



Notebook n° 4

Content:

- Collateral damage: An Eco-Extremist Defense of Indiscriminate Violence. By Chahta-Ima
- Indiscriminate attacks? What the fuck's wrong with you? By Xale
- Hunter: A Review of "The Other Slavery" by Andrés Reséndez. By Huizache's Bow

Cover page: ---

Edit Regresión Magazine

Autumn 2016

Collateral damage: An Eco-Extremist Defense of Indiscriminate Violence

Merely being an eco-extremist propagandist, I am forced to pay attention to reactions of anarchist and leftist readers to the actions of ITS and other eco-extremist groups. The first reaction I encounter is usually one of disgust. How can eco-extremists carry out indiscriminate acts against property and people, such as burning buses and sending mail-bombs, where “innocent bystanders” may also get hurt? What if a child was near a bomb, or what if the secretary to the scientist, a mother and a wife, opens the package and gets killed instead? Why this obsession with nihilistic violence, where innocent people get killed? Isn’t this ineffective for helping to destroy civilization? Doesn’t this just show that the eco-extremists are mentally disturbed, probably angry at their parents, off their medications, outcasts, etc.?

Really, the opposition of leftists, anarchists, anarcho-primitivists, and any number of people who react negatively to eco-extremist violence is one of great hypocrisy: hypocrisy of the level that Nietzsche and any good manipulator of words could easily dissect. For civilization, and any ideology really, is based on indiscriminate violence, on hiding dirty laundry and sweeping dirt under the rhetorical rug so no one can see it.

Let’s start with the numbers game:

Opposition to eco-extremist violence can be approached from the view of the Christian “Golden Rule”: “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.” You wouldn’t want to be blown up on a bus. You would not want to have your fingers blown off, or have a bullet put in your head when you are just “doing your job”. Everyone has the right to work and support themselves, right? But your chances of being on the business end of an eco-extremist blast are minuscule: you probably have a better chance of winning the lottery. On the other hand, your chances of crashing your car, or being hit by one, are astronomically higher by comparison. Your chances of dying early of cancer or heart disease due to the consumption of processed foods are even higher. Yet those two last causes of death are “perfectly natural”, while being “collateral damage” in a war to defend nature itself is somehow a tragedy. Cry me a river.

Of course, what such condemnation means is a tacit approval of state or civilized violence. For the bourgeois liberal, “terrorist violence” is horrible because only the State can designate people who need to be killed (if you lived in Afghanistan or Yemen, for example, you would have more to fear than just cars; you would also have drones raining down death on you from the skies. But that’s okay, because U.S. democracy approved this.) The leftist and anarchist can criticize eco-extremist action with more integrity, so the reasoning goes, because they too reject the violence of capitalism and the State. Aside from that, however, they create a fantasy world where “the guilty”, rich parasites who they have tried and sentenced to death in their own minds from the comforts of their talk-shops, are killed indiscriminately and even with cruelty, not taking into account that

the bourgeoisie too are also husbands, fathers, sons, daughters, etc. And of course, they expect that violence to be minimal, as Revolutions have historically been dainty tea parties where the innocent never, ever get hurt...

What we are confronting here is the Great Hologram of Civilization: one that compels us to care about people we never will meet, to have deep empathy for the abstract citizen, comrade, or child of God. We are supposed to get upset at the sight of the burning bus, or the destroyed office, or the leftovers of an incendiary device left outside of a government building. We are supposed to go over scenarios in our head: “What if my daughter was in front of that building? What if my wife was in that office? What if I was that scientist lying in a pool of my own blood in a parking lot?” Well, what if you were? And to be honest, you weren’t, so why are you playing that film in your head?

Isn’t that the great narrative of civilization: we are all in this together? That’s a lie, because we aren’t. Your life is merely a cog in a great Machine, and should the Machine decide to spit you out, you will be spit out. You have no agency, your morality is an illusion. It just covers up a lot of violence and death that went into making the clothes on your back and the food you eat. It’s alright for massive numbers of animals to die, to burn down forests and pave over meadows. It’s okay to enslave people in factories, to erect monuments to those who buried the worlds of wild savages, to sacrifice the dreams and sanity of those alive today for a better tomorrow. But for the love of God, don’t place a pipe bomb in front of a government ministry! That’s going too far.

Here's the key to your liberation: you owe society nothing, and you don't have to do what it says. Those people who get killed on the other side of the world don't care about you, and they never will. You are just one digit too many in their Dunbar's number: at most you will be a headline and then you will be forgotten. Your identifying with the death of the "citizen" or "child of God" hundreds and thousands of miles away is a way to manipulate you into doing what society wants: it's a tool of domestication, and that's it.

The poet Robinson Jeffers once stated that cruelty was the most natural thing, yet civilized man makes it out to be contrary to nature. Some tribes in what is now northern California were observed by the Europeans to be the most peaceful and the most violent at the same time: peaceful in that they had no organized warfare, violent because that's how they settled inter-personal disputes. Those who cower in disgust at individualist acts of violence are really defending the right of the State and civilization to have exclusive power of life and death over civilized human animals.

They're its property, so how dare those eco-terrorists impinge on that right, as well as the right of 10,000 years of civilized law and order to decide who lives or who dies!

I end my rant with two (apocryphal?) quotes from Joseph Stalin. The first is: "You have to break a few eggs to make an omelette." Of course, that is what the opponents of eco-extremists will always say: we are sacrificing the lives of innocent people to make our own version of Eden. Anyone with half a brain and a little reading comprehension will know that's bullshit.

Eco-extremism doesn't seek to break eggs to make an omelette: it seeks to destroy the whole farm, and if eggs get damaged in the process, that's just the nature of the beast. How many eggs get broken on a factory farm a day?

The second quote from Stalin is: "One death is a tragedy, a million deaths is a statistic." And is this not the logic of civilization, of the leftist and anarchist? They can shrug off a whole world being butchered by civilization, they can wave off the deaths of savage peoples who did nothing but defend their land, and they can play video games in their heads of strangling capitalists in their beds, but when they see a bus on fire, or a lab blown up, they scream, "Won't somebody think of the children!?"

You may think these acts are ineffective; you may think them the obsessions of crazy sociopaths, or what have you. We're not trying to change the world, we would rather see it all go up in flames. And if you don't see that the destruction of the Earth, of the rivers and mountains, of the forests and oceans, is the real insanity, then we cannot help you, nor would we care to. Just duck when you see us coming.

Indiscriminate attacks? What the fuck's wrong with you?

“So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.”

A.

Introduction

For some time now many have been commenting on the eco-extremist position of carrying out indiscriminate attacks. The attacks, which have now extended from North into South America, have caused a great deal of consternation among radical anarchists, not to speak of the modern left.

The unsettled discourse coming from these groups has its origins in the initial ITS communiqués dating from 2011 forward. These openly favored terrorist violence for those who work in favor of techno-industrial progress without regard as to whether innocent bystanders are hurt.

This attitude was plainly evident in the first attack by the group when a UPVM worker did not deliver the mail-bomb left at the campus to the selected target. Instead he decided to open it himself, and his wounds were the first incident in the series of attacks that continues to this day.

Since its beginning, ITS has no doubt been a group without classification that has clashed with various eco-anarchist circles characterized by their civilized and progressivist posturing, as well as their “cult of the victim” and humanism.

Some Background

In Mexico, various collectives, organizations, and individuals that advocate the same old ideologies antagonistic to the state, institutions, political parties, etc. have been scandalized by ITS and its official statements. They never really understood them, and still don't get them it seems.

What was with all of those communiqués and attacks against scientists in 2011? A few pansies whined to anyone who would hear that ITS was a macabre front to justify repression against the social movements and anarchists active at the time.

From where did such a group emerge that is so problematic in its attacks? What did these claims of responsibility on behalf of Wild Nature mean? Isn't Mexico the land of Zapatistas, commies, and shitty anarchists who go on and on about autonomist-populist discourses? Is this some sort of split from an armed communist group? Are they really radical ecological militants as they claim to be or are they agent provocateurs to be used to jail the same whiny usual suspects clamoring for justice? Or is this some sort of elaborate troll executed by a bunch of bored punks?

No, ITS is a group of individualists coming out of eco-anarchism who have departed with unrealistic and utopian ideals. They criticized and self-criticized, working in the shadows to carry out attacks in the here and now.

ITS adamantly states that there is NOTHING that can change society for the better. Neither can we rely on a “primitivist paradise” or a revolution to struggle for. We aren't anarchists, communists, feminists, punks, or any other stereotypical “radical”. We are at WAR with civilization. We are against the technological system, against science and all that seeks the domestication of Wild Nature and wants to impose an artificial life upon us as humans bound to our most profound roots in the past. We don't deny our own personal contradictions. Indeed, we don't really care if we seem “inconsistent” to those who issue dumb arguments like, “If they oppose technology, why do they use the Internet?” We piss on their vague and baseless criticisms.

After the first phase of ITS in 2011, the second began after the publication of the sixth communiqué in January 2012. This document contained a number of self-criticisms which ITS made to rid itself of vestigial anarchism and the influence of Theodore Kaczynski.

The third phase reached in 2014 with the emergence of Reacción Salvaje (Wild Reaction) clarified ideas even more. Here a penchant for indiscriminate attacks was maintained and carried out by different groups: of the

25 communiqués issued that year, 15 were primarily concerned with claiming responsibility for a particular attack.

ITS was not lying when it said in these communiqués that it was not interested in who was wounded in these attacks. It was pretty clear then that they were indiscriminate and this continues to be true.

In April 2011, ITS's attack left the already-mentioned UPVM worker in the Mexico State gravely injured. In August of that year a package-bomb left two important professors of the Tec University of Monterrey in similar condition. In November they assassinated a recognized biotechnology investigator in Morelos with a gunshot to the head. In December an envelope-bomb wounded another professor at the UPP in Hidalgo. In 2013, a postal worker was wounded after having stolen a package-bomb from a mailbox in Mexico City. That is all to say that, from 2011-2013, ITS's attacks left 5 injured and one dead: four were serious and two hit unintended targets.

This was the same story with RS: in July 2015 a public official belonging to the Commission of Human Rights suffered burns after opening a package found in the garage of the headquarters of that institution in Mexico State. On August 14th a secretary of the Cuevas Group (engineers linked to the ICA) was hurt in a similar manner after opening a package left at its offices in the same state.

After the death of RS, successor eco-extremist groups have already racked up a casualty list. In October 2015 nine bombs were left in nine separate Mexibus buses in Mexico State. These were detonated using timers and even though this was an attack on public transit, only one person was injured. Nevertheless, the danger of doing major damage to both life and property was quite severe, but the author of the attack, "The Pagan Sect of the Mountain and Allied Groups", did not care about this.

In November of that year, a package bomb was left inside the National Agriculture Council in Mexico City and wounded the Vice-President of the Pro-GMO Alliance, as well as his secretary and two bystanders who were nearby. The "Eco-Extremist Circle of Terrorism and Sabotage" took responsibility for the attack.

Two other groups coming out of RS, "The Indiscriminate Faction" and "Ouroboros Nihilista", have tried to detonate explosives at their targets without concern that they might hurt innocent bystanders. Even though their attacks do not appear successful so far, their intention remains the same.

In January of this year, 2016, ITS then resurfaced with its first communiqué, which opens a new chapter. Even for the usual suspects in this War, this has been a surprise. Fifteen days after the publication of this communiqué, ITS carried out six attacks with explosives in three different states in Mexico. Its ability to carry out these widespread successive attacks has given people much to talk about. A second communiqué claimed responsibility for the January-February attacks. A week after its publication a Transantiago Bus was reduced to a burnt-out hunk of metal in Santiago, Chile in broad daylight. The name of the group that took responsibility for carrying out the attack was "Individualists Tending Toward the Wild – Chile".

With this third group communiqué, it was evident that indiscriminate eco-extremism was going international. A week after the bus burning, a fourth communiqué signed by "Individualists Tending Toward the Wild – Argentina" was issued taking responsibility for an explosive device left at the Nanotechnology Foundation, for various threatening messages sent to scientists and the press, and also for having left a package full of blasting powder with a message at a bus station in Buenos Aires.

Even though ITS in February carried out attacks in three distinct countries under its own direction, in ten separate attacks some of which were carried out in broad daylight, this wave of attacks only left two bystanders wounded.

In March a fifth communiqué of ITS-America (Mexico, Chile, and Argentina) defended and re-emphasized the position that has been advocated since 2011: it doesn't matter if bystanders get hurt, this is War, the method of attack is indiscriminate. ITS does NOT have any moral qualms in carrying out its attacks. In the aftermath of these disturbing words, there were reactions...

Debates, notes, and insinuations

Various anarchist "counter-information" blogs reported on these attacks by eco-extremist groups in Mexico with the caveat that they did not approve of these attacks even though they decided to publish the

communiqués anyway. Others chose to publish them without comment or editorializing. Some only mentioned the actions themselves while silencing our positions. This is understandable, as no blog, magazine, or any other anarchist project has any obligation to publicize what eco-extremist groups do or say. There will always be criticisms between us, some constructive and some not so much. What the Editorial Group of Regresión Magazine would like to clarify is the following:

-We don't want everyone else to accept our "terms and conditions", we are not trying to be nice or friendly to strangers. We don't want others to be more like us. We are not looking to make converts from eco-anarchism to eco-extremism. The few who decide to go down this path are convinced that this project will be defended with tooth and claw; by planning and contemplating how to inflict surer and stronger blows. Some anachos call us out as being a "Mafia". We'll accept that classification from those critics and big talkers who go about defaming our project in Mexico as well as in other countries where the eco-extremist presence is felt.

We carry out a special type of crime, we are delinquents who have come together to attack different places in Mexico as well as in Chile, Argentina, and other countries. Don't think twice about accusing us of being terrorists or a new type of mafia, because the shoe fits in this case and you're not telling us something we don't already know.

-Everyone is open to express their anger when they read our stuff; many closeted U.S. anarcho-Zerzanians (Anarchist News, to name one example) have done so. This last example in particular censored ITS communiqués since many on the site consider us "reactionaries". We don't bring this up because we are bitter and are playing the victim. We're bringing it up so that these blogs don't put on airs of being so tolerant of divergent opinions. And if they are indeed so "triggered" by our politically incorrect, terrorist, and Mafioso communiqués, they'd be doing us a favor by not publishing them.

-As we stated above, anyone can disagree with the indiscriminate eco-extremism that we advocate. For example, the so-called "Paulino Scarfó Revolutionary Cell" has done so in February of this year when it indirectly mentioned the ITS attack in Chile. To reiterate, it's healthy to express criticism and disagreements, but insinuations are a whole other story. That's not being particularly badass to be honest. Maybe they should have signed their communiqué, "Leo Tolstoy Anarcho-Christian Cell" instead of what they signed. It also seems that memory escapes these supposed anachos, or they suffer temporary amnesia at the mention of the person who was the comrade of the TERRORIST Severino Di Giovanni, the anarchist who blew up the Italian Consulate in Buenos Aires, killing various fascists but also wounding bystanders, and who also murdered another anarchist who he had branded "a fascist".

Scarfó accompanied Di Giovanni in the most violent phase of the Individualist War against mobile and symbolic objectives. He was INDISCRIMINATE, in fact he was condemned by the anarchists of his time as his methods were considered "inappropriate".

It's true CRPS, the eco-extremist groups, ITS, and we aren't revolutionaries. We don't particularly care for repetitive and boring leftist discourse. The difference between you and us is that we don't beat around the bush about it and we don't passively-aggressively deal in bitchy innuendo.

Some of our positions in regard to "Nigra Truo" (NT)

Some days ago a member of the blog, "Por la Anarquía" published a post where one can read his position for and against eco-extremism. To date it's the only criticism that for us approaches being sincere as it doesn't just focus on criticizing what we defend but also makes criticism of anarchist circles. Still we're not letting him get off that easily, so we have to clarify the following:

-It seems that NT has gotten his information about ITS all mixed up, as he has written that it is a contradiction to be pushing The Amoral Debate of the nihilists from the editorial house "Nechayevshchina" but at the same time have a moral rule of "Nature is Good, Civilization is Evil". NT should be reminded that ITS has went through many phases: if the group defended that Naturien motto in 2011, it should be clarified that the ITS of today is different. It's been years since we've utilized that phrase, so I hate to break it to you, NT, but your criticism is a day late and a dollar short. ITS no longer utilizes this motto, as Wild Nature works on an extramoral level.

-Reading NT's criticism it seems like he is confused about what we, the defenders of the eco-extremist tendency, consider to be Indiscriminate Attacks. Putting a bomb in a bum's cardboard box or lighting a Street vendor's cart on fire is not what we are talking about when we mention "indiscriminate attacks". Indiscriminate attacks are when we place a bomb in a specific place, a factory, a university, a particular house, a car, or institution where our human or inanimate target can be found, without regard as to whether an explosive can harm bystanders. Indiscriminate Attack is setting fire to a place of symbolic significance without worrying about whether "innocent people" will get hurt, in order to strike out at Human Progress. Indiscriminate Attack is what ITS has been doing since 2011 which was outlined at the beginning of this text: it's sending package-bombs without regard for "collateral damage", always having the objective of destabilizing, terrorizing, and spreading chaos in a society that cannot think for itself.

-We continue to celebrate "natural disasters" which can be considered acts of vengeance or violent reactions of Wild Nature (depending on one's personal individualist worldview that departs from the one which civilized culture defends), derived from the environmental destruction that comes from the hand of man, from the giant multinational corporation to its peons, the proletariat.

Conclusion

In closing, all that is left to say is that the attacks by eco-extremist groups will continue along with their unsettling discourse. There will be moments where we all agree to disagree, but let it be known that we will respond when appropriate as the politically incorrect terrorists that we are. We say what is on our minds, and we clarify again that before anything, we are members of the Eco-extremist Mafia!!

With the inscrutable fury of Wild Nature!

With Chahta-Ima, Nechayevshchina, and Maldición Eco-extremista (Eco-extremist Curse)!

With ITS of Mexico, Chile, and Argentina!

Let the War continue!

Xale: Editor-in-Chief of Regresión Magazine

Mexico, Winter 2016

Hunter: A Review of “The Other Slavery” by Andrés Reséndez

In order to put more content on this page, and also to focus the eco-extremist point of view, once in a while we will be putting up reviews of books here. Mostly these will be of books that perhaps are inaccessible to the majority of eco-extremists and their accomplices in the Spanish-speaking world. Here we begin with the recently published book from the Mexican-“American” professor at the University of California, Davis, Andrés Reséndez, entitled, *The Other Slavery: The Uncovered Story of Indian Enslavement in America*. This book addresses many of the themes that have been discussed in *Revista Regresión* and similar venues, which are also themes that are well-known in Latin America but not so well-known in the English-speaking world. For that reason, we are not going to give a summary of the entire book here. Much of that content is taught at universities and even high schools in Latin America as the history of the colonies and the Viceroyalty. For example, almost everyone knows about the slavery of the Indians in Mexico and Peru. There’s no need to tackle those themes again in this review.

It should be noted, however, that there has been much revisionism in recent years among theorists concerning the progressive march of civilization in what is now known as “the Americas”. The U.S. authors Charles Mann in the book, *1491*, and Jared Diamond in *Guns, Germs, and Steel*, can give the impression that colonizing violence may have been exaggerated in some historical sources. In this book at least, Reséndez refutes that revisionism. The conquest was just as bloody as Bartolomé de las Casas and others wrote it.

Nevertheless, we don’t want to dwell on the role of the “poor Indians” as “martyrs”, which leftist discourse often does in its cult to the “noble savage”. Here we want to focus on the parts of the text that significantly complicate the question at hand. In the chapter, “Powerful Nomads”, Reséndez describes the effect of the introduction of the horse into hunter-gatherer tribes. The author writes:

“The most dramatic instances of Indian reinvention occurred in what is now the American Southwest. Multiple factors propelled the Indians of this region to become prominent traffickers. The royal antislavery activism of the Spanish crown and the legal prohibitions against Indian slavery dissuaded some Spanish slavers in northern Mexico, leaving a void that others filled. Moreover, the Indian rebellions of the seventeenth century that culminated in the Great Northern Rebellion restricted the flow of Indian slaves from some regions and led to the opening of new slaving grounds, creating new opportunities. Most important, the diffusion of horses and firearms accelerated at this time, giving some Indians the means to enslave other people. The new traffickers, new victims, and new slaving routes emerged in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Some native communities experienced a process of “deterritorialization,” as Cecilia Sheridan has called it, becoming unmoored from their traditional homelands, fusing with other groups, and reinventing themselves as mobile bands capable of operating over vast distances. They made a living by trading the spoils of war, including horses and captives.”

In the Southwest of what is now known as “the United States,” but even more so in the Great Plains, there was a “revolution of the horse.” This was not a question of introducing warlike behavior in peoples who were historically hunter-gatherers. On the contrary, pedestrian Indians did everything Indians on horseback did: move about, hunt, trade, and wage war. It was only a question of “doing it better.”

Some tribes benefitted more than others. These tribes generally enslaved the others, including hunter-gatherer nomads and agricultural peoples. The Comanches were an example of a “minor” tribe that became a great “hunter-gatherer empire,” obtaining its wealth through plunder acquired in raids. The most profitable plunder was in their capture of slaves, even though slavery was technically illegal in the Spanish Empire, though this law was generally ignored.

Comanches in particular hunted slaves in order to trade them for horses, rifles, and metal knives. But they also absorbed slaves into their society. In general in a raid, the Comanches killed all of the adult males but they took the women and children who could help augment their numbers. As a polygamous society, a warrior could have many wives, up to ten or more if he was successful in warfare. Women served not just for prestige or sexual gratification. Having many wives had benefits in that a warrior could kill many buffalo in only an hour, and it was the task of the women to process the meat, which was a time-consuming process.

Reséndez describes the preparation for a raid stating that a group of warriors would parade their horses and themselves publicly, so that others would be invited to join. Great shows of horses and personal finery would be seen at this time, and the strength and bravery of the warriors were assessed to determine the raid's potential success. A war dance would precede the attack, which could stretch far into Mexico some distance away from Comanche territory. Reséndez describes one significant raid in the middle of the 19th century:

“Witnesses emphasized the stealth of these Indian attacks, which in an instant could turn a placid night into a surreal scene of mayhem, complete with screams of “Los bárbaros!,” gunshots, galloping horses, and arrows flying. Outlying ranches, isolated houses, and shepherds plying their trade in remote areas were easy pickings. But Comanche warriors sometimes targeted large Mexican towns as well. In December 1840 and January 1841, a group of Indian attackers spent two weeks raiding ranches in the vicinity of Saltillo, the capital of the state of Coahuila, moving from one ranch to the next, as if in complete defiance of any Mexican retribution. In a feat of ‘inconceivable audacity’ as the Mexican press labeled it, they appeared right on the outskirts of the city before being driven away by a hastily assembled Mexican force. Similarly, in August 1846, during one of the most daring and brazen raids of all, some five hundred Comanches cut a swath through Chihuahua and Durango. George F. Ruxton, an Englishman who was traveling through northern Mexico at the time, left us a bleak portrayal: abandoned ranches, impassable roads, and barricaded towns living in dread of Indian raids. When he reached the city of Durango in September, he was astonished to learn that the talk of this town of some eighteen thousand inhabitants was not about the ongoing U.S. – Mexican War, but about the possible Indian invasion by Comanches who had been ravaging haciendas to the northeast of the city.”

The Comanches were not the only tribe that carried out raids. Reséndez speaks of the Apaches and Utes who also preyed on other Indians and non-Indians alike. The stories of Mangas Coloradas and Geronimo are widely known and require little description here. The Apaches differed from some other tribes in that, until the 18th century, they were some of the worst victims of enslavement by the Spanish to work in the silver mines of northern Mexico. The coming of the 19th century and the Mexican Republic saw them make efforts to become somewhat sedentary and agricultural, but due to the decline of the military presence on the Mexican frontier, they quickly began to take up raiding as a way of life like many of their neighbors. They fought vicious battles with the Mexican military which often degenerated into hand-to-hand combat, and as in many other instances, captive men were either killed or outright enslaved, while women and children were often absorbed into the Apache community.

Captives were not always treated very “humanely”, however. There is the story of Matilda Lockhart captured by the Comanches who, when she was “returned to civilization,” “...had bruises and sores all over her body, and her nose had been cut off, her nostrils ‘wide open and denuded of flesh, especially to her nose, and how they would shout and laugh like fiends when she cried.” Many times these prisoners, especially if they were of means, were held for ransom. The Mormons, upon arriving in Utah in the mid-nineteenth century encountered the Ute chief Walkara who, according to Mormon leader Brigham Young, was never without “a quantity of Indian children slaves”. Young commented that, “I have seen his slaves so emaciated that they were not able to stand on their feet. He is in the habit of tying them out from his camp at night, naked and destitute of food, unless it is so cold he apprehends that they will freeze to death.” Walkara’s children were literally described by another witness as “living skeletons,” “literally starved to death by their captors.”

Walkara was called, “the Hawk of the Mountains,” who sold Indian children from tribes such as the Paiute for guns and other goods from civilization. He would ride and trade as far away as California, and was known to steal cattle and horses, as well as raid caravans. The recently arrived Mormons both feared and dealt with Walkara and the Utes, but were often powerless to stop their barbarism. In trying to prevent the sale of Indian children, the Mormons were witness to the following gruesome scene when Walkara’s brother, Arapeen, was told that they refused to buy the Indian children he was selling:

“Several of us were present when he took one of the children by the heels and dashed his brains out on the hard ground, after which he threw the body toward us telling us that we had no hearts or we would have saved its life.”

The Utes also participated in the destruction of the Navajo tribe in conjunction with U.S. government forces, though with a great deal of autonomy so that they could steal from and enslave the Navajos.

There are of course other parts of this book that we won't discuss here that cover such aspects of history like the Pueblo Revolt and even a section on the Chichimeca War, which was very thoroughly described in *Revista Regresión*. The reason we discuss this particular theme of the book is to deal another blow to the myth of the "noble savage". The naysayers will of course say that tribes like the Comanches, Apaches, Utes, etc. didn't become warlike and cruel until they domesticated the horse and were enticed into becoming so by the promise of Europeans goods (guns, knives, horses, etc.) That's true to some extent, but it also perhaps raises the question of if they were "always like that," and the introduction of the horse and other novelties only made this fact all the more manifest. Civilization isn't the stain of original sin in the soul of the "noble savage," it's the means to amplify and carry out something that is already there, making it all-consuming and out of balance.

Nevertheless, our tendency doesn't shrink back from the savage legacy of these tribes, on the contrary. A savage cannot choose the "ideal time" to be a savage, he is one wherever he is, and acts accordingly.

To the green anarchist, perhaps Mangas Coloradas and Walkara are "villains" who fell for the bait of civilization, enslaving and selling prisoners. Eco-extremism renounces such "morality of attack". Victims are not "saints of our devotion," we don't shrink back from the inevitable cruelty of life. These things must be so, and blows must be returned with blows.

What is even more telling is how all of this reflects on the utopian "green anarchist future primitive". I am sure that we will give ourselves a lobotomy in order to de-domesticate the horse, forget how to use guns and metal, and become completely nomadic on foot only, because any other way would lead to "hierarchy," and we can't have that. Also we will forget about nuclear reactors, drones, space ships, etc. etc. Thus, a "future primitive" band would never devolve into selling emaciated children on slave markets and dashing toddlers' skulls open when people refuse to buy... No, I am sure that these "green anarchists" will preserve their "purity of heart," in a techno-industrial world after collapse, unlike the unworthy sinners of history such as Geronimo, Mangas Coloradas, Walkara, and the rest of the reprobate in anarchist salvation history....

Eco-extremists are wild in the here and now, they attack in the here and now, using tools of the present to fight against that which seeks to enslave and domesticate them. That may make them hypocrites, but whatever, at least they're in good company. Like any sensible people, they use the weapons at hand to fight the enemy. I end this reflection with a passage from an article in *Revista Regresión* number 3 related to this theme:

And with this we reply to the question presented in the fourth reading: we cannot limit ourselves to using ancient weapons just because we criticize the technological system. We should use the arms of the same system in order to fight it. Just as the Native Americans who participated in the slaughter at Little Big Horn didn't refuse to use repeating rifles, neither do we refuse to use modern weaponry that can inflict damage on our enemy.

-Arco de Huizache (Huizache's Bow)

– *Chicomoztoc, Full Moon of July, 2016*

Regresión

Cuadernos contra el progreso tecnolndustrial