate>

If you would like to take other action against this development, you can also write to relevant politicians and organizations about your concerns surrounding the proposed development. SCAN has provided a template for you to use, which is attached alongside this newsletter. For whom to send your letter/email to, navigate to this website and click the drop-down menu titled “Speak Up”: <https://sites.google.com/view/millsiteinfo-scan/contact-us/other-ways-to-help>

-
1. Washington State Department of Ecology. (2021). <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/paris/ComplianceAndViolations/ViolationsAndPermitTriggers.aspx?PermitNumber=WAR303314&StartDate=7/1/1981&EndDate=12/31/2020>
 2. Waste Action Project v. Snoqualmie Mill Ventures LLC et al. (2022, October 26). Justia Dockets. <https://dockets.justia.com/docket/washington/wawdce/2:2021cv00240/296600>
 3. Washington State Department of Ecology. (2021). Site Hazard Assessment. <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/cleanupsearch/document/104498>

* * *

Effective Action in Time of Crisis (abridged)

To save Nature, stay on target — against Technology.

Humans need only wild Nature, yet we're sold a lie: that we must have new ways to extend technological progress, but without creating CO₂. Whose interest are so many young people being deceived to serve?

by Jorge Clúni (November 6th, 2022)



Altering wild Nature allows for the furtherance of technological society: space junk, global economic markets, autonomous surveillance and warfare, addictive gadgets for the kids, with jobs and homes and food for all of civilization. Many people have been duped into advocating for this nightmare, such is the system's neatest trick.

“It is conceivable that our environmental problems (for example) may some day be settled through a rational, comprehensive plan, but if this happens it will be only because it is in the long-term interest of the system to solve these problems. But it is not in the interest of the system to preserve freedom or small-group autonomy. On the contrary, it is in the interest of the system to bring human behavior under control to the greatest possible extent.”

—“**Industrial Society and Its Future**” (1995) paragraph 139

Recent actions by [Just Stop Oil](#) have allowed them to eclipse [Extinction Rebellion](#) (XR) — no surprise given how scattered is XR in their stated goals. The three main demands of XR are all vague and impossible to judge as achieved; to have goals misperceived as accomplished is to suffer a *false* sense of success, and **having abstract concepts as goals undercuts the willingness of people to sacrifice for results which are neither easily assessed nor irreversible.** How does XR determine success, when the UK government concedes all three demands? When will they re-assess their performance and adjust? What if the Citizens' Assembly demanded by XR decides to continue fossil fuel extraction? **XR's fatal flaw is to not have one single, unambiguous and irreversible goal.**

Just Stop Oil generated much publicity by performing attention-grabbing, illegal stunts each day of October. But more “awareness” has dubious value, as negative news can cause

[despair due to a perception of impotence](#), leading to a willful disregard. Putting its members through the court system, Just Stop Oil seeks from the British government “a statement that it will immediately halt all future licensing and consents for the exploration, development and production of fossil fuels in the UK.” But imagine that after your tireless efforts, being jailed and dealing with consequences, you win the concession — and then the next government in power simply reverses course. (Some recent examples: [2005](#), [2009](#), [2017](#), [2021](#), [2022](#)). Would you simply have a homicidal psychopath *pledge* not to use his chainsaw to kill, or would you best restrain the maniac and *destroy* the powerful chainsaw? **Any change(s) conceded must be obvious and irreversible.**

Another problem for Just Stop Oil is that they don't know what they want to accomplish. This is an intrinsic problem common to coalitions and mass-movements, which usually have divergent (often enough, *competing*) interests and goals among members. One JSO activist [claimed](#) that Britain's present oil leases would supply the nation for eight years — highly doubtful, given the constantly-increasing demand of techno-industrial society for electricity and motor fuels — during which time “a just and fair transition to a renewable future” must be undertaken (whatever that might be understood to be), with “training for people who work in the fossil fuel industry,” and “insulation of British homes and... subsidized public transport.” So **JSO accepts burning oil for another eight years — an assault on Nature which ought need no explanation** — if *more* people are fed and rapidly moved long distances.² Clearly the group (more accurately Just Stop Oil in Eight Years) doesn't want to disrupt “economic growth” and “prosperity” as is necessary.

In typical fashion, JSO takes up every cause and issue; will they draw any line?³ Surely they want also to stop racism and sexism and protect indigenous rights, etc., [just like the oblivious passengers aboard the ship](#)... If you enjoy a lengthy list of goals with radical rhetoric, look to [Deep Green Resistance](#) and their litany of issues: patriarchy, White supremacy, colonialism, mental health, worker exploitation, worker solidarity, etc. How does DGR judge the success of stopping patriarchy and the rest? Shall we vaguely “resist” such abstractions forever? Have they no priority among that list? Why does “Just Stop Oil” hold goals of ending hunger, *and* reducing ‘energy’ costs, *and* deploying renewable energy-generating technologies, *and* improving (or lowering fares for) public transportation? Appeasing more people reduces revolutionary potential by *decreasing* social tensions and *pacifying* the population as well as the plethora of pharmaceuticals now available. Thus leftists have been labelled **“a kind of fire extinguisher that douses and quenches any nascent revolutionary movement.”** ([p. 6](#))

Problems of *distraction* and *abstraction* plague JSO's German counterpart, [Last Generation](#), who [demands](#) “a speed limit of

100 km/h on German autobahns and the introduction of affordable local public transport with a €9 ticket” fare under threat of “maximum disruption to public order... in a disciplined, non-violent manner. ...we will do everything we can to ensure that no one is harmed.” To think that causing mild irritation might force government capitulation is absurd: the German state today faces terrorist movements willing to employ violence and avoid capture. **So it is certain the government will not concede** LG's demands, because to do so would show weakness, setting a precedent to encourage others seeking social changes without using electoral parameters of Democracy.

But if *seriously* pressed the government *could* enact the demanded adjustments, precisely because *the system would not be impeded* by them.⁴ This shows how worthless are those goals, not only abstract and beyond judging as accomplished, and reversible, but also tolerable to the technological system. **In conflict, triumph owes to the greatest application of discomforting or unpleasant force;** consider what *more effective* measures could be applied as you read LG's statement: “Given the situation we find ourselves in with the climate catastrophe, there is no argument that would justify not implementing these measures immediately.” If they truly believe that governments (and technological developments they allow) are dooming the future, why do LG and JSO and XR activists handicap themselves, broadcasting a dogmatic limit upon their rebellion? Even if we imagine that nice and gentle *could* work, it clearly is not the most expedient route, requiring a greater sacrifice of time, funds, and personnel than harsher methods require.

What would it look like if the renewable energy industry abandoned its own direct lobbying of governments for subsidies and instead persuaded concerned young people to be unpaid “activists” demanding that governments adopt renewable electrical generation? It would look just like XR and Just Stop Oil and Last Generation...

The goals (for which young people are tarnishing their “permanent records” created by the surveillance state) are akin to adamantly demanding that your kidnapper wear a balaclava of a different color; if you had the power to enforce this, would it improve your predicament? A real demand would be for your release, **and it would take serious and substantial discomforting force to win it**, being contrary to your captor's will. What is most contrary to the interests of the constantly-advancing technological system? The flourishing of wild Nature.⁵

Technology and Nature are incompatible: for one to live and prosper, the other must be killed. So the demand for ending technology must be asserted, exclusively, for only that will break the system. Any lesser goal is tantamount to advocating better service aboard the tilting Titanic. Though Just Stop Oil touts [nearly 2000 arrests](#), **their greatest success is**

their failure to press the UK government to becoming *more technologically enabled*. “success” won’t be due to pressure *against* the technological system, but because “[the system’s neatest trick](#)”: they seek to compel the techno-industrial system in the direction it is *already* poised to go, for its own benefit.

“...the fact that solutions are found in cases where the interests of the system *coincide* with the interests of human beings gives us no reason to hope for solutions in cases where the interests of the system *conflict* with those of human beings. ...Since it is in the system’s own interest to keep pollution and global warming under control, it is conceivable that solutions may be found that will prevent these problems from becoming utterly disastrous.”

— “Letter to David Skrbina, 03 Jan. 2005”, *Technological Slavery* (2019)

As oil becomes less-easily accessible or fully depleted, the system will invade some *new* area of Nature, making use of material previously useless or of low value. Thus we see development of renewable (limitless) energy sources: the technician class (serving technological progress) and the industrial concerns (seeking to increase wealth and power) have their own motives to achieve the means for continuing techno-industrial society while avoiding the known problem of CO₂ emissions (but oblivious to unforeseeable problems of the future);⁶ “green energy” technologies will not *replace* remaining hydrocarbons, but only *supplement* fossil fuels.⁷ And what will be done with the electricity generated from wind and sunlight (which Earth’s flora and fauna will suffer to be deprived of)? Expansions of human freedom are implausible.



If we suppose that a completely engineered environment such as this techno-utopian fantasy could be tolerated over the long-term by adaptable humans, where in such a future are the wild and free and uncontrolled gorilla, wolves, chimps, whales, forests, bears, rivers, birds, et al?

Is it plausible that true freedom would exist here, beyond oversight of all, absent the use of technical abilities to fully control and regulate behavior and thoughts?

Those ready to make sacrifices to save wild Nature (which includes human freedom) need to avoid these worthless groups

successful only at sacrificing their members in order to gain prominence. The petty goals and the **fleeting achievements of these campaigns by “climate activists” are worse than inadequate**, because they misdirect the focus of the dissatisfied and rebellious from the core of our social and ecological crises: Technology itself.

How to change society has already been studied by a certified genius, the lessons given to us in detail as [the 2016 book *Anti-Tech Revolution: Why and How*](#), the culmination of years of analyzing both triumphant *and* failed revolutionary and reformist movements, throughout history and around the world, by [captured revolutionary Theodore J. Kaczynski](#). The wisdom and truths of *ATR* are applicable to even those who have a goal different from its author, but anyone wanting to ensure that Earth remains viable habit for humanity *as a free species* cannot afford to forego a serious study of this work. **Efficacy demands that *Anti-Tech Revolution* be well understood and its insights employed**, lest people drawn to groups such as DGR,⁸ Just Stop Oil, Last Generation, or XR remain unwitting pawns of the techno-industrial system.

“...a successful revolutionary movement may start out as a tiny and despised group of “crackpots” who are taken seriously by no one but themselves. The movement may remain insignificant and powerless for many years before it finds its opportunity and achieves success. ...**A small but well-organized, unified, and deeply committed movement will have a far better chance of success than will a vastly larger movement that lacks these characteristics.** In other words, quality is more important than quantity. ...**A chief determinant, if not *the* chief determinant, of success for a revolutionary movement is its faith in itself.”**

— *Anti-Tech Revolution: Why & How* (2016) pp. 145, 154, 160



What gadgets or luxuries could possibly be a worthwhile trade of such evolved and irreplaceable natural majesties as these?

* * *

Dave Foreman – An Obituary & Eulogy by David Skrbina

The environmental movement lost a great champion and true hero recently, when Dave Foreman died on September 19. Dave had long suffered from a variety of minor health problems, but he ultimately succumbed to a lung disease at age 75. In this short obituary, I would like to reflect on my thoughts and direct personal experiences with the man who has become a near-mythic figure in the American environmental movement.

As a lifelong resident of the state of New Mexico, Foreman learned to love the open spaces of the desert southwest and came to revere the indigenous life there. As a young man, he was politically active, especially in defense of nature, and in 1973, at the age of 27, he joined one of the major environmental groups, The Wilderness Society. He would spend seven years with that group, eventually working his way up to a national position in Washington DC, where he was active in lobbying congressmen on behalf of nature. It was in Washington that Foreman came to realize both the depth of the environmental crisis and the pervasive corruption of the socio-political system that was causing it. He realized that the “big environmental groups” existed not so much for nature as to sustain their own large organization, and in particular, their well-paid leadership. He realized that even the more “environmental” politicians had little true knowledge or interest in nature, and that such people mostly feigned environmentalism because it drew in votes and donations. By 1980, Dave was fed up with a system that was doing virtually nothing for nature, and he quit his post.

It was at that time that Foreman came to believe that only direct intervention would reduce environmental damage. Out there, on the ground, it was the bulldozers, chainsaws, and backhoes that were doing the physical damage, and thus he concluded that only by disrupting their activity could the destruction be halted—if only temporarily. Taking inspiration from the radical environmentalist Edward Abbey, and especially from Abbey’s 1975 book *The Monkeywrench Gang*, Foreman and some friends established a new group: Earth First! Their mission would be to physically and directly intervene, destroying the machines of destruction, and otherwise directly disrupting the mechanisms of exploitation and “development.” Thus they undertook a whole variety of guerilla tactics, including disabling or destroying bulldozer and vehicle engines, pulling up surveyor stakes, cutting down billboards and other signage, and driving large metal spikes into trees to destroy any chainsaws that might seek to cut them down. All these tactics are brilliantly described in a now-infamous 1987 book, *Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching*. (You can buy used copies online, or read the text at theanarchistlibrary.org).

In the early years, the EF! gang operated quietly and mostly at night, but as their success and notoriety grew, they began to attract publicity. There was an excellent interview with

a then-39-year-old Dave Foreman from 1985, published in *Mother Earth News* (Jan/Feb); I strongly recommend it.

After the publication of *Ecodefense* in 1987, Earth First! had gained a national reputation, and more young environmentalists sought to join the cause. At first they were welcomed, but by the late 1980s, they were turning out to be detrimental. For one, given that EF! was conducting illegal action (but always nonviolent; no humans were ever injured by EF! efforts), they started to get infiltrated by moles and spies. Secondly, the newer young recruits seemed more interested in “leftist” causes, like fighting against authority and oppression, fighting for minority and immigrant rights, promoting women and LGBT-interests, battling patriarchy, and so on. Such efforts, though perhaps worthwhile, were certainly not putting “Earth first.” Dave’s original “conservative,” right-leaning eco-group was in danger of becoming a diverse, distracted, left-leaning social organization. In 1990, Foreman left the group he had established just 10 years earlier.

At that point, a number of things happened. Earth First! carried on, though now with a decidedly leftist orientation. The group still exists today, and they still publish the [Earth First! Journal](http://EarthFirstJournal.com). But they have little of the original flavor. As for Dave himself, he got caught up in a 1990 FBI sting operation on the attempted toppling of a power line—complete with moles and an agent provocateur—that got him arrested, despite having only incidental involvement in the whole affair. But by that time, he was out of EF! and moving on to establish a new wilderness preservation group, The Wildlands Project, and a new website, www.rewilding.org.

Though no longer an active monkeywrencher, Foreman continued to publicly press his radical ideas to defend nature. He published two more books in 1991: *Defending the Earth*, and *Confessions of an Eco-Warrior*. Both are highly recommended. As for the real monkeywrenchers: they split off from Earth First! and became part of a new, highly-decentralized organization, the Earth Liberation Front (ELF). The ELF was very active through the 1990s and early 2000s, causing massive financial damage to the land development infrastructure, though they have largely faded away in the past 15 years. For one good account of the movement and the FBI’s infiltration, see the 2011 documentary *If a Tree Falls*. For a good, objective, recent account of ELF—though without mentioning Foreman—see the NYT Magazine article “The rise and fall of America’s environmental underground” (13 July 2022).

Dave spent the last 30 years of his life working on the Wildlands Project, tirelessly lobbying and advocating for a large-scale return to wild nature in all its diversity and wildness.

As for myself, I began teaching environmental philosophy at the Univ of Michigan-Dearborn in 2003, carrying on as the sole instructor of Environmental Ethics for 15 years. A regular part of the course material was a discussion of EF!, ELF, and the writings of Dave Foreman. Sometime around 2010, I began to

pursue the idea of bringing in interesting environmentalist guest speakers to talk to the class and to perhaps give an open campus lecture. In late 2011, I realized that Dave was available to give talks at universities, provided we could raise the travel expenses. So I applied for funding to cover his costs to fly to UM-D for a couple of days.

By early 2012, I had secured enough money, so I contacted Dave directly with an official invite, asking him to speak at Dearborn in late March. Much to my pleasure, he agreed. I booked his airfare and hotel, and then began to promote his upcoming talk—the first at UM-D by a major figure in US environmentalism.

Then bad news: During a scuba diving trip in Florida in February, Dave suffered some kind of neck injury—not paralyzing, but bad enough to be very painful and to require a neck brace for several weeks. In early March, Dave regretfully cancelled. Needless to say, we were all disappointed.

But I suggested a compromise to his secretary: Maybe Dave could talk to our class live, via Skype? She said she would ask him, but added that Dave generally disliked video calls and had “never done a Skype lecture before”. Ugh. But luck was with us—he agreed. So we arranged and conducted Dave Foreman’s first-ever live video lecture, for the full 75 minutes of class, on 5 April 2012. It was a great success.

But being my usual persistent self, I was determined to get Dave here, live and in person. So I had the funds set aside to be held for a year. As 2013 came around, I contacted Dave again, and fortunately he agreed once more. Thus we arranged his visit to Dearborn on March 21 of that year.

I picked Dave up from the airport on the day before, drove him over to his hotel to check in, and took him out to dinner—a great opportunity for me to chat one-on-one with “Uncle Dave.” We covered a range of topics—current environmentalism, technology, direct action, student attitudes, and so on. The next day, Dave gave two talks: a ‘private’ one for our Enviro Ethics class, and an open lecture in one of our big auditoriums. Both were great successes. When Dave had a free minute at the end of the day, we snapped a few photos; below is one of them:



All in all, it was a fantastic visit—Dave was extremely friendly, positive, optimistic. He was impressed that I was actually teaching EF!/Foreman at a major university, and he considered this a hopeful sign for the future. In subsequent years, I’ve tried to follow through on that hope.

Now, with Dave gone, it truly is “up to us.” Not to be overly anthropocentric, but we humans have a clear role to play in the salvation of the planet. The Earth did not evolve to handle 8 billion members of the human species; or to handle toxic wastes, microplastics, ubiquitous radiation, mass agriculture (and agricultural animals), slash-and-burn farming, mass release of greenhouse gasses, or any other of the myriad wonders of our technological age. With 8 billion humans and an out-of-control high-tech infrastructure, the planet is almost certainly doomed. There is a fair chance that, unless things change, all humans and all higher lifeforms could be exterminated within 100 years.

The general form of the solution is clear: many fewer people, consuming far less per capita, with much simpler technology. As I have argued elsewhere, we need concrete goals: something like 1 or 2 billion humans, max; pre-industrial technological societies (which means no fossil fuels and no electricity); and consumption levels (energy and material) at perhaps 1/10th of today’s levels, or less. And we need vast increases in true wilderness—targeting perhaps 50% of the Earth’s land area, where there would be no permanent human presence, no agriculture, no roads, and no resource extraction.

Impossible, you say? Ok: if we can’t do it on our own, I strongly suspect that Nature will “help” us. I would wager a large sum that, one way or another, there will be less than 1 billion humans on Earth in the early 22nd century—and perhaps a lot less. And they won’t be using fossil fuels, because they will be gone. And they won’t be doing mass agriculture, because much of the planet will be non-arable and perhaps uninhabitable. One way or another, humanity will arrive at the condition sketched above; we can do it rationally, slowly, and humanely, or we can let Nature do it—and She won’t be nice.

Rest in peace, Dave Foreman. You did as much as any one man can do for nature. Now, it is up to us.

* * *

Visit antitechcollective.com for more

